

UPDATE TO COUNTY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO CONSULTATION ON THE FOLLOWING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

District: Cherwell

Application no: 16/02446/F-3

Proposal: Erection of 296 residential dwellings (Use Class C3) comprising a mix of open market and affordable housing, together with associated works including provision of new and amended vehicular and pedestrian accesses, public open space, landscaping, utilities and infrastructure, and demolition of existing built structures and site clearance works

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

Response date: 19th September 2018

This report sets out the officer views of Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) on the above proposal. These are set out by individual service area/technical discipline and include details of any planning conditions or informatives that should be attached in the event that permission is granted and any obligations to be secured by way of a S106 agreement. Where considered appropriate, an overarching strategic commentary is also included. If the local County Council member has provided comments on the application these are provided as a separate attachment.

Application no: 16/02446/F-3

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

Strategic Comments

As reported in OCC's response of 6th July 2018, OCC support this application and the delivery of Local Plan Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford.

Following receipt of additional information on 10th September 2018, OCC's transport objection concerning connections to the cycle network on Camp Road can now be withdrawn. However, there remains an OCC transport objection to the application with a number of technical issues around layout and the proposed bus loop that require further work to resolve them.

The transport response also maintains its objection on the grounds of incomplete strategic mitigation for the Policy Villages 5 allocation as a whole, pending completion of the Transport Assessment for the masterplan area. However, as reported previously, good progress has been made and the majority of mitigation measures are agreed. Further work is required however to identify mitigation solutions for Middleton Stoney, and for Junction 10 and its surrounding junctions. Funding from the Oxfordshire Growth Deal has been released for this financial year to help identify solutions to the impact on the B430 in order to avoid housing delivery being delayed. It is expected that this work will be complete in the autumn. Whilst OCC would normally insist on this work being carried out prior to the application going to planning committee, it is considered that the release of Growth Deal funding towards infrastructure solutions constitutes exceptional circumstances. Therefore, if CDC are minded to approve this application, any resolution to grant planning permission should be subject to resolving OCC's technical transport objection and to agreeing a mechanism to cover S106 contributions for the elements of the masterplan mitigation package that are still to be finalised.

All comments in OCC's responses of 6th March 2017 and 6th July 2018 continue to apply other than where addressed in this update.

Officer's Name: Jacqui Cox

Officer's Title: Locality Lead (Cherwell)

Date: 19 September 2018

Application no: 16/02446/F-3

Location: Phase 9 Heyford Park, Camp Road, Upper Heyford, Bicester OX25 5HD.

Transport Schedule

Recommendation:

Objection for the following reasons:

- It is not possible to fully assess the impact of traffic and the mitigation required based on the Transport Addendum provided, due to its dependency on the site-wide Allocation Transport Assessment and agreement on its associated mitigation package, which is not yet complete.
- The proposed bus loop within the site is too constrained and could prejudice the sustainable transport strategy for the Policy Villages 5 Allocation site.
- Various aspects of the proposed layout pose a potential highway safety risk, as well as being prejudicial to the provision of attractive sustainable transport opportunities.

Comments:

OCC's previous response raised the following objections:

Objection for the following reasons:

1. It is not possible to fully assess the impact of traffic and the mitigation required based on the Transport Addendum provided, due to its dependency on the site-wide Allocation Transport Assessment and agreement on its associated mitigation package, which is not yet complete.
2. The proposed bus loop within the site is too constrained and could prejudice the sustainable transport strategy for the Policy Villages 5 Allocation site.
3. Various aspects of the proposed layout pose a potential highway safety risk, as well as being prejudicial to the provision of attractive sustainable transport opportunities.
4. The connections to the cycle network on Camp Road are inadequate and likely to adversely affect the take up of sustainable travel within the Policy Villages 5 Allocation site.

A set of plans and revised documents has been received, the main one for my purposes being Planning layout PH9-102 Rev F, and I set out below how these address our objections and concerns. Objections 2 and 3 still stand, but point 4 has been addressed.

No further documents have been submitted to address point 1.

Fundamentally, the application addresses only the transport impacts of this particular development rather than its impact as part of Policy Villages 5, and there is as yet no mitigation strategy for the full allocation. Several inadequacies in the TA were identified and these have not been addressed.

I am awaiting comments on the revised drainage strategy plan.

A safety audit and designer's response template has been submitted, however, I we reserve our right to respond formally on this at a later date.

Concerns raised in our last response:

1. Lack of strategic mitigation for the Policy Villages 5 allocation as a whole.

This has not been addressed.

