

**Background:**

Condition 6 on the approved hybrid consent (LPA Ref; 18/00825/HYBRID) requires a design code to be submitted to the LPA where the submit of reserved matters would not accord with the design principles contained in the Proctor Mathews Upper Heyford Strategy Document.

*The Design Code shall comprise:*

- 1. Land use, density, layout of streets and public spaces and character areas.*
- 2. Landscape, including for the immediate setting of the new settlement, to include retained trees and vegetation, new planting, public open space, amenity space, children's' play areas, sports facilities, footpaths, public spaces, together with adoption arrangements and extent.*
- 3. Surface water control, including design standards and methodology for sustainable drainage systems, details of specific features, including appropriate options for Sustainable Urban Drainage, swales, together with adoption arrangements and extent;*
- 4. Public realm, including hierarchy of streets and public spaces, characteristics, dimensions, building line and or set backs, materials, means of enclosure, street furniture, including street lighting, and car parking, methods to control traffic speeds and create legibility, together with adoption arrangements and extent;*
- 5. Built form, including scale, materials, roof treatment, elevational treatment, treatment of landmark and marker buildings, key frontages and gateways;*
- 6. Sustainable design, including the measures to be incorporated to ensure that the development complies with at least the minimum Code Level required by the Building Regulations in the Code for Sustainable Homes and to assess the impact this would have on appearance.*
- 7. Car and cycle parking, including standards of provision by land use and dwelling type; and*
- 8. Waste recycling, including how the Councils standards for individual householders' waste and recycling bins are to be accommodated within the dwelling curtilage and refuse vehicle access to these obtained.*

*Parcels 12,21 and 23 in particular shall accord with the design principles set down in the Proctor Mathews Upper Heyford (Design) Strategy Document-June 2020 The development shall thereafter be carried out in accordance with the approved Design Codes."*

**Comments.**

	<b>Parcel 11</b>	<b>Parcel 13</b>	<b>Parcel 16</b>	<b>Parcel 17</b>	<b>Plot 38</b>	<b>Plot 39</b>	<b>Plot 40</b>
General Comments	The Code needs a 'how to use section' so that the Code can be clearly understood by all those involved in planning, design and implementation.						
	A land use parameter plan is included however it is stated that this is indicative. Separate 'Routes and Roads' and 'Density' plans are included. These plans should be clearly labelled as 'CODING PLANS' or presented as one single 'CODING PLAN'.						
	Presentation of 'Masterplans' should not be included at this coding stage – The important principles should all be identified on the coding plan.						
	The statements set out within the tables are not clearly labelled as codes. They are generally generic and subjective – the codes should be clearly set out and written in such a way that their adherence can be interpreted in binary yes/no answers.						
Land Use, Density, Layout of streets and public spaces, character areas.	The density and heights coding should consider/reflect the scale of airfield buildings and location within the site.	The coding needs to better reflect existing officer housing context such as plot depths, frontages, plot size.	The coding needs to respond to the character of northern edge – i.e. the relationship to the school fields and open space.	Allotments and LEAP, are not included on the code plans as per the approved outline scheme, what is the rationale for this?	Coding should consider visual relationship between the town center and open space to the south.	Coding needs to relate more strongly to the design context – Existing parking to the west on Brice Road – suggest this is retained/enhanced as a parking square rather than the introduction of a rear courtyard.	Coding needs to rationalise and clearly identify public/private realm, fronts and backs. Reconsider and rationalise vehicle access and parking.
	Code plans should better reflect the approved outline masterplan. This requires a clearly		The southern edge should clearly relate to the existing	Coding needs to consider opportunities to provide north-south links and			Coding should ensure a clear well

	<b>Parcel 11</b>	<b>Parcel 13</b>	<b>Parcel 16</b>	<b>Parcel 17</b>	<b>Plot 38</b>	<b>Plot 39</b>	<b>Plot 40</b>
	defined block structure. Short cul-de-sacs, parking courts and doubling up on existing streets needs to be avoided.		and/or emerging context.	views out to southern open space and wider countryside.			defined road frontage.
	The proposed coding is likely to result in very generic character – how does the proposal reflect historic context, existing scale?		Coding plans consolidates open space around large attenuation basins – The proposals need to revert back to the approved outline scheme, which identifies a green corridor, and a consistent building line that aligns with existing frontages housing to the north. This needs to be clearly coded.				
	Public realm – consider		What is the rationale for				

	Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Plot 38	Plot 39	Plot 40
	character of spaces rather than roads (i.e. where streets meet, what will be the purpose, character of this space?)		dropping the allotments and indoor sports facilities from previous approved outline scheme?				
Landscape, including for the immediate setting of the new settlement, to include retained trees and vegetation, new planting, public open space, amenity space, children's play areas, sports facilities, footpaths, public spaces, together with adoption arrangements and extent.	The Root Protection Area's (RPA's) and canopies of trees/vegetation to be retained should be clearly identified on the coding plans						
	As set out in the Condition the coding should clearly identify those streets and spaces that are intended for adoption and those areas that would be maintained by a management company.						
	<p>Coding provides insufficient landscape information. I suggest the following is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Key locations for tree planting within streets and public spaces.</li> <li>• A tree planting strategy identifying an appropriate tree pallet for different street types, public realm, open space green infrastructure and/or character areas.</li> <li>• Typical plans/ details/wording to set out how tree planting will be achieved within different street types and public spaces to avoid conflict with below ground services, street lighting and adoptable standards (where required).</li> <li>• Hard and soft materials and street furniture pallets for public realm and landscape areas.</li> <li>• Details of the character of public green space and other public realm spaces such as squares.</li> <li>• Details of the character, use and appearance of the various key public realm spaces that are proposed.</li> <li>• Identify key locations for benches to ensure sufficient resting places for older people and people with disabilities.</li> <li>• Details of the character of play space.</li> </ul>						
	Links between streets and footpaths/ cycle routes need to be identified because these are key desire lines.	Coding needs to include the green spaces to the north and south – is this public or private, what is its purpose, what is the design intent?	The LEAP/LAP is close to the existing play facility to the north – coding should give further consideration to the location and	There does not appear to be any integration with southern space (as shown on the approved outline scheme) – how is this intended to relate and what is			What is the relationship with existing trees?

	Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Plot 38	Plot 39	Plot 40
			character/use of open spaces in relation to existing open space.	the proposed phasing? Suggest this space should form part of Parcel 17 and be coded.			
				Consider footpath links to adjacent residential areas – are these deliverable?			
Surface water control, including design standards and methodology for sustainable drainage systems, details of specific features, including appropriate options for Sustainable Urban Drainage, swales, together with adoption arrangements and extent;	No coding provided. Coding should include details of the intended appearance and character of SuDS features. This should include details of habitat creation, contribution to amenity, landform, inlets outlets and structures. Overall coding needs to ensure that SuDS features will be an integral part of the landscape and public realm design providing multifunctional benefits.						
	Potential conflict between large attenuation basin and RPA's			The code plan does not include for any SuDS. The SuDS strategy needs to form part of the code.			
Public realm, including hierarchy of streets and public	The public realm – i.e. the space created by the placement of buildings needs to be fully coded. The Highways Structuring Section is insufficient to provide confidence that the scheme will establish a strong sense of place. The diagrams are very functional i.e. a road, a path, parking, some traffic calming (which should be inherent to the design) – a more holistic vision for the character of these spaces needs to be developed and coded.						

	Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Plot 38	Plot 39	Plot 40
spaces, characteristics, dimensions, building line and or set-backs, materials, means of enclosure, street furniture, including street lighting, and car parking, methods to control traffic speeds and create legibility, together with adoption arrangements and extent;	<p><b>Principle Roads:</b> No information on tree planting has been provided, no information on landscaping has been provided, if parking is not desirable along these routes there needs to be details of how this will be prevented, how will verge parking be deterred? There are a large number of wide cross overs for on plot parking, which break up the verge – how can this be rationalised/managed? How do the heights/frontages and set backs frame the street? (suggest amalgamation of building forms/garages to create a stronger frontage) What are the intended boundary treatments? How will key public realm spaces be designed (other than a raised table?), is there any priority for pedestrians or cyclists at junctions? How will potential conflicts between pedestrian and cycle movement be managed?</p>						
	<p><b>Secondary Road:</b> The diagram does not appear to reflect table. For example, on-road parking is not shown; and there are insufficient opportunities for regular street tree planting. The code diagram would result in irregular setbacks and poor containment of the street. The frontage parking is unsatisfactory because it breaks the building line – the diagram does not show how pedestrians would be able to access the fronts of these properties?</p>						
	<p><b>Shared Surface/ Lanes and Private Drives</b> – For both these typologies the diagrams are similar – what is the intended character difference? How will on-street parking be managed? Generally, where there are edge cul-de-sacs weak links should be provided for pedestrians and cyclists (i.e. linking paths rather than disconnected private driveways).</p>						
	<p><b>Mews/shared surface streets:</b> Suggest coding is needed to cover mews type/shared surface streets and public realm parking areas such as parking squares and well-designed parking courtyards. The current/built approach to parking courtyards within the development is not acceptable and should not be repeated. It results in exposed rear gardens, a lack of activity, passive surveillance and permeability.</p>						
	<p><b>Footpaths/cycleways:</b> Code hierarchy of footpaths and cycleways.</p>						
				It should not be necessary to double up on footpaths and edge roads – Preference for single shared surface streets and weak links – i.e. edge roads connected by footways as per		Generally, coding needs to ensure that existing building lines/ frontages to the north are reflected.	

	Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Plot 38	Plot 39	Plot 40
				Elmsbrook north-west Bicester.			
						Rear courtyard car park would not reflect existing character. Proposed access cuts through area of green/existing trees.	
Built form, including scale, materials, roof treatment, elevational treatment, treatment of landmark and marker buildings, key frontages and gateways;	Inconsistent set back and building lines. Generally, building lines should tie in with adjacent plots.						
	There should be a clear block structure of private backs and public fronts to frame streets and spaces. Parking courts creating exposed rear garden boundaries would generally not be acceptable.						
	Building materials and details appear generic.						
	Suggest code is needed to cover solar panel positioning/ location etc.						
	There should be a coherent roofscape strategy. I would not support irregular eaves/ ridgelines without design justification/ rationale.						
		The south-western corner is a key corner That the coding plan needs to address.	The appearance does not reflect the character of existing officer housing. Consider consolidating footprints with more green space between blocks.	Suggesting 2-2.5 stories across the whole site is too generic – heights and densities should consider relationship to open space, the main bus route etc.		The code needs to explain how the proposed buildings should relate to the existing hotel/bar to the east.	

	Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Plot 38	Plot 39	Plot 40
	What is the rationale for gables throughout?						
6. Sustainable design, including the measures to be incorporated to ensure that the development complies with at least the minimum Code Level required by the Building Regulations in the Code for Sustainable Homes and to assess the impact this would have on appearance.	<p>The sustainability section does not include any specific design coding. Sustainability should be a golden thread running through all of the design codes following the very latest sustainability guidance, targets and best practice such as the RIBA 2030 Climate Challenge, the suite of LETI guidance documents and emerging UK Net Zero Building Standards</p> <p>Amongst other things design coding needs to consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Passive design strategies to control solar gains and maximise daylighting.</li> <li>- Roof alignment and appearance to maximise the effectiveness of solar technology and minimise visual impact.</li> <li>- A fabric first approach to design and energy efficient development, and minimise any future operational need (i.e. manipulate building form and fabric to facilitate natural ventilation and make effective use of thermal mass to help reduce peak internal temperatures.</li> <li>- The Commercial/community buildings, flats and houses will have different design requirements that need to be considered.</li> <li>- Open water SuDS features and tree planting to help moderate microclimate.</li> <li>- Rainwater harvesting</li> <li>- Use of locally sourced materials and low embodied carbon.</li> </ul>						
7. Car and cycle parking, including standards of provision by land	<p>The Parking section repeats Oxfordshire Standards rather than providing specific design coding. Parking coding should be considered holistically with public realm and street design and reflect the character of each phase.</p> <p>Amongst other things design considerations should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Trees and landscaping,</li> <li>- Containment and overlooking</li> <li>- Minimising visual dominance of parking</li> <li>- Future flexibility/ allocated/non allocated</li> </ul>						



	Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Plot 38	Plot 39	Plot 40
use and dwelling type; and	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Integration and contribution to the public realm and street scene</li> <li>- Cycle parking typologies that are integrated with the built form/public realm, close to front door, secure convenient and accessible.</li> </ul> <p>Streets for a Healthy Life - A Companion guide to Building for a Healthy Life (Homes England) provides useful analysis and guidance of what works where.</p>						
		Consider integration of parking with the building form and public realm design.					
8. Waste recycling, including how the Councils standards for individual householders' waste and recycling bins are to be accommodated within the dwelling curtilage and refuse vehicle access to these obtained.	The waste section repeats general policy and guidance rather than providing specific design coding. Waste and recycling should be integral to the built form and public realm, avoiding visual intrusion. Servicing of the commercial units will require specific consideration to ensure that this doesn't detract from the overall design.						
					Fronts/backs and servicing strategy needs to be identified.		The coding should include a strategy for servicing, bikes and bins.