

Oxford Local Plan 2036

Proposed Submission Draft

Part A

You only need to
fill Part A in once

Your name:

Organisation (if applicable):

Address:

Email:

Date:

Data protection:

Please note that your response will be made available for inspection by the public in paper form at the Council's offices, or other locations as appropriate for the purpose of facilitating public access.

Your personal details will be properly safeguarded and processed in accordance with the requirements of the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) 2018. Your information will be used for The Oxford Local Plan 2036 Proposed Submission Consultation only, and we will only store your data until the Oxford Local Plan 2036 is accepted. Information you give in this form could be shared with the Independent Examiner at the examination stage of the Local Plan process.

We cannot accept anonymous comments.

If you are happy for us to state your name and the first line of your address and postcode when publishing your response(s), please tick this box.

If you would rather all personal details except your name and a non-specific address (e.g. Oxford) to be obscured, please tick this box.

Do you wish to speak at the examination hearings?

(Please note that the Inspector will decide who to invite to speak)

Yes	No
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Do you wish to be notified when:

the Council submit the Oxford Local Plan 2036 to the Government?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

the Inspector's Report is published?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

the Oxford Local Plan 2036 is adopted by the Council?

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------------------------------	--------------------------

GENERAL ADVICE

For advice on making a comment, please see the accompanying notes page.

It is also available at www.oxford.gov.uk/localplan

When completing the form,

You only need to complete Part A once

Cover concisely all the information and evidence you feel supports or justifies your view, as this will normally be your only opportunity to tell us about it

Be as precise as possible

HOW TO SUBMIT YOUR COMMENTS

Please submit completed forms by email or post to:

planningpolicy@oxford.gov.uk

Planning Policy Team

Oxford City Council
St Aldate's Chambers
109-113 St Aldate's
Oxford
OX1 1DS

If you have any questions please feel free to get in touch with the Planning Policy Team

T: 01865 252847

F: 01865 252144

planningpolicy@oxford.gov.uk

www.oxford.gov.uk/localplan

Please ensure your comments reach us by

16:00 on 28th December 2018.

Thank you for
participating.

Policy M1: Prioritising walking, cycling, and public transport

267.1 1654

1 Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number below)

- Paragraph
- Policies Map
- Policy Number M1 ✓
- Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

2 Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

(a) is legally compliant? Y N

(b) is sound? Y N

(c) complies with the duty to co-operate? Y N

3 Do you consider that the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick as appropriate)

- (a) positively prepared?
- (b) justified?
- (c) effective?
- (d) consistent with national policy? ✓

4 Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound, not legally compliant or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. If you do believe the document is sound, legally compliant, or complies with the duty to co-operate you may use the box to explain why.

We welcome the focus on walking and cycling and public transport.

No mention is made of people with disabilities in this policy. The text at 7.31 about disabled access and the design of transport infrastructure is isolated and not implemented through policy. Consideration of their needs should be paramount as stated in para 110b of the National Planning Policy Framework, which states "address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport" The only mentions of disability in any of the transport policies is in the two policies relating to parking M3 and M5. We do not believe that this sufficiently represents the transport needs of people with disabilities, and in particular those who use bicycles or tricycles to travel.

The policy M1a states that the urban environment should be permeable. This needs to be made clearer in the policy. See Manual for Streets paragraph 4.2.3 "Street networks should, in general, be connected. Connected, or 'permeable', networks encourage walking and cycling, and make places easier to navigate through. They also lead to a more even spread of motor traffic throughout the area..."

In the section in M1 on the Rail Network, there is no mention of the provision of pedestrian and cycle routes to the new stations along the Cowley Branch Line as they open up, and of potential requirements for developers to contribute to such infrastructure. It is essential that there is good access by sustainable transport means.

On the Policies map https://www.oxford.gov.uk/downloads/file/5147/local_plan_2016-2036_policies_map it isn't possible to select layers so, we sought to trace cycling facilities. We know that it is the County who are responsible for Highways but nonetheless the map seems confusing and possibly misleading as it in no way represents either current or future cycle routes.

The last sentence of paragraph 7.1 is not consistent with the remainder of the chapter and could be interpreted to read that there is a need to prioritise road space for vehicles rather than the intended meaning, which is to prioritise road space for sustainable modes of travel.

5 What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

Disabled access

The first paragraph of policy M1 should be amended as follows (additional text in underlined red italics):

"Planning permission will only be granted for development that minimises the need to travel and is laid out and designed in a way that prioritises access for all by walking, cycling and public transport."

