

CDC Comments						
General Comments	<p>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.</p> <p>Within section 1, we have added an additional page on "How to use this design code" which highlights the 3 methods: this being, the coded information, desirable information and a synopsis of the parcel information with the Code table as a conclusion.</p>					
	<p>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'.</p> <p>Noted, this has been amended accordingly.</p>					
	<p>Presentation of 'Masterplans' should not be included at this coding stage – The important principles should all be identified on the coding plan.</p> <p>Noted, this has been removed accordingly.</p>					
	<p>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.</p> <p>Table reworked for more concise detailing.</p>					
	<p>The surrounding characteristics of each of the seven development parcels varies considerably, with only parcels 16 and 17 having similar characteristics. It therefore might reasonably be expected that different design code approaches may be derived to reflect the bespoke nature of each of the land parcels surroundings.</p> <p>Please refer to P17-21; these pages highlight the detailed character evolution since the original outline application. Further amendments to individual parcel coding now emphasise the specific characteristics that reflect the individual parcel context; coding for future proposals is required to blend with/be sympathetic to the original character areas as per P17.</p>					
Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Parcel 39	Parcel 40	
CONDITION 1						
<p>The density and heights coding should consider/reflect the scale of airfield buildings and location within the site.</p> <p>Overall parameter plans have been updated to better reflect the wider set of comments</p> <p>The density plan has been updated to better reflect the airfield buildings and the embedded presence along Lindh Road.</p> <p>A Building heights plan has been added, which references the airfield hangars to the west while addressing the open space and the surrounding development context with consideration for future development.</p>	<p>The coding needs to better reflect existing officer housing context such as plot depths, frontages, plot size.</p> <p>Overall parameter plans have been updated to better reflect the wider set of comments</p> <p>The density plan has been updated; this follows the characteristics of the Officer Housing context.</p> <p>A Building heights plan has been added, reflecting the neighbouring scale of residential build forms.</p>	<p>The coding needs to respond to the character of northern edge – i.e. the relationship to the school fields and open space.</p> <p>Overall parameter plans have been updated to better reflect the wider set of comments</p> <p>A sufficient northern buffer is included to integrate with existing pedestrian pathways and provide access links to the development.</p> <p>The updated density and building heights plans demonstrate consideration for the northern context - providing a gradual transition in building heights, with an opportunity for 3-storey development addressing the open space while maintaining an open and spacious development edge.</p>	<p>Allotments and LEAP, are not included on the code plans as per the approved outline scheme, what is the rationale for this?</p> <p>Overall parameter plans have been updated to better reflect the wider set of comments</p> <p>Allotments are located on Parcel 16 as per the approved outline parameter plan P16-0631_08AS. The LEAP facilities and further LAP are located in the Sports park adjacent to the southern parcel boundary.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Overall parameter plans have been updated to better reflect the wider set of comments</p> <p>The existing parking and road infrastructure along Brice Road is now proposed to be utilised and enhanced to better align with the surrounding context.</p>	<p>Coding needs to rationalise and clearly identify public/private realm, fronts and backs. Reconsider and rationalise vehicle access and parking.</p> <p>Overall parameter plans have been updated to better reflect the wider set of comments</p> <p>Plans have been updated to reflect this and outline public and private spaces.</p> <p>The restructured parking within the parcel now better reflects the surrounding context, utilising the space more efficiently.</p>	

