

**District:** Cherwell

**Application No:** 20/00631/DISC-2

**Proposal:** Discharge of Condition 6(ii) (parking provision for Building 103) of 16/01545/F

**Location:** Building 103 & 315 Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester, OX25 5HD

---

## **Transport Development Control**

### **Recommendation**

Objection

### **Key issues**

- The Car Park Management Plan still requires improvement before it can be considered acceptable.

### **Detailed comments**

It is noted that this consultation is now for the partial discharge of condition 55 relating to the non residential parking strategy only of 10/01642/OUT. The consultation is accompanied by a revised version of the Heyford Park Village Centre Car Park Management Plan (Revision 05, 3<sup>rd</sup> July 2020).

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. Whilst this planning application relates to the non residential the holistic approach of the CPMP means that residential car parking provisions are integral to the overall parking strategy. This response therefore also relates to residential provisions where relevant.

The revised CPMP takes account of a number of issues raised in the County’s response to the original consultation on this planning application, dated 29<sup>th</sup> April 2020, and therefore represents an improved document. However, not all of the issues raised by the County have been addressed and the revised CPMP still contains shortcomings which need to be addressed before it can be considered acceptable. These are set out below.

- Table 3-1 remains 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.**
- Section 3.7 presents a total parking provision of 126 car parking spaces. This determined by allocations according to standards for various uses together with a parking accumulation analysis. An additional 12 car parking spaces are proposed over and above the maximum weekday accumulation determined. This is not considered sufficient 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 4.2.2 states that: “*Resident vehicles will only be permitted to use dedicated residents’ spaces. Residents parking outside of these spaces will be given a formal warning. In the event of a repeat offence within 12-months, a fine will be issued.*” Instant fines are considered to be a far more effective deterrent. **Reason for objection.**
- Paragraph 5.1.3 states that: “*It is not anticipated that a formal review process is needed for the CPMP, rather key changes will arise from experience of implementing the Plan and feedback from users and operators of the car parking provision.*” The County would expect to see provision for formal review as well and that this should include consultation with the County. **Reason for objection.**

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

**Officer’s Name** : Chris Nichols  
**Officer’s Title** : Transport Development Control  
**Date** : 17 July 2020

---