

# **OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL**

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 16/01545/F

**Proposal:** Change of use of Building 103 to A Heritage Centre (Use Class D1) and Building 315 for storage and distribution (Use Class B8) and associated works.

**Location:** 103 & 315 Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HA

---

## **Purpose of document**

This report sets out Oxfordshire County Council's view on the proposal.

This report contains officer advice in the form of technical team responses. Where local members have responded these have been attached by OCCs Major Planning Applications Team ([planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:planningconsultations@oxfordshire.gov.uk)).

**Officer's Name:** David Flavin

**Officer's Title:** Senior Planning Officer

**Date:** 30 August 2016

---

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 16/01545/F

**Proposal:** Change of use of Building 103 to A Heritage Centre (Use Class D1) and Building 315 for storage and distribution (Use Class B8) and associated works.

**Location:** 103 & 315 Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HA

---

## **Transport**

### **Recommendation:**

#### **Objection**

At this stage insufficient information has been provided that demonstrates the impact of the proposed development in transport and highway perspective. Additional information shall be required to recommend approval from the Local Highway Authority as outlined below.

#### **Key issues:**

A number of detailed points need to be addressed and additional information must be provided (see Detailed Comments below)

It is not clear why this application has been submitted as a full application rather than a reserved matters application. If the District is minded to grant planning permission, the development should comply with the transport conditions contained within the Decision Notice relating to application 10/01642/OUT, transport obligations contained within the agreed Section 106, and the approved Heyford Park Design Code. Any development over and above the ceiling set out in Clause 14 in the legal agreement for 10/01642/OUT will be expected to contribute to a transport mitigation package for allocation covered by Policy Villages 5. Moreover, a comprehensive masterplan that sets out the transport mitigation package required to mitigate the additional growth should be in place prior to the determination of applications that will exceed the ceiling.

#### **Conditions:**

If Cherwell District Council is minded to grant planning consent, the following conditions are recommended by the county council in addition to those referenced above relating to application 10/01642/OUT:

##### **Car Parking**

Prior to commencement of development, a plan showing car parking provision for the types of vehicles generated by the development to be accommodated within the site of each building together with any areas for manoeuvring shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. All parking shall be retained at all times thereafter, unless otherwise agreed in writing beforehand by the local planning authority. Vehicle parking shall be retained unobstructed except for the parking and manoeuvring of vehicles at all times thereafter.

Reason - To ensure appropriate levels of car parking are available at all times to serve the development, and to comply with Government guidance contained within the National Planning Policy Framework.

### Construction traffic management plan

Prior to commencement of the development hereby approved, a Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Thereafter, the approved Construction Traffic Management Plan shall be implemented and operated in accordance with the approved details.

Reason - In the interests of highway safety and the residential amenities of neighbouring occupiers.

### Detailed comments:

#### Transport Strategy

The principle of development has been permitted for this site through planning application 10/01642/OUT and in the approved Heyford Park Design Code. However, it is not clear why this application has been submitted as a full application, as opposed to a reserved matters application. If it is a departure from 10/01642/OUT, I would have expected a Transport Statement to accompany the application, assessing the proposal against the granted outline permission and the emerging development framework.

Assuming that this is not the case and that it is effectively a reserved matters application, Transport Strategy has no comment relating to this application, subject to it complying with the transport conditions contained within the Decision Notice, transport obligations contained within the agreed Section 106 and compliance with the approved Heyford Park Design Code, relating to application 10/01642/OUT.

However, the application does not appear to provide a sufficient level of detail for Transport Development Control and Road Agreements colleagues to be able to fully assess the application (no vehicle tracking for emergency vehicles from Camp Road, for example).

Clause 14 in the legal agreement for 10/01642/OUT dated 22/12/11 sets a ceiling of 1075 dwellings (or 1,135 as varied by the agreement for 13/01811/OUT). Any development over and above this ceiling will be expected to contribute to a transport mitigation package for allocation covered by Policy Villages 5. Moreover, a comprehensive masterplan that sets out the transport mitigation package required to mitigate the additional growth should be in place prior to the determination of applications that will exceed the ceiling.

#### Access

Vehicular access is proposed via the main entrance to Heyford Park via Camp Road. However Drawings **HEYF-5-SK280**, **HEYF-5-SK281** and **D.0341\_107** accompanying this application appear to suggest an access off Camp Road west of the Heritage site. The application suggests that a further access may be available in the future to the west of the Heritage Centre as development of Heyford Park evolves. Whilst this is not yet implemented, all proposals herein should refer to the existing road network including accesses.

This ambiguity needs to be addressed by showing that the link road west of Building 103 is currently a no-through road in the layout drawings.

