

Stakeholder feedback and OCC response

Responses to the Cycling Design Guide (CDG)

Organisation or Individual	Feedback	OCC Response and changes made to the Cycling Guide
Associate of the Health Improvement Board	<p>Supports both documents</p> <p>Asks if guidance includes plans to look at existing provision</p> <p>Asks about monitoring and evaluation</p>	<p>Guidance will be applicable to any future schemes but won't in itself trigger changes in existing streetscapes</p> <p>Monitoring and evaluation are to be considered at a future time</p>
A member of the Oxford Civic Society	<p>Support both documents</p> <p>Various comments on individual aspects of CDG, including suggestion for diagram of cycle 'design vehicle'</p>	<p>Diagram of cycle 'design vehicle' to be included in publication version of CDG</p>
British Horse Society	<p>Various text additions to include mention of equestrian users at relevant points</p> <p>Request for Equestrian Design Guide</p>	<p>Similar point made by OCC Countryside Access Team and changes incorporated where possible</p> <p>Request for Equestrian Design Guide noted</p>
Independent comment 01	<p>Concern about walkers and cyclists sharing paths</p>	<p>Concern shared in CDG which promotes alternatives. However such paths do still have a place in the circumstances detailed in the guidance</p>
SODC Didcot Garden Town Team	<p>Supports both documents</p>	<p>Noted</p>
Oxfordshire County Council Research & Innovation Team	<p>Suggested amended text for paragraph covering parallel cycle tracks along higher speed roads</p>	<p>Text amended</p>
Oxfordshire County Council Countryside Team	<p>Various minor text changes concerning public rights of way and equestrian users</p>	<p>Changes incorporated where possible</p>
Oxfordshire County Council Major Infrastructure Delivery team	<p>Documents would benefit from less text and more plans</p> <p>Suggest need to be checked / assessed for alignment with District Council developer guidance</p> <p>Suggest cross-referencing with OCC guidance/practices</p>	<p>Publication versions of documents will be professionally produced and more diagrams and illustrations added to aid this</p> <p>Representatives from all District Council Planning teams have been involved throughout the development of the guides as part of the Active & Healthy Travel Steering Group (A&HTSG)</p> <p>Cross referencing could be included</p>

CMDE9

		in a future revision and hyperlinks added to the electronic versions
Oxfordshire County Council Traffic and Road Safety Team	Various minor comments on individual paragraphs	Changes incorporated where possible
Harwell Parish Council	Support both documents Comment that guidance is too late	Noted. Whilst regrettably the guides might not serve past schemes and schemes already approved, it is intended that they will support the design of better solutions in future schemes.
Oxford City Council Green Spaces Development team	Supports both documents but comments that they need to be put into practice Highlights several issues raised at a Westminster Briefing conference last year on walking and cycling	The guidance documents are a tool to help implement several existing policies that will go some way to addressing many of the issues raised at the conference as noted
HarBUG	Supports new CDG Concern that with separate CDG and WDG and no updated Residential Road Design Guide (RDG) and developers may not coordinate street designs District Council planning policy documents must point to these design guides and the councils must ensure compliance with them	The Residential Road Design Guide (RRDG) will be updated in due course which will present a fully coordinated set of guidance District Councils have been involved with these guidance documents through the A&HTSG. Their support is essential and will be supported through OCC's role as Highway Authority and statutory planning consultee
Oxford Bus Company	Supports guidance for better cycle infrastructure at bus stops to reduce conflict Request for Public Transport Infrastructure Design Guidance	Request for Public Transport Infrastructure Design Guide noted
Oxford City Council Planning department	Fully support both documents in principle Design guides need to be seen within wider overarching strategy and need to cover priority (in terms of mode), and request for a walking and cycling strategy for Oxford Concern regarding guidance stating that shared use paths should not be provided alongside roads within new developments and objection to requirement for stepped cycle tracks in larger new developments	Walking and cycling strategy is covered on a countywide basis in the Active & Healthy Travel Strategy, which is part of LTP4 The new guidance is deliberately strong in regards to stating that shared use paths should not be provided in new developments alongside roads. This is because of several shortcomings of such infrastructure (reference Cycle Nation's "Making Space for Cycling")