Land Use, Density, Layout of streets and public spaces, character areas.	<p>Code plans should better reflect the approved outline masterplan and existing development to the south and east. This requires a clearly defined block structure. Short cul-de-sacs, parking courts and doubling up on existing streets needs to be avoided.</p> <p>An extract of the approved parameters P16-0631_08AS is now included alongside the proposed plan. The Routes and road plan have been updated to show the principle and secondary roads and potential locations for further private drives and parking facilities.</p> <p>The main road within Parcel 11 is subject to a separate application. Further information can be found 24/01612/REM.</p> <p>Landscaped Parking courts and parking squares are proposed to reflect existing Trident development characteristics.</p>	<p>Coding should reflect the character of the former Officer housing alongside.</p> <p>An extract of the approved outline parameters P16-0631_08AS is now included alongside the proposed plan.</p> <p>Relevant coding information is now denoted on relevant pages, and the parcel coding table has been updated to reflect more specific principles relative to the former Officers' Housing with justifications relating to neighbouring eastern development to create a transition.</p>	<p>The southern edge should clearly relate to the existing and/or emerging context. Should also reference the School alongside and linkages back to the centre.</p> <p>A sufficient landscaping buffer is located along the southern boundary to work with and respect the rural edge of the development in line with the approved parameter plan while also considering potential future links to adjacent development outlined in the draft allocation. (Further information can be found in the landscape principles.)</p> <p>The pedestrian network has been worked into the scheme to ensure a seamless connection with the existing pedestrian network, enhancing links to the school and the centre of the wider Heyford Park development.</p>	<p>Coding needs to consider opportunities to provide north-south links and views out to southern open space and wider countryside.</p> <p>Needs to properly integrate with the approved sports, open space and allotments planned for parcels 17 and 18.</p> <p>The routes & road plans and the landscape principles indicate potential links and access points to neighbouring residential areas, connecting the northern areas of Heart Walk and the western area of Raven Close that can be established in future RM proposals.</p> <p>The plans further establish a strategic pedestrian network through the site which integrates with the the adjacent sports park facilities on the southern boundary.</p>	<p>Coding should ensure a clear well defined road frontage.</p> <p>The layout has now been amended, and the plans illustrate a well-defined set of frontages and access points along Offutt Drive.</p>
	<p>The proposed coding is likely to result in very generic character – how does the proposal reflect historic context, existing scale of the former RAF hangers to the west?</p> <p>The updated building heights plan reflects its current location characteristics whilst considering future development, which is highlighted within the approved outline parameters. Trident housing characteristics have been outlined in the subsequent parcel 11 coding table.</p>		<p>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.</p> <p>The proposed plans have been amended accordingly and have been reverted back to follow the approved outline parameter plan P16-0631_08AS, which locates the two attenuation basins of a smaller scale within the green corridor.</p>		
	<p>Public realm – consider character of spaces rather than roads (i.e. where streets meet, what will be the purpose, character of this space?)</p> <p>Pedestrian & cycle links follow the desire line and focus on the connection to further residential and wider Heyford Park community.</p> <p>We have further integrated landscape plans and sections into the document to outline the principles. The layout proposes to embellish non-vehicular elements within the public realm and enhance the character of these spaces.</p>		<p>What is the rationale for dropping the allotments and indoor sports facilities from the previously approved outline scheme? It only works if compensatory facilities are provided on parcels 17 and 18.</p> <p>The proposed parameters are in line with the approved outline parameter plan P16-0631_08AS.</p> <p>The allotments are located at the northwestern corner of the parcel as per the approved parameter plan. Indoor sports facilities provided elsewhere on the development.</p>		
Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Parcel 39	Parcel 40
CONDITION 2					
	<p>The Root Protection Area's (RPA's) and canopies of trees/vegetation to be retained should be clearly identified on the coding plans</p> <p>The updated tree surveys have been integrated into each parcel. The parameter plans now illustrate RPAs and the canopies of retained trees, while also indicating removed trees and vegetation.</p> <p>The solid roads highlighted on the plans are believed to represent the existing routes within the context. Dashed lines indicate potential route locations based on the Approved Parameters and possible placements for elements such as lanes, private drives, and parking squares, which will be detailed in future Reserved Matters proposals.</p>				

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.	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					
	Information on adoption arrangement is included on page 25 of the design code. Additionally, we have provided a routes and road plan hierarchy for each parcel which provides the basis for S38 discussion following RM application.					
	<p>Coding provides insufficient landscape information. I suggest the following is needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key locations for tree planting within streets and public spaces. • A tree planting strategy identifying an appropriate tree pallet for different street types, public realm, open space green infrastructure and/or character areas. • 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). • Hard and soft materials and street furniture pallets for public realm and landscape areas. • Details of the character of public green space and other public realm spaces such as squares. • Details of the character, use and appearance of the various key public realm spaces that are proposed. • Identify key locations for benches to ensure sufficient resting places for older people and people with disabilities. • Details of the character of play space. <p>The document has now been restructured to provide section 3.0 Additional coding, which includes site-wide principles across all parcels with matters relating to landscaping.</p> <p>Additional information on individual parcel landscaping principles and characteristics is provided within each phase section and in the coding tables at the end of each section. These tables define the coding and desired details as outlined in the conditions.</p>					
	Links between streets and footpaths/ cycle routes need to be identified because these are key desire lines. The proposed layout integrates with the existing pedestrian network and the planned pedestrian and cycle routes. Meaningful connections throughout the development encourage social interaction along 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 northern and southern spaces are public. They offer small pockets of open green space with opportunities for enhanced landscaping that complement the existing retained mature trees on the site.	The LEAP/LAP is close to the existing play facility to the north – coding should give further consideration to the location and character/use of open spaces in relation to existing open space. A landscaping plan and landscape section is now included on pages 70-71, which shows the character and use of the open space.	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 the proposed phasing? Suggest this space should form part of Parcel 17 as required in the SI06 obligations, and be coded. The parameter plan has been updated to propose a seamless transition from a hardscape to a landscaped edge. Two attenuation basins are proposed adjacent to the boundary (subject to engineering), intending to safeguard the southern boundary while offering strategic links through the parcel to the Sports Park. The sports park will be designed up separately and doesnt form part of this design code.		
				Consider footpath links to adjacent residential areas – are these deliverable? Footpath links have been strategically positioned within the proposed parameters to ensure successful delivery—these are illustrated in the updated plans for Parcel 17. The land within adjacent residential parcels is within the control of the applicant and is therefore deliverable.		
	Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Parcel 39	Parcel 40
CONDITION 3						
	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. Additional high-level information is provided in sections 3.10 and 3.11. This approach emphasises a landscape-led strategy, demonstrating how drainage can be integrated into public realm spaces. Relevant sections illustrate the potential placement of drainage features within the public areas of the parcels where SUDs are required. Specific drainage details will be provided at the Reserved Matters application stage.					

