**District:** Cherwell

**Application no: 13/00205/DISC**

**Proposal:** Partial clearance of condition 21 of 10/01642/OUT – commercial centre

**Location:** Camp Road, Heyford Park, Upper Heyford.

Transport Development Control

**Recommendation**

Objection

**Key issues**

* The quantum of car parking needs to be justified.
* Provisions for cyclists require improvement.
* Loading and unloading provisions require improvement.
* Pedestrian provisions require improvement.
* The scheme may benefit from a 20mph speed limit.
* A road safety audit is required.
* Improvements to the road layout are required.

**Informatives**

The Advance Payments Code (APC), Sections 219 -225 of the Highways Act, is in force in the county to ensure financial security from the developer to off-set the frontage owners’ liability for private street works, typically in the form of a cash deposit or bond. Should a developer wish for a street or estate to remain private then to secure exemption from the APC procedure a ‘Private Road Agreement’ must be entered into with the County Council to protect the interests of prospective frontage owners. Alternatively the developer may wish to consider adoption of the estate road under Section 38 of the Highways Act.

Prior to commencement of development, a separate consent must be obtained from OCC Road Agreements Team for the design and layout of roads within the development under S38 and / or S278 of the Highway Act. Contact: 01865 815700; [RoadAgreements@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:RoadAgreements@oxfordshire.gov.uk).

The proposed measures are on the existing highway and OCC would need to carry out statutory consultations for Traffic Regulation Orders with the appropriate fees.

**Detailed comments**

**Transport Development Control**

The traffic calming features are noted together with references pointing to likely approach and exit speeds. A 20mph zone together with a suitable signage plan would help to reinforce this scheme, and it is recommended that this is extended to include the residential areas of the Heyford Park development.

The ramps look to be sufficiently well spaced to avoid discomfort for bus passengers, but the gradient needs to be maximum 1:20.

The bus laybys are not big enough for buses to pull up to the kerb properly. Also, the bus that has been used for tracking is too small. A 12m bus is required. In fact, laybys here for the buses are not really necessary and the scheme might be better without them. Buses are not expected to stop for long in the village centre. **Reason for objection.**

Shelters will need to be provided and are not shown. They need to be considered in the design. Also the TS states, and tracking shows, buses routing south through the residential area. In practice this is likely to reduce the commercial viability of the route.

The quantum of car parking is not justified. Analysis of likely parking accumulation at different times of day and different days of the week would need to be presented to demonstrate that parking provision is adequate but not excessive. It is also not clear whether any of the parking is allocated to the flats immediately to the south of Camp Road. There appears to be no obvious car parking nearby for these flats, and if the spaces were used by residents, this would significantly reduce the car parking available for the village centre uses. **Reason for objection.**

The plans show some cycle parking in the village centre. However, this is generally not well located for access to facilities. Ideally cycle parking should be placed near the entrance to buildings for maximum convenience. **Reason for objection.**

The delivery drop off point for the village centre south is noted, but appears on some plans as parking spaces. The most obvious route for the movement of goods between this point and the uses around the village square is across the village square. This is undesirable for reasons of conflict with users of the village square. There is no apparent provision for loading and unloading for the facilities on the north side of Camp Road. All loading and unloading areas will need to be demonstrated as adequate through vehicle swept path analysis for both delivery and refuse vehicles. **Reason for objection.**

**Road Safety Engineering Team**

A road safety audit is required. This would normally be part of the Section 278 process, but given the nature and complexity of these proposals will be required to discharge this condition. **Reason for objection.**

The proposed pedestrian crossing point between the proposed bus stops and parking bays would seem to presents the risk that visibility for pedestrians would be masked by buses and parked vehicles. It is also unclear if this is meant to be a formal zebra or a courtesy crossing arrangement. **Reason for objection.**

There do not appear to be any specific provisions for cyclists. This may not be needed if speeds are very well managed in the centre, but would be necessary elsewhere. The road narrowing as shown would not be ideal for cyclists. **Reason for objection.**

There are no major concerns about the use of echelon parking bays. However, it is not clear how vehicles using this parking area then conveniently manoeuvre out of the parking area. This would need to be demonstrated. **Reason for objection.**

It is not clear whether a 20mph limit is being proposed. While the calming features and horizontal alignment in the centre in particular should help manage speeds, it could well be helpful to reinforce this with a 20mph speed limit. Under DfT guidance this should be a minimum of 300m length.

