**District:** Cherwell

**Application No: 12/00040/DISC**

**Proposal:** Discharge of Condition 54 of 10/01642/OUT - Travel plan.

**Location:** Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5HD.

Transport Development Control

**Recommendation**

Objection

**Key issues**

Travel plan does not meet the requirements set out in the County’s guidance document Transport for New Developments: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans (Oxfordshire County Council. March 2014). Several amendments and improvements are required, as set out in detail below.

**Detailed comments**

Comments provied below are based on the County’s guidance document Transport for New Developments: Transport Assements and Travel Plans. The following comments identify the points that would need to be addressed to bring the submitted documents to the required standard.

**Residential Travel Plan (PBA. April 2018).**

* Para 1.1.2. No mention of local villages.
* Para 1.2.3. If this Travel Plan is to be used to support future developments it will need to conform to the requirements set out in the County’s current guidance document. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 1.2.3. The document states that this Travel Plan is focused on housing within the Dorchester Group boundary. However, the Travel Plan needs to be applicable to all housing permitted under planning application No.10/01642/OUT. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 1.2.4. If this Travel Plan is to be used to support future developments, specifically Cherwell District Council Local Plan Policy Villages 5 allocation, it will need to conform to the requirements set out in the County’s current guidance document. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 1.3.5. As has been noted on previous occasions the County regards 13/01811/OUT and 16/00263/F as part of the original consented development. It would be useful if this plan confirmed the total residential properties that have permission and the number planned as further applications to be covered by this Travel Plan. This would be clearer in a table.
* Sections 2.2 - 2.4. Give details of new or existing provision but no information regarding the current barriers to sustainable travel and how these will be overcome. **Reason for objection.**
* Table 3.1. The trip rates presented are not the sensitivity trip rates required by the County. **Reason for objection.**
* Section 3.2. the Travel Plan should be based on a detailed to understand the current travel patterns on the site and the perceived barriers to sustainable travel. Table 6.2 of the Transport Assessment for 18/00825/OUT reveals that the development had 562 residential units that were still to be built out and occupied in April 2018. It therefore follows that at least 500 units were already occupied in April 2018. This occupancy level is likely to have increased in the intervening time as further units are built out and occupied. This represents an occupancy level of at least 50% which is a more than adequate sample population on which to base a survey of travel behaviour. The survey should be carried out using detailed face to face interviews to achieve a good response rate. **Reason for objection.**
* Tables 3.4 and 3.5. The term “Car Sharers” is not acceptable. Car share is where a person from another household shares a ride not a passenger from the same household.
* Para 4.3.2. There is no methodology describing how these indicators will be measured. Each indicator requires a current base line, a target, and a robust method of measurement. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.3. Cycle map will need to show details of the cycle parking across the development.
* Para 5.1.4. Details of the travel information centre are required. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.7. *“The provision of a bike-hire, or bike-pool, scheme will be considered…”*. If it is decided not to initiate such a scheme then clear and credible reasons must be provided.
* Para 5.1.13. This provision needs to be immediate, not *“…as soon as practicable”*. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.14. *“…easy to understand bus timetables and maps…”* it is not specified what this means in practice. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.16. *“It may be beneficial…”*. The Travel Plan needs to be clear as to whether or not this information will be provided. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.17. Specific details are required such as location and provisions, etc. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.19. It is unclear what liaison has been undertaken with the County. *“…OCC’s Development Control Officer…”* is not specified. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.20. A plan is required to show visitors cycle parking provisions. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.21. Details should be provided as to how this monitoring will be undertaken and what will be the triggers for the installation of more cycle parking. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.23. This needs to be shown on a plan. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 5.1.24. The travel Plan should state specifically how car parking on site will be managed. **Reason for objection.**
* Section 5.2. No time scale for the delivery is given in the action plan. Required is an agreed start date, a monitoring trigger and a completion or update action date. There are no soft measures to be delivered in the action plan. **Reason for objection.**
* Section 6.1. The targets are not SMART. They are not bench marked against a residential survey. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.2. These items are not considered relevant to the delivery of the travel plan.
* Para 6.1.4. No time scale is stated for the delivery of targets. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.6. The baseline needs to be set from data collected on the current occupied housing and then monitored biannually until 5 years after the final build. **Reason for objection.**
* Section 7.2. The one day a week allocated to the Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC) role is seriously inadequate. It is not considered possible that the TPCs responsibilities as set out in paragraph 7.2.3 can be effectively discharged across both residential and commercial travel plans in just one day a week. It is considered that the TPC role should be full time throughout the occupation phase of the development. **Reason for objection.**
* Section 8.2. Monitoring of this travel plan needs to be brought in to line with the County’s guidance. The base line needs to be established immediately through a face to face survey of existing occupants. This should be followed by biannual monitoring of the plan until five year after full occupation of the development. **Reason for objection.**

**Commercial Travel Plan (PBA. April 2018).**

* Para 1.1.2. No mention of local villages.
* Para 1.2.2. If this Travel Plan is to be used to support future developments it will need to conform to the requirements set out in the County’s current guidance document. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 1.3.5. As has been noted on previous occasions the County regards 13/01811/OUT and 16/00263/F as part of the original consented development. It would be useful if this plan confirmed the total number of jobs that have permission and the number planned as further applications to be covered by this Travel Plan. This would be clearer in a table.
* Para 1.3.7. If this Travel Plan is to be used to support future developments it will need to conform to the requirements set out in the County’s current guidance document. **Reason for objection.**
* Sections 2.2 - 2.4. Give details of new or existing provision but no information regarding the current barriers to sustainable travel and how these will be overcome. **Reason for objection.**
* Section 3. The baseline travel survey is acceptable. However, it would seem that is potential bias in the results because *“…some staff at the airfield are not based there full-time and visit the site infrequently, and some occupiers do not have email and are hard to reach.”* Future surveys undertaken for monitoring purposes should be undertaken through face to face interviews.
* Para 5.3.2. There is no methodology describing how these indicators will be measured. Each indicator requires a current base line, a target, and a robust method of measurement. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.5. Details of the travel information centre are required. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.7. Cycle parking provisions should be shown on a plan. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.8. *“The provision of a bike-hire, or bike-pool, scheme will be considered…”*. If it is decided not to initiate such a scheme then clear and credible reasons must be provided.
* Para 6.1.16. *“…easy to understand bus timetables and maps…”* it is not specified what this means in practice. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.18 *“It may be beneficial…”*. The Travel Plan needs to be clear as to whether or not this information will be provided. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.19 Specific details are required such as location and provisions, etc. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.22 A plan is required to show cycle parking provisions. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.23 Details should be provided as to how this monitoring will be undertaken and what will be the triggers for the installation of more cycle parking. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.24. This needs to be shown on a plan. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 6.1.26. The travel Plan should state specifically how car parking on site will be managed. **Reason for objection.**
* Section 6.2. No time scale for the delivery is given in the action plan. Required is an agreed start date, a monitoring trigger and a completion or update action date. There are no soft measures to be delivered in the action plan. **Reason for objection.**
* Para 7.1.2. These items are not considered relevant to the delivery of the travel plan.
* Section 7.2. Required are over all targets and interim targets along with how the actions are SMART. **Reason for objection.**
* Section 8.2. The one day a week allocated to the Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC) role is seriously inadequate. It is not considered possible that the TPCs responsibilities as set out in paragraph 7.2.3 can be effectively discharged across both residential and commercial travel plans in just one day a week. It is considered that the TPC role should be full time throughout the occupation phase of the development. **Reason for objection.**
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