2. The application only addresses the transport impact of this development.

This has not been addressed

3. Applications .

- 13/01811/OUT - Dow Street permission: 60 dwellings
- 16/00263/F – Demolition of Buildings 485 and 488 and the erection of 43 dwellings

The status of these applications has not been addressed.

4. Public transport proposals must be seen as not prejudicial to the development of a public transport mitigation strategy for Policy Villages 5 as a whole.

Minor changes have been made to address our concerns with the bus loop through the development. However, the bus still crosses the centre line in making turns within the development, and there are locations where forward visibility would need to be improved to ensure that the 'stand off' situation does not occur, notably near the junction of Izzard Road and Camp Road, and at the western junction on the loop within the site. The forward visibility at the Izzard Road/Camp Road junction is across the neighbouring parcel, so this presents a potential problem as it cannot now be guaranteed. This is a safety hazard as it is likely to result in drivers having to reverse to allow the bus to come around the corner.

Izzard Road narrows to 5.5m, which is less than our minimum standard for bus routes of 6.5m. It appears this could be widened on the development side.

The crown height of trees adjacent to the highway will need to be maintained at 5m clearance for buses.

I still consider that layout is not designed in the interests of ensuring that there is an efficient loop in which buses can turn around, and it is likely to lead to problems with providing an efficient service. *This has not been fully addressed.*

OCC have not recommended a bus loop through this application site. Discussions with the developer regarding the bus strategy have assumed that bus services to Upper Heyford would operate as follows:

1. Bicester – Bomb Stores Loop – Camp Road to the western end of site, where a turnaround is required on Camp Road itself (this could be a roundabout or similar).

2. Oxford – Kirtlington – Camp Road – Bomb Stores loop.

There is development both north and south of Camp Road, which provides the best axis for the operation of buses. Operation of buses around the tight residential area in this application site could prejudice the successful operation of the Bicester - Upper Heyford bus service. As it has not proven possible to change the design to suitably accommodate the bus loop within the development, to overcome this objection a commitment should be made to providing a bus turning arrangement on Camp Road itself, as an alternative.

5. **Minimal parking provision for flats and smaller dwellings leading on on-street parking.** With the amount of tandem parking there is still likely to be a desire for on street parking, which will disrupt the flow of the bus around the loop and has the potential to lead to significant delays, which could undermine the bus strategy. *This has not been addressed.*
6. **Trip generation and distribution:** *This has not been addressed.*
7. **Future year assessment:** *This has not been addressed.*
8. **9 and 10: TEMPRO methodology for growing background traffic:** *This has not been addressed.*
9. **See above**
10. **See above**
11. **And 12: Trip distribution – dataset not presented so not possible to verify:** *This has not been addressed.*
12. **See above**
13. **Study area too limited:** *This has not been addressed.*
14. **And 15: Junctions not included in assessment:** see above.
15. **See above**
16. **Junction modelling can't be relied on due to shortcomings with the methodology:** *this has not been addressed*
17. **Travel plan:** *No update has been received, so this has not been addressed.*
18. **Portway bridleway works:** Further clarification is still required on the points raised in our previous response.
19. **Lack of footpath connection to the south east corner of the site:** I am not aware that the parameter plan has been updated as suggested, though this is shown as a link in the Composite Footway/Cycleway movement plan.

20. And 21 and 22: Concern over the design of the one-way section of the main road loop through the site and its approach from shared space areas. The safety audit has not specifically raised the lack of awareness/enforcement of the one-way as a concern. However, forward visibility does need to be provided to avoid stand-off situations. The crown height of trees will need to be conditioned.

My concerns about the continuity of cycle facilities remain and this has not been addressed.

25. Parking spaces in visibility splays. Vis splays are now marked but see above regarding crown height of trees.

28. Lack of pedestrian access across the central verge of the boulevard. This has not been addressed.

33: Vehicle tracking – Appears to have been addressed, but will be subject to technical approval at S38 stage.

Further points not listed:

Cycle connectivity: A 3-metre wide shared use cycle path has been included (no dig construction) on the development side of the hedge. The safety audit raised concern about visibility splays and the dimensions of these will need to be subject to further discussion. This provides better linkage to the cycle route to the east, but the connection at Iazard Road will need some slight amendment on the eastern side of this junction to ensure continuity at the crossing point. Likewise, further detail will be required of the connection to the carriageway at the western end.

Construction phase and HGV traffic

This has not been addressed.

Drainage

I am awaiting comments from our drainage team on the updated drainage strategy.

S106 planning obligations and conditions – please see our previous response.

Officer's Name: Joy White

Officer's Title: Principal Transport Planner

Date: 17 September 2018
