

## **General points**

PPG3 is quoted when it should be PPS3.

There is no mention of junction 10 until page 22 which is surprising.

135 pupils are quoted – it is our understanding that the primary school is to be built for a capacity of 210 pupils; therefore the school has to be assessed for 210 pupils not the 135 quoted.

20mph speed limit to be imposed within Exemplar - this will require a contribution of £4,000 for Oxfordshire County Council to go through the TRO procedures to impose it.

## **Chapter 4 – current transport proposals**

4.4 – last sentence before the bullet points suggest reword along these lines, “A summary of the LTP2 schemes (2006 to 2011) is provided in the following, although this is currently being reviewed as part of the LDF and LTP3 processes.” The emphasis needs to be on the emerging LTP3 strategy and ensuring that proposals fit with that.

## **Chapter 5 – development proposals**

5.1 – last sentence – the success of this containment depends on the mix of employment and non-residential services on offer – unable to judge at this stage how successful this might be.

5.2 – it’s a loose statement to claim that the local centre is in the “approximate geographical centre” – without measuring it must be about 1200 metres from the most northerly houses but only about 750m from the most southerly field. Appreciate that this has had to be compromised because of ecological and commercial considerations, but need to demonstrate why this compromise will not be a problem for the northern houses.

Why will this be “high quality public transport” and have “a high level of accessibility”? Who is not within 400 metres of a bus stop and how far will they have to walk / cycle to get to one? There is no plan showing them. Other distances are quoted but are not shown - an isochrones plans needs to be submitted with the TA for the planning application.

Need to be careful with the design of the main access road adjacent to the primary school because of road safety implications with this proposal.

5.3 - pleased with the proposals for the cycle routes – there is a need to demonstrate more strongly in the Travel Plan how people will be encouraged to try these out.

There will need to be a off-carriageway route to link the northern areas to the primary school.

The high quality route along Banbury Road from the town centre to Bure Park will be delivered through the 1<sup>st</sup> tranche funding as part of the Travel Behaviour Demonstration Project – good to demonstrate how this all joins up together.

We need to be able to see the direct and comfortable walk and cycle routes in more detail.

Cycle parking and storage needs to be over and above the usual levels. There should be reserved areas already identified for further cycle parking if demand requires them.

The PROW statement sounds positive, but there has not been the time to check this with the experts – is there a plan that shows these links?

5.4 – travel by public transport – most comments are covered by what we sent through on the draft Travel Plan.

“Cycle stands will be provided close to the bus stop in the village centre” – but will there be a bus service there in future? It is understood that this is still being debated.

Frequency of the bus service – you are right to state that “Frequency is the key influencing factor in patronage”, but they will need to be 10 minutes apart to really influence travel behaviour. A half hourly service will need to be provided by the developer on the first occupation, from the site to the station(s) and town centre (and return). This will only be for the Exemplar and will need to be reviewed when the next phase comes on.

Investigations for a Hybrid bus are not confirmed – it really should be Hybrid for this site.

Bus stands should be at all bus stops (I know this was discussed but the advice is that this should be standard in this development.) with RTI too. 3 bus stop locations are required.

Mention the in-house terminals that could provide residents with timetabling and real-time information – this will all help to make bus travel an attractive option.

Bus priority around the town – this will be very important for the overall site. Bus patronage is unlikely to be maximised until there is a real advantage over the car – one reason why the exemplar on its own is unlikely to meet 2026 bus share targets. Bus priority schemes are currently being investigated at Bucknell Road and Banbury Road as part of the County Council's LTP3 strategy work.

5.5 – travel by car – the access junctions – will need land safeguarded for a larger junction in future if required.

Parking provision – the residential parking levels appear to be as they would be for any standard development and not in-line with an eco-development.

There is little attempt to use design of parking to influence travel behaviour – having spaces off-plot gives advantage to walking and cycling.

There is no mention of garage dimensions, parking space dimensions etc. For the record - for a garage to be considered a parking space internally it must be 6m x 3m. Parking spaces must be a minimum of 4.8m x 2.4m with additional space for vehicle overhang (front + back) and space of 0.15m either side if a space is next to a structure.

Visitor parking up to 118 - 0.3 spaces per residential unit - this is high for an eco-development. Generally Oxfordshire County Council accepts 1 visitor space for every 4 to 5 units i.e. OCC would accept between 78 - 98 visitor spaces. Visitor spaces need to be designed into the Exemplar layout and in places act as calming features.

We do support low parking provision for non-residential purposes but they need to be justified and it is not shown how they have been calculated - this is required.

The school is quoted with 135 pupils but the capacity of the school will be 210 pupils. Need to have reserved areas already identified for future operational use when the school is at full size. The level expected is to be for operational use only i.e. staff spaces, some visitor spaces and space for deliveries and cycle parking.

Coach/bus drop to the school to be on-street where appropriate parking/traffic restrictions are expected to be imposed.