A further sentence should be added at the end of the public transport section:

Developments should be designed to accommodate bus movements, where appropriate. The design and location of bus stops, footways, parking and cycling facilities should be designed with the needs of people with disabilities in mind.

Providing cycle and pedestrian access to new railway stations

The first sentence within the public transport section should be amended as follows:

In order to safeguard and promote the provision of public transport in Oxford development that will add to demands on public transport should contribute towards improvements to bus network infrastructure including pedestrian and cycle routes to bus stops and new railway stations, shelters, passenger seating, waiting areas, signage, timetable information and infrastructure relating to zero emissions.

Amendment to last sentence of 7.1 for clarity

Road space within the city is limited, so to achieve its ambition there is a need to prioritise road space so as to and promote the sustainable modes of travel, walking, cycling and public transport.

Policy M4: Provision of electric charging points

1655
207.2

1 Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number below)

- Paragraph
- Policies Map
- Policy Number
- Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

2 Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

(a) is legally compliant? Y N

(b) is sound? Y N

(c) complies with the duty to co-operate? Y N

3 Do you consider that the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick as appropriate)

- (a) positively prepared?
- (b) justified?
- (c) effective?
- (d) consistent with national policy?

Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound, not legally compliant or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. If you do believe the document is sound, legally compliant, or complies with the duty to co-operate you may use the box to explain why.

National policy dictates that we should provide an infrastructure for electric car charging points. Most residents of Oxford do not have drive-ways or garages and therefore cannot charge their electric cars at home. As the City Council changes all its lamp-posts to LED, it should provide on-street electric car charging points on EVERY lamp-post. This means that the lamp-posts should be positioned on the street side of the pavement so that pedestrians way is not blocked and they don't have to walk over cables.

What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

At the end of M4, the text should read: 'All new LED street lamps should be provided with two electric charging points as standard. The new street lamps should be positioned at the street side of the pavement so that pedestrians do not need to cross charging cables.'

1656

267.3

Policy M5: Cycle Parking

1 Which part of the document do you wish to comment on? (please give the relevant paragraph or policy number below)

- Paragraph
- Policies Map
- Policy Number
- Sustainability Appraisal

Please give the relevant paragraph or policy number

2 Do you consider that the document:

Select the most applicable option in each row.

(a) is legally compliant? Y N

(b) is sound? Y N

(c) complies with the duty to co-operate? Y N

3 Do you consider that the document is **unsound** because it is **not**: (tick as appropriate)

- (a) positively prepared?
- (b) justified?
- (c) effective?
- (d) consistent with national policy?

4 Please tell us below why you consider the document to be unsound, not legally compliant or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. If you do believe the document is sound, legally compliant, or complies with the duty to co-operate you may use the box to explain why.

Policy M5 – should include not only disabled but trailer bikes for carrying children DMRB IAN 195/16 While the cycle parking standards exceeds that of the county council policy and the previous local plan policy by the horizon of this plan in 2036 we will need to be zero carbon and a large majority of journeys will be by bike.

Bicycle theft is a big problem in Oxford. Given the high rate of cycling in the city, and the Council's aspirations to increase this further, there should be stronger requirements for all new developments to be provided with secure cycle parking within secure, weather-proof stores. It is not acceptable for newly built developments to have cycle storage vulnerable to theft.

The policy should additionally differentiate more clearly between visitor cycle parking where on-street Sheffield stands are appropriate and long-stay cycle parking (for employees of a business or residents) where secure and enclosed cycle storage is necessary and reasonable.

It is pleasing that more cycle parking is promised but this is ineffective without a clear target. The supporting text in respect of cycle parking should be more specific about the need for the number of cycle parking spaces to be quadrupled.

5 What change(s) do you consider necessary to make the document sound or legally compliant? Please explain why this change will achieve soundness or legal compliance. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination.) It would be helpful if you could suggest revised wording for the policy or text in question.

**Amendments to first and second sentence, paragraph 7.39
(new or revised text shown in red italics. Deleted text shown struck-through.)**

"All long-term cycle parking must be enclosed within a secure and weather-proof enclosure, unless demonstrated that this is not practicable possible, having adopted a proactive approach of planning and designing for its inclusion. The location of cycle parking is also important: where cycle parking for residents or employees is not in a secure store, it should be located away from the street frontage, to maximise security.

Amendment to policy M5 – first sentence of second paragraph and new sentence

Cycle parking should be, well designed and well-located, convenient, *enclosed and secure, covered (where possible enclosed)* and provide level, unobstructed external access to the street. *Exceptions will be made where it can be demonstrated that this is not practicable possible, having adopted a proactive approach of planning and designing for its inclusion.*