		<p>and because, when provided, generally consideration is only made for cyclists</p> <p>Stepped cycle lanes are a better alternative to shared use paths within larger new developments and do not take up significantly more space, and have much better support from cycling and walking groups. There should be no reason why such infrastructure can not be designed into new developments</p>
<p>Cycling UK Representative</p>	<p>Many good points in the CDG</p> <p>Several detailed comments on individual paragraphs, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Guidance should be used from outset of design process • Disagree with spreading motor traffic throughout an area, filtered permeability • More residential cycle storage space needed for families • Refuges used by cyclists need to be big enough • Disagree with gravel surfaces in rural areas <p><i>Note: The above list is only a selection of the points made</i></p>	<p>Filtered permeability will be picked up in the revised RRDG as it affects more than cycling. The key point the CDG is making is for full cycle permeability</p> <p>Cycle parking limits and more detail on refuge dimensions can be picked up in a future revision of the guidance</p> <p>Compacted gravel surfaces in rural areas often result from other (non-cyclist) user needs, which have to be taken into consideration</p> <p>Changes have been made in response to detailed comments where possible</p>
<p>Oxford Brookes University, Cycle BOOM project</p>	<p>Supports OCC's ambition to encourage more people of all ages and abilities to cycle more</p> <p>Query over whether references to other existing guides lacks clarity and has potential for guidance to become applied inconsistently. Need links to where documents can be found online.</p> <p>Greater emphasis needed on keeping motor vehicle speeds low on residential streets</p> <p>Several further detailed comments on individual paragraphs</p>	<p>The use of existing guidance from elsewhere to fill gaps in the OCC guidance will be kept under review and addressed when the CDG is next updated if required. Document links will be provided in the published document</p> <p>Vehicle speeds on residential streets will be covered in the revised version of RRDG</p> <p>Changes have been made in response to further detailed comments where possible</p>
<p>A representative from Cyclox / Cycling UK and Oxford Civic Society</p>	<p>Several detailed comments and on individual paragraphs and suggestions for text changes</p> <p>Some more broad issues raised</p>	<p>Changes have been made in response to detailed comments and text change suggestions where possible</p>

CMDE9

	<p>include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Query why references made to Street Design for All, which has little on provision for cycling • Differences with existing RRDG, such as conflict between number of access points for new developments and having a well-connected street network • Use of road type names “spine” and “distributor” • Higher standards for cycle parking needed • Guidance that cycle lanes should not use coloured surfaces due to maintenance costs runs counter to the tenor of the document • ASLs should be 5m deep (not 4m) <p><i>Note: The above list is only a selection of the points made</i></p>	<p>References to Street Design for All have been removed</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there are CDG issues that cause conflict with the current version of RRDG, which has not at this present time been updated. RRDG will be updated in future to create a coordinated set of guidance documents which will resolve this. When RRDG is updated, road type naming conventions will be consistent</p> <p>Cycle parking standards will be reviewed when CDG (or RRDG) is next updated</p> <p>The use of coloured surfaces will be reviewed in a future version of CDG</p> <p>The requirement for ASLs has been changed to be a <i>minimum of 4m</i></p>
<p>Peter Brett Associates LLP</p>	<p>Support the provision of local authority guidance for developers</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>Oxfordshire Cycling Network</p>	<p>Overall support for both CDG and WDG</p> <p>Both need to be used at the very start of the planning process</p> <p>Several detailed comments on individual paragraphs, which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggestion that user hierarchy mentioned in CDG • Concern about having developments fully permeable to motor traffic • Concern about concept of ‘spine’ and ‘distributor’ roads • Suggestion of inclusion of light-segregation solutions (e.g. armadillos) • Guidance should cover maintainability <p><i>Note: The above list is only a selection of the points made</i></p>	<p>Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments</p> <p>User hierarchy concept should be explained in RRDG</p> <p>Motor traffic permeability will be picked up in the revised RRDG as it affects more than cycling. The key point the CDG is making is for full cycle permeability</p> <p>RRDG update will better name road types (CDG will then be updated accordingly)</p> <p>Light segregation now mentioned in CDG</p>
<p>Oxford University Estates department</p>	<p>Broadly satisfied with content and considers CDG and WDG should help encourage walking and cycling in the future</p> <p>More detailed comments made</p>	<p>Light segregation now mentioned in CDG</p> <p>Parking for larger bikes and trailers now mentioned in CDG</p>

CMDE9

	including comments on light segregation, high density cycle parking and cycle parking for larger cycles (e.g. cargo bikes)	
SODC / VoWHDC Planning department	<p>Support both CDG and WDG, their aspirations and key principles</p> <p>Suggestion for diagrams and photos to have figure numbers and titles</p> <p>Suggestion to include examples and case studies</p> <p>Detailed comments on individual paragraphs in CDG</p>	<p>Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments</p> <p>Publication versions of documents will include numbers and titles for diagrams and photos, and examples of case studies if possible</p>
OxTRAG	<p>Cycle provision also needs to allow provision of mobility vehicles. Stepped cycle tracks should offer frequent drop sections to allow movement of mobility vehicles to footway</p> <p>Detailed comments on individual paragraphs in CDG</p>	Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments
Cherwell District Council Planning department	<p>Guidance to assist developers prepare high quality designs to encourage walking and cycling is welcomed and supported</p> <p>Several comments regarding the overall style and content including suggestion of a need for a delivery section, summary section and executive section</p> <p>Detailed comments on individual paragraphs in CDG</p> <p>OCC Road Agreements team need to be fully engaged and committed to the guidance</p>	<p>Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments</p> <p>The publication versions of the documents may be able to address some of the style and content suggestions – others will need to wait until the next update to the documents (or RRDG update)</p> <p>Liaison with OCC Road Agreements team has taken place</p>
Oxfordshire County Council Transport Localities representative	Detailed comments on individual paragraphs in CDG	Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments
Oxfordshire Sport and Physical Activity	Detailed comments on individual paragraphs in CDG	Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments
Oxfordshire County Council Public Health representative and member of the	Suggestion made that developers could provide storage for cycle related equipment, and query whether infrastructure will be able to accommodate adaptive/accessible	<p>Storage for cycle related equipment is now mentioned</p> <p>Infrastructure