Cycle parking - no mention of standards for residential or other uses except some at local centre by bus stop. You need to be going overboard on the amount of cycle spaces – it needs to be easy for residents across the site not just in certain locations.

Overall the parking section is very disappointing and needs a lot of improvement to be acceptable.

5.6 - access strategy - the proposed locations of the northern and southern access points into the Exemplar site are acceptable; subject to being designed to DMRB standards, safety audits, TRO amendments, land dedication plans for vision splays (+ footway/cycle links) and land required for future traffic signals when other parcels within the NW site come on board.

The recently submitted S278 plan now shows two toucans and footway/cycleway links on both sides of the B4100 which is acceptable. The plan still needs tweaks as the right turn lane is not drawn correctly and there are no measurements shown for the visibility splays. The radii for the junctions do not appear to be correct - also require dimensions to be shown. Radii for the junctions must be constructed in line with DMRB and for all types of vehicles using them and the associated speeds.

5.7 - construction traffic - OCC will require a construction travel plan which will include a routing agreement and commitments to considerate construction i.e. wheel washing facilities etc.

Consideration will need to be given as to how to route the buses until the link road is in place. An indication needs to be given in the TA as to when the developers anticipate that they will provide the bus-only link in the site.

5.8 – this does not look like “a high standard” for these modes – public transport in particular will be limited whilst the exemplar is in on its own because of the low frequency service on offer and the inability to remedy the town centre problems. This will require further discussion.

## **Chapter 7 - Draft Travel Plan**

The Car Club is acceptable as the developer is organising it, but it must tally with the objectives in the Travel Plan and its targets and should link to [Oxfordshirecarshare.com](http://Oxfordshirecarshare.com).

Other comments have already been sent through.

## **Chapter 8 - Trip Generation, Distribution, Impact (Committed Developments)**

We cannot agree to this section without justifications and evidence from the TRICS breakdown etc.

As mentioned previously, this level of containment will not be acceptable for the overall NW site and containment levels within Bicester will also need to be considered at that stage. 30% containment level within Bicester was used in the SATURN modelling work.

The trip rates are reduced by 17.4% as agreed, however we need to see the base data and source.

Presumably the figures in Table 8.7 will be the base data for monitoring - when monitoring starts needs to be agreed as well as what incentives will be in place if the surveys show that the targets are not being met.

8.7 – we accept that the COTM was used for the traffic distribution from the site.

## **Chapter 9 – Traffic Impact**

9.1 – for any major schemes + 15 years after is required by the County Council for the design year.

There are still issues within this chapter that we need to address collectively.

9.7 – regardless of when these queues occur they are not acceptable.

Table 9.11 – Junction 2b – the remaining queue on the Lord's Lane eastern arm is acceptable, but clearly indicates that this is going to be a problem junction for the overall site. Discussion needs to be had about how to progress improvements at this location.

Junction 3 the remaining a.m. peak queue on Banbury Road northern arm is acceptable given that we are not looking to solve all queues with the eco-development.

Junction 4 – this remains a concern, particularly as the aim is to encourage use of the eastern peripheral route. A queue of 53 vehicles would still be unacceptable. We need to discuss how to deal with this.

The main point with this chapter is that we cannot give conclusive comments without seeing the Arcady outputs and the plans for the improvement schemes.

If the figures are correct then the junctions will require improving at the developer's expense via S278 Agreement(s).

SW Bicester and the town centre are identified or mentioned, but there appear to be no details of other development around Bicester i.e. Bicester Business Park etc.

Off-site works for SW Bicester are mentioned.

## **Conclusion**

The Exemplar site as presented in this draft TA is not "eco" as far as the transport offer is concerned and not exemplary in any way. The residential parking standards and design are unacceptable, the public transport offer is poor and even the cycle propositions offer nothing exciting and therefore it is hard to see how the mode share targets will be achieved. There seem to be good opportunities created on-site but without certainty over what the non-residential elements will deliver, in particular in terms of jobs, it is difficult to be certain how much of people's travel patterns this element will be. 17.4% has been accepted for testing purposes as far as containment on site is concerned, but there is no guarantee of that target at the moment.

It is the connections out that need to be improved upon. The TA sets out that a 30 minute peak bus frequency may be the best that the Exemplar can offer. However, the County Council's Public Transport team have prepared a draft bus timetable which is attached. This shows how a peak time 30-minute frequency could mean a 15-minute off-peak frequency, and how a 15-minute peak frequency could be achieved. Clearly this needs further discussion, which needs to involve the bus companies as well, but this shows one way to boost what is on offer.

As mentioned on the telephone the other day, we also feel that the cycling element could be improved upon. The bus can make a great offer for the stations and town centre, but for a greater variety of destinations it is cycling that is going to be key in Bicester. We need exciting ways to get people interested in trying out cycling and ways of making it an attractive option to stay with.

We particularly feel the need to emphasise that any standards accepted on this site cannot be assumed for the overall site, unless there is a dramatic improvement in the Exemplar offer.

*23 November 2010*