Pedestrian access will also be available utilising this route. Considering the fact that a bus stop is in existence along Camp Road south of the Heritage Centre, it would be unattractive getting pedestrians to walk further east along Camp Road to access the site through the Heyford Park main entrance. I would suggest that the applicant considers a pedestrian access across to what is currently a closed gate to make walking and/cycling more attractive.

### Layout

The layout plan for the heritage centre and car parking area is inconsistent with future plans for the village centre, on which Highways has been consulted informally. There is a need for the northern part of the village centre (north of Camp Road) to be considered as a whole, taking into account all types of movements and parking needs. The layout as shown could prejudice the comprehensive planning of the village centre from a transport perspective.

The Heritage Management Plan submitted in support of this application has made reference to the site's suitability to accommodate school children. Besides a show of lecture/presentation rooms, no other information has been provided on how the site would accommodate large groups such as school children. I would have expected to see on the layout plans provision for bus/coach parking for occasional group visits.

The proposed parking layout is unacceptable. The perpendicular parking bays behind footways is not considered safe in terms of pedestrian safety and a risk of conflict with other road users. These are denoted by H9-H17 to the west of the Heritage Centre. Perpendicular parking north of the Heritage Centre is also deemed unsafe as it is assumed that parking related movements here would interfere with the movement of traffic along these roads as well as safety of road users. It should also be borne in mind that the roads surrounding the site will be heavily trafficked and shall also be used by buses serving the wider Heyford Park.

### Parking Provision

The application proposes 20 car parking spaces for Building 103 (Heritage Centre) and 18 parking spaces for Building 315. Parking associated with Building 315 has been indicated to lie west of the building but the precise details have not been provided. It is a requirement for the applicant to provide these details.

I have noticed that the 9 parking spaces south of Building 315 and the 12 spaces north of the Heritage Centre as shown by drawing no **HEYF-5-SK280** are outside of the application site area. The parking that lies outside of the redline application area shall not be taken into account in this assessment until such a time that the applicant demonstrates ownership of this area.

From the same drawing it can also be seen that some parking spaces provided are of insufficient dimensions. Some bays along the access road are shown to have 2.3m widths which is below the required OCC parking standards. The minimum standard dimensions for a parking space as required by OCC are 2.4 x 4.8m.

### Tracking

Drawing No. **HEYF-5-SK280** shows the site layout and tracking in relation to building 103 for a car and building 315 for a 16.5m articulate lorry. Tracking for a car appears very tight in some parking bays which shall not be acceptable particularly those areas along the access road.

It is unclear whether the area marked for vehicle manoeuvring associated with Building 315 is sufficient for HGV's. This needs to be demonstrated with scaled plans that track the swept path of a HGV lorry entering, turning around and exiting the site in forward gear.

### Trip Generation

It is likely that the proposal could be an intensification of use on site compared to the where the number of visitors may exceed the provisions outlined within the approved Outline

application 10/01642/OUT. In traffic generation terms, it is felt that the proposed development would have a detrimental impact on the link roads in terms of traffic flow and congestion.

The developer will be required to demonstrate through a transport statement that the expected trips can all be accommodated safely on site without risk of visitors having to park on link roads within the wider Heyford Park designation.

Refuse Servicing

No servicing details have been submitted – which is required to be shown. Tracking for a refuse wagon shall also be required.

Drainage

Surface water run-off is proposed to discharge into the main sewer. In line with SUDS principles, any new areas of hard-standing must be SUDS compliant and there must no increase in surface water discharged from the site compared to the current levels.

**Officer's Name: Rashid Bbosa**

**Officer's Title: Transport Engineer**

**Date: 25 August 2016**

---

**District:** Cherwell

**Application no:** 16/01545/F

**Proposal:** Change of use of Building 103 to A Heritage Centre (Use Class D1) and Building 315 for storage and distribution (Use Class B8) and associated works.

**Location:** 103 & 315 Heyford Park Camp Road Upper Heyford Bicester OX25 5HA

---

## **Ecology**

### **Recommendation:**

Comments

### **Key issues:**

The District Council should be seeking the advice of their in-house ecologist who can advise them on this application.

In addition, the following guidance document on Biodiversity & Planning in Oxfordshire combines planning policy with information about wildlife sites, habitats and species to help identify where biodiversity should be protected. The guidance also gives advice on opportunities for enhancing biodiversity:

<https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/planning-and-biodiversity>

### **Legal agreement required to secure:**

N/A - For the District Council to comment

### **Conditions:**

N/A - For the District Council to comment

### **Informatives:**

N/A - For the District Council to comment

### **Detailed comments:**

**Officer's Name:** Sarah Postlethwaite

**Officer's Title:** Protected Species Officer

**Date:** 24 August 2016

---