**Road Agreements Team**

* The application is not accompanied by a Road Safety Audit. **Reason for objection.**
* Is it proposed to introduce a 70mm step/ramp in the footways surrounding the square to achieve the reduction in kerb upstand? This would not be acceptable particularly in a blank canvas situation. A reduction in kerb upstand would normally be achieved with a continuous kerb level and ramped raised table in the carriageway. It is not clear how it is proposed to level the Eastern edge of the square to achieve the transition from 50mm to 120mm upstand. **Reason for objection.**
* OCC does not tend to use full width bus lay-bys. **Section 278 matter.**
* There is confusion between different drawings about what are parking bays and what are bus lay-bys. **Section 278 matter.**
* The forward visibility over the Western kink in Camp Road would be obstructed by buses parked in the lay-by. **Reason for objection.**
* The Western kink in Camp Road increases the difficulty of manoeuvring a bus into the lay-by. **Reason for objection.**
* There are areas of significant overhang in bus manoeuvres into and out of the lay-bys. **Reason for objection.**
* It is not clear whether restrictions are proposed on the parking bays. **Reason for objection.**
* There is no northern delivery drop off point shown. **Reason for objection.**
* For maintenance reasons OCC would not accept a spray and chip surface treatment on the crossing due to the bus manoeuvres. **Section 278 matter.**
* For maintenance reasons OCC would prefer to see a black top finish to bus laybys. The proposed red brick paving will not stand up to the required manoeuvres. **Section 278 matter.**
* For maintenance reasons OCC will not accept slot drains in adoptable areas. **Section 278 matter.**
* OCC would not wish to adopt the whole of the square, and private areas should not drain on to the highway. **Section 278 matter.**
* There are safety concerns regarding the shared surface section of Camp Road through the square. A 6m wide carriageway is not wide enough to have pedestrians, buses, delivery vehicles and cars weaving in and out of each other. It is unlikely that there will be the continuous even flow of pedestrians required to enforce the concept of a shared surface 24 hours a day 7 days a week. This section of road should be kerbed vehicular carriageway with direct pedestrian crossing points. **Reason for objection.**
* There are safety concerns about the “grey” square as a single colour doesn’t provide the required definition for visually impaired pedestrians. **Section 278 matter.**
* The raised tables constructed on Camp Road to date have taken a battering form heavy speeding vehicles. Blockwork isn’t an ideal material for such a road, and particularly not so for the ramps. **Section 278 matter.**
* The junction to the west of the bus lay-bys is different to all of the other significant new junctions on Camp Road. There is no blockwork raised table. This and the deflection of Camp Road may confuse priority. It is not clear whether it is proposed to use road markings. **Section 278 matter.**
* Visibility from the Western junction may be restricted by buses parked in the lay-by, and the kink in Camp Road may provide an illusion of safety and encourage drivers to edge out in to danger. **Section 278 matter.**
* The junction with the Northern access road to the East of the Square is different to all other significant new junctions on Camp Road. There is no raised table. This and the change in carriageway surface material through the square may confuse priority. It is not clear whether it is proposed to use road markings. **Section 278 matter.**
* It is not desirable to encourage pedestrians to cross the Northern Access to the East of the square in a diagonal direction. **Reason for objection.**
* The visibility for cars turning out of the Eastern car park may be obstructed by vehicles using the Delivery Drop Off Point. **Reason for objection.**
* No-standard materials, trees and planting, and street furniture will attract commuted sums.
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