

District: Cherwell

Application No: 19/01777/DISC

Proposal: Discharge of condition 5 (travel plan and draft routeing agreement) of 18/02169/F

Location: Camp Road Upper Heyford

Transport Development Control

Recommendation

Objection

Key issues

- The Travel Plan requires further development.

Detailed comments

Transport Strategy

Paragraph 5.2.1 of the Travel Plan states that “*Vehicular access the site is in line with the most recent routing agreement between Oxfordshire County Council and the landowners relating to the development of the former RAF base at Upper Heyford which was decided on the 27th June 2014.*” It is acceptable for this access arrangement to continue.

Transport Development Control

The following items are noted as requiring attention. **Reason for objection.**

- Paragraph 3.2.3. The Travel Plan Pack and Travel Plan Leaflet will need to be submitted to the County’s Travel Plans team for approval prior to distribution.
- Section 4. A plan showing all existing staff post code locations, rather than only those that are relevant to certain modes, would be informative.
- Paragraph 4.3.6 refers to Dorchester’s proposals “...to reinstate the previously curtailed PRow...”. It is assumed that this refers to the Aves Ditch and Port Way rights of way. This reinstatement is long overdue despite the County’s numerous requests. In their absence these routes can not be counted as part of the network of footpaths around the site.
- Paragraph 4.3.8. States that “*It is generally considered that two kilometres is a reasonable distance for people to walk to work or nearby facilities and amenities.*” However, no source is quoted, and this is considered to be a demanding rather than a “reasonable” distance.

- Paragraph 4.3.13. States that “*The industry-accepted distance over which cycling is feasible for most of the population is 5-kilometres.*” However, again no source is quoted.
- Paragraph 4.3.16. It is not stated what a Strava Heat Map is. Figure 4.5 therefore has no meaning.
- Paragraph 4.3.32. The accessibility to bus travel for 14% of staff is considered low.
- Paragraph 4.4.7. States that “*The accessibility of the nearby railway stations mean that the site would be viable for staff working on an agency contract who may live further afield.*” It is not clear what this statement means.
- Paragraph 5.4.1. It is usual to analyse five years of personal injury accident (PIA) data rather than only three. The County’s PIA data is more up to date than that presented on the Crash Map website.
- Paragraph 7.2.1. Baseline mode split should be taken from a survey of existing staff rather than from the 2011 census.
- Table 7.2. It is not clear where how these targets have been derived.
- Section 8.1. It is not stated how much time input there will be from the Travel Plan Coordinator.
- Section 9.6. Bus ticket incentives could be offered to encourage the use of this mode of transport.
- Paragraph 9.7.1, d). It is not stated how car sharing will be rewarded.
- Paragraph 9.7.2, e). It is not clear how car sharing can reduce absenteeism.
- Figure 9.1. It is not clear what this figure is demonstrating.
- Section 10. It is not clear what informal monitoring entails.
- Section 11. The action plan is not detailed enough.
- Section 12. A budget estimate and breakdown is required.

Travel Plans

A Travel Plan has been submitted to discharge a planning condition associated with this site. The submitted travel plan will need further development to be able to do this. **Reason for objection.**

Specific items that require attention are set out below.

- The overall number of employees has been included in the Travel Plan but no information has been provided about shift patterns and how many employees are on site at any given time or general hours of business. This information should be included.
- Paragraph 3.2.3. It would be good to offer employees a choice of how they wish to receive this information allowing them to opt for receiving it electronically if they prefer. This documentation should be sent to the Travel Plan Team at Oxfordshire County Council for approval.
- Paragraph 7.2.1. This site has been operational for a number of years and will continue to operate for a number of years. For the purposes of this Travel Plan it will be necessary to conduct a baseline survey. A realistic timescale for this is required and details should be included in the Travel Plan together with the employee survey.
- Employees home postcodes will be collected as part of the baseline survey and this information will be used to look at employees home locations and to highlight which forms of sustainable travel are available for their journeys to and from work. This will help to inform the TPC of the best areas for promotion and the most likely to be successful. Later in the travel plan it states that employee home postcode information is already available as it has been used to check car sharing potential. It is a shame that it was not also used to identify the most suitable routes for travel plan promotion purposes. Without consulting with employees it is not possible to say that car share is a viable options for employees travelling to and from the site.
- Table 7.2. Considering the high levels of SOV travel identified in the census data these targets are not very challenging. Targets should be revised once the employee survey has been completed with a more challenging target being introduced.
- Section 8. Contact details for the TPC should be sent to the Travel Plan Team at Oxfordshire County Council. The Travel Plan should state that this will happen.
- Paragraph 8.4.2. A commitment to formal monitoring is required. This will need be annual and will need to take place at the same time of year as the baseline survey. A month after a survey has taken place a monitoring report will need to be sent to the Travel Plan Team at Oxfordshire County Council detailing progress towards achieving agreed travel plan targets. The Travel Plan will need to state that this will happen.
- Section 9.3. It is preferable to brand this as a Travel Information Pack for employees. It is not clear if there are any incentives being offered to encourage the uptake of sustainable travel to and from the site.
- No mention is made of what facilities are provided for employees that cycle to work, such as covered secure cycle parking, showers and lockers. These details should be included details in the travel plan.

- The action plan provided in the appendices is quite limited. Measures should be grouped under headings such as measures to reduce SOV use, measures to encourage cycling, measures to encourage walking, measures to increase the uptake of car share etc.
- No details are provided of the car parking that is available on site and how this is managed. These details should be included together with details of parking provision set aside for employees who car share.

A link to the County's Travel Plan guidance is included below.

<https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/roadsandtransport/transportpoliciesandplans/newdevelopments/TravelAssessmentsandTravelPlans.pdf>

Rights of Way

Section 4.3 of the Travel Plan references the network of public rights of way in the area and the value of these routes for walking and cycling journeys once the walking and riding network as illustrated in figure 4.3 is delivered.

However, the site owners have so far failed to meet the current and overdue requirements to reinstate Aves Ditch and Portway bridleways through the site and along Chilgrove Drive. This means that their potential for use as sustainable travel options is not relevant in relation to this Travel Plan. Given the direct connection between the whole site, the reopening of Aves Ditch and Portway, and this application, the owners of the site need take immediate steps to meet their responsibilities in a timely manner.

Officer's Name	:	Chris Nichols
Officer's Title	:	Transport Development Control
Date	:	14 October 2019
