

District: Cherwell

Application No: 20/00918/DISC

Proposal: Discharge of condition 55 (parking strategy) of 10/01642/OUT

Location: Heyford Park, Camp road, Upper Heyford, Bicester, OX25 5HD

Transport Development Control

Recommendation

Objection

Key issues

- The Car Park Management Plan contains a number of inconsistencies, inaccuracies and shortcomings which need to be addressed before it can be considered acceptable.
- The swept path analysis presented in drawing No. HEYF-5-224 D is acceptable in principle.

Detailed comments

The submission is accompanied by the Heyford Park Village Centre Car Park Management Plan (CPMP).

Paragraph 1.1.5 of the Car Park Management Plan (CPMP) states *“Whilst the conditions relate to separate applications, a holistic approach has been taken within this CPMP in so much as it relates to both the Village Centre North and Phase 1 of the Village Centre South. This ensures that parking can be managed more effectively across the Village Centre and Heritage Centre as a whole”* This approach is welcomed. However, CPMP contains a number of inconsistencies, inaccuracies and shortcomings which need to be addressed before it can be considered acceptable. These are set out below.

- Paragraph 1.1.1 states that this application is in discharge of a condition of planning permission 18/00043/NMA, whereas it is actually in discharge of planning permission 16/01000/F.
- Figure 1-1 would benefit from showing the Heritage Centre as well since the CPMP covers this facility. **Reason for objection.**
- Paragraph 1.2.1 states that the jurisdiction of the CPMP is *“North and South sections of Village Centre”* this would benefit from being clarified as *“...as shown in Figure 1-1”*

- Paragraph 1.3.2 states that *“this CPMP will come into effect once the Village Centre North external works are completed prior to the rest of the Village Centre North opening.”* It is not clear why Village Centre North is the trigger for the CPMP to come into effect.
- Paragraph 3.1.2 makes no reference to the Heritage Centre.
- Sections 3.2 and 3.3 do not state where the quoted quantum of development is taken from.
- Table 3-1 appears incorrect. The totals shown for Village Centre North and Village Centre South do not represent the number of spaces shown by land use over each total. It is assumed that this is because the Restaurant/Pub and Bowling Alley land uses are shown as Village Centre North whereas they are in Village Centre South. Also the parking quantum for the restaurant/Pub is presented for the area quoted in Section 3.3 but it is not clear whether this is public space, as required by the parking standard, or total space. **Reason for objection.**
- Paragraph 3.5.3 states that visitor parking spaces *“... will not be specifically allocated...”*. This is not an acceptable approach. The County requires that visitor parking spaces are specifically allocated. **Reason for objection.**
- Paragraph 3.6.8 implies that the total parking provision will be 102 spaces. This based on 40 spaces for the residential portion of the development as dictated by standards and 62 spaces for the non-residential uses based on a parking accumulation analysis. This level of provision is considered inadequate because it is likely that there will be occasions when the accumulated demand for non-residential uses will be exceeded. Some additional provision to accommodate this is therefore required. **Reason for objection.**
- Figure 3-3 appears to show a total allocation of some 126 car parking spaces. It is assumed that these include spaces to serve the heritage centre, although it is not clear how many. The County requires a clear statement of how many parking spaces are managed by this CPMP, and the use for which they are intended. As noted above the total number of car parking spaces will need to provide for occasions when the accumulated demand for non-residential uses will be exceeded. **Reason for objection.**
- It is not clear how the provisions for enforcement will be delivered in terms of personnel, systems, monitoring practices and premises. The County requires a clear statement of how the enforcement will be delivered. **Reason for objection.**
- Paragraph 4.1.6 states that: *“There will be a maximum number of visitor permits per dwelling per month/year...”* but does not say how many. This is required. **Reason for objection.**

- Paragraph 4.2.3 states that: “*In the event that the ANPR identifies that a vehicle which is not registered on the database is parked in residential allocated spaces, a first warning notice will be issued. Subsequent offences by the same vehicle will result in a fine being issued.*” Instant fines are considered to be a far more effective deterrent. **Reason for objection.**
- Paragraph 4.2.5 provides for appeals against fines to be made but does not state how or by whom these will be judged. **Reason for objection.**
- Paragraph 4.2.6. Instant fines are considered to be a far more effective deterrent. **Reason for objection.**
- Paragraph 4.3.1. A period of 72 hours seems a very generous period to provide before a vehicle is towed away.
- Paragraph 4.5.1. It is not stated how the appeal panel will be comprised.

The County can not recommend discharge of this condition until a CPMP is submitted which addresses these issues.

The swept path analysis presented in drawing No. HEYF-5-224 D is acceptable in principle.

Officer's Name : Chris Nichols
Officer's Title : Transport Development Control
Date : 29 April 2020
