Application no: 22/02848/DISC

Location: Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, OX25 5HD

# **Transport Development Control**

#### Recommendation:

### Objection

The issues set out below need to be addressed to ensure that the Design Code conforms to current standards

### Key issues:

- Design of residential developments should conform to both the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide and LTN 1/20 throughout.
- The Streets marked in blue on page 30 have been labelled as both secondary and tertiary throughout the document. It needs to be clarified which type of street they are.
- There is a lack of pedestrian connectivity between internal streets (secondary/tertiary).
- The Street Hierarchy Table on page 33 needs careful review.
- The density of housing is the inverse of what is desirable from an OCC perspective.
- The type of cycle parking facilities need to be outlined for dwellings with no garage space.
- There is no information in regard to the electric vehicle charging facilities throughout the development.
- There is no information on traffic calming measures.
- It is unclear as to whether this document is a precedent for the whole Heyford Park scheme (hence hybrid application), or whether this is just a document for Phase 10.
- There is no mention of the HGV/Bus link road.

#### **Detailed comments:**

### **General Comments Regarding Design Guide**

OCC have viewed the submission of this document as one that sets the precedent for the entirety of the 'Hybrid' development masterplan area. The document in its current state only refers to Phase 10 of the development, with no reference to the HGV/bus spine road or other phases of the development. Clarity on the purpose of the document is required.

On page 30 the blue streets have been described as 'Tertiary' streets, however in other places within the document they have been described as 'Secondary' clarification on the type of street this represents is key as it will influence the design criteria it must meet.

Camp Road is not LTN 120 compliant, table on 33 needs careful review.

### **Street Design**

There should be better pedestrian/cycle connectivity throughout the site in accordance with Oxfordshire LTCP Policy 2b. There should be a pedestrian/cycle connection between the west end of the site and Camp Road to reduce walking distances to services within Heyford Park. Internally there are also 2 loop roads with no pedestrian/cycle connectivity between them, OCC's Street Design Guide states within the Street Hierarchy that Pedestrians/Cyclists have top priority within the street scene and therefore greater efforts need to be made to decrease walking and cycling distances. We note that the developer declined to provide a ped/cycle connection between the site and the employment area to the north, on security grounds.

The design contains stretches of straight road longer than 70m in length, which means that traffic calming would be required. It would be preferable to have a curved alignment.

Having consulted OCC Road Agreements, they have also outlined that that forward visibility on a 20pmh road must measure at least 25m not the 10 outlined on page 33. The junction radii of 4m are sufficient, however it must be demonstrated that refuse and emergency vehicles can use the junctions without over running.

Any shared surfaces must be a width of 6.0m of clear carriageway (with an additional 1m for parking on one side and 2m for parking on both sides), this allows for sufficient room for vehicles and pedestrians. A minimum of 800mm maintenance margin on either side outside the kerbs, this is needed for maintenance access and because streetlighting columns cannot go in the shared surface. Perpendicular parking is not adoptable.

The housing density displayed on page 44 is the inverse of what OCC would recommend for new housing developments. The higher density of population should be

located at a closer proximity to the public transport links, in this case Camp Road, this is likely to improve patronage and help the bus service to become commercially viable.

### **Car Parking**

The Car Parking Provision at Heyford Park table on page 36, the table states that 1-bedroom dwellings are to have 1.5 spaces. However the recently adopted OCC Vehicle and Cycle parking standards state that 1-bedroom dwellings in rural Oxfordshire should have a maximum of 1 space per dwelling meaning this table will need to be revised. It must also be ensured that houses must not be designed with half spaces as per OCC's Street Design Guide. An example of this would be at the front of a garage, as this will encourage people to park over footways, blocking them to pedestrians. 3–4-bedroom dwellings should have a maximum of 2 spaces (versus 3) and 4+ bedroom houses should have a maximum of 3 (versus 4). This table needs to be revised so that it meets the guidance set out within the new standards.

As some garages are to be counted as parking spaces, a condition should be imposed to prevent those garages from being converted into rooms, i.e., the garages should be retained for parking purposes. However, it must be noted that various documents including Manual for Streets advise that fewer people are using garages for parking in the present day. I think this should be taken into consideration for larger houses, as providing limited parking may result in overspill onto the adjacent network as residents decide not to use the garage for parking.

# **Cycle Parking**

The dwellings within this development that have not been designed with garages must have their own, onsite cycle parking facilities. The OCC minimum levels of cycle provision required based on LTN 1/20 is 1 space per bedroom for all property sizes. These structures should be covered, convenient to access and secure.

# **Electric Vehicle Charging**

The Design Code does not provide any information regarding electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Policy EVI8 within the OCC Electric Infrastructure Guide states that all residential developments must have a minimum of 1 electric vehicle charging space. If there are to be any properties within the development that do not have driveways or allocated parking areas, information should be included on how the developer is going to provide electric vehicle charging infrastructure to the residents of these properties.

#### Landscaping

Regarding the landscaping throughout the site, all species that are within the adopted highway boundary will need OCC approval. A mix of species is required with no more

than 20% of any genus and no more than 10% of a particular species on the site. This is to prevent major impacts on the landscape in event of disease.

Preferably there will be no shrubs in the adoptable highway, If they are required for the purposes of biodiversity, they must not exceed a height of 600mm. Highway adoptable trees need approved tree pits/root barriers and need to be positioned with care around the streetlighting columns. (NB A commuted sum will be chargeable for any highway adoptable trees). Finally, within secondary streets, OCC recommend as little verges as possible, for maintenance purposes, again should they be required for the purposes of biodiversity, OCC will accept them on these grounds.

### **Comments from Road Agreements**

- Camp Road is due to be 20mph limit soon. There is a TRO already in place for this.
- Camp Rd is HRA with chippings as currently. Lower speed Site roads High stone HRA 55/10
- Kerbs on Camp Road are to be flush adjacent to swales (to allow over-the-edge drainage) but need to be 125mm upstand HB when adjacent to footways.
- Kerbs on the shared surfaces need to be a minimum of 50mm upstand for asphalt carriageway (to allow for surface dressing if required) – 25mm is acceptable for block paving.
- No central pinch points on Camp road calming. Just the left or right buildouts.
- The original central pinch points have been modified over time
- Any ramps on Camp Road to be bus friendly, they are not to be block paved.
- Block paved tables (with asphalt ramps) are acceptable on the secondary streets.
- Swept Path on Camp Rd needs to allow for max length articulated vehicle to reflect current usage.

Officer's Name: Ben Mundy

Officer's Title: Assistant Transport Planner

Date: 21/10/2022