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;	Potential conflict between large attenuation basin and RPA's Plans have been updated accordingly.			The code plan does not include for any SuDS. The SuDS strategy needs to form part of the code. The plans have been updated to reflect the proposed SuDS locations near the southern boundary, maintaining a landscape transition and ensuring accessibility between the residential and public spaces.		
---	---	--	--	--	--	--

Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Parcel 39	Parcel 40
-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------	-----------

CONDITION 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,	<p>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.</p> <p>Whilst we respect this comment, the diagram's purpose is to be functional as it highlights the approach which integrates the updated occ/ Cherwell standards. Each parcel has its own holistic approach, which is encapsulated through design, place-making. Landscaping plans and sections are now featured within each section to provide an overview of how the spaces are used and connected.</p> <p>Principle Roads: 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>Plans updated accordingly - Highways Coding table and information updated to reflect comments</p> <p>Secondary Road: 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>Plans updated accordingly</p> <p>Shared Surface/ Lanes and Private Drives – 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>Plans updated accordingly</p> <p>Mews/shared surface streets: 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>Plans updated accordingly</p> <p>Footpaths/cycleways: Code hierarchy of footpaths and cycleways.</p> <p>Information and coding table updated accordingly</p>
--	--

together with adoption arrangements and extent;				<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 Elmsbrook northwest Bicester.</p> <p>The proposed coding plans and layout have been updated, which illustrates the proposed locations of potential footpath links or shared surfaces between the surrounding cul-de-sacs (Heart Walk and Raven Close).</p>	<p>Generally, coding needs to ensure that existing building lines/ frontages to the north are reflected.</p> <p>Surrounding areas do not have an established build line – the purpose of pushing the building line to the approved parameter plan is to close the open space to the north.</p>	
					<p>Rear courtyard car park would not reflect existing character. Proposed access cuts through area of green/existing trees.</p> <p>Following assessment of the existing surrounding area there are no character areas.</p>	

Parcel 11 Parcel 13 Parcel 16 Parcel 17 Parcel 39 Parcel 40

CONDITION 5

	<p>Inconsistent set back and building lines. Generally, building lines should tie in with adjacent plots.</p> <p>Build lines will be defined and followed within set characteristics for each parcels - variation will be added to add interest into the streetscape.</p>
	<p>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.</p> <p>Plans have been updated to reflect clear build lines and frontages and defined private amenity space.</p>
	<p>Building materials and details appear generic</p> <p>The proposed palette illustrated currently is to allow for a blend within the existing build form context and current phases. Whilst allowing for versatility as future RMs come forward.</p>
	<p>Suggest code is needed to cover solar panel positioning/ location etc.</p> <p>Solar panels will be located within the most efficient locations, maximising sunlight exposure</p> <p>Consideration to minimise visual impact</p>
	<p>There should be a coherent roofscape strategy. I would not support irregular eaves/ ridgelines without design justification/ rationale</p> <p>Further information has been provided in the summary coding table for each parcel defining the roofscape approach. (This has been updated following the draft sent over)</p>

Built form, including scale, materials, roof treatment, elevational treatment, treatment of landmark and marker buildings, key frontages and gateways;	<p>The south-western corner is a key corner That the coding plan needs to address.</p> <p>Due to the proximity of this part of the site to airfield boundary it is felt that the buildings should respond to the character in terms of size and design.</p> <p>Further details have been added to the updated coding table, with the southwestern corner now specified in the landmark building column.</p>	<p>The appearance does not reflect the character of existing officer housing. Consider consolidating footprints with more green space between blocks.</p> <p>We have worked the proposed layout to the parcel constraints relating to scale</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>A building heights plan has been produced; this illustrates the layout and transition of heights across the site taking into consideration the context and road typology.</p>		<p>It is accepted that permission has been granted to demolish the existing community buildings, however the proposals for housing here are considered to be very generic. It is suggested that the new housing should reflect the existing remaining military housing or at the very least take its design cues from the existing. This may include more of a mix of housing types within it.</p> <p>Revised house types have been proposed for this character area, incorporating detailing inspired by the context of the existing military housing.</p>	<p>Due to the proximity of this part of the site to airfield boundary it is felt that the buildings should respond to the character in terms of size and design.</p> <p>A building heights plan has been produced; this illustrates the layout and transition of heights across the site, taking into consideration the characteristics of the neighbouring airfield context as well as the recently delivered residential context.</p>
	<p>What is the rationale for gables throughout?</p> <p>Gables reflect the military connection with buildings in the settlement area, which further incorporates ridge and eave heights to formulate an embedded approach.</p>	<p>This area contains the officer housing and the character is more distinct here. The properties are generally larger and have more space between them. The proposed housing feels more suburban and the layout does not reflect that of the existing buildings. It is accepted that this parcel is narrow but it is considered that the scale, design and layout of these new buildings should respond to the existing character and the design code should address this.</p> <p>The Parameter Plan has been updated to better reflect the character of the officers' housing. Building frontages have been reoriented, and garages attached to create a larger building form. This parcel will serve as a termination point for the existing officers' housing, adjacent to the David Wilson scheme.</p>				
Parcel 11 Parcel 13 Parcel 16 Parcel 17 Parcel 39 Parcel 40						
CONDITION 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 Amongst other things design coding needs to consider:- Passive design strategies to control solar gains and maximise daylighting.- Roof alignment and appearance to maximise the effectiveness of solar technology and minimise visual impact.- 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 reducepeak internal temperatures.- The Commercial/community buildings, flats and houses will have different design requirements that need to be considered.- Open water SuDS features and tree planting to help moderate microclimate.- Rainwater harvesting- Use of locally sourced materials and low embodied carbon.</p> <p>High-level coding has been included outlining possible mitigation within coding tables for the parcels; however, future RM proposals will include further detailing with specified systems and strategies. There is no planning condition or S106 obligation requiring adherence to sustainability requirements over and above building regulations.</p>					
	Parcel 11 Parcel 13 Parcel 16 Parcel 17 Parcel 39 Parcel 40					
CONDITION 7						

<p>Car and cycle parking, including standards of provision by landuse and dwelling type; and</p>	<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. Amongst other things design considerations should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Trees and landscaping, - Containment and overlooking - Minimising visual dominance of parking- Future flexibility/ allocated/non allocated - Integration and contribution to the public realm and street scene - Cycle parking typologies that are integrated with the built form/public realm, close to front door, secure convenient and accessible. <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> <p>Whilst a holistic approach has been taken, this is as a whole parcel design, whilst parking has been prepared in accordance with OCC/ Cherwell standards - information is sympathetic in regards to the standards to formalise our approach to move it forward.</p> <p>The Road typologies have been updated and sections added which address points raised while incorporating Building for Life and Secure by design principles. Parking requirements are determined on individual parcels.</p>					
	<p>Consider integration of parking with the building form and public realm design.</p> <p>Parking typologies proposed in the form of on-plot parking with attached garages as per the existing characteristics of the Officer's housing</p>					
Parcel 11	Parcel 13	Parcel 16	Parcel 17	Parcel 39	Parcel 40	
CONDITION 8						
<p>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.</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>Cycle Store and Refuse Strategy updated within section 3.08 which outlines storage and collection.</p>					
					<p>The coding should include a strategy for servicing, bikes and bins.</p> <p>To adhere to regulations and fire safety, Apartments will have external storage provisions for bins and bikes. Dwellings will be provided with external space within private amenity space, and bins will have collection points outside frontages on the curtilage or by the curb.</p>	

Following on from the comments received we have produced this table to outline our responses and how the design code and parameters seek to mitigate the issues raised by the CDC.

Updates are as follow:

- Parcel 38 has been removed from the comments table as it will not be included within this Design Code
- Text colour has been changed to highlight A2s response and further comments from Simon & Dorchester Living
- Addition of landscaping principles and sections
- Buiding heights plans back into document for each parcel
- Removal of masterplans within document
- Clearly defined coding system with how-to page
- Section added (3.0 Additional Coding) outlines the sitewide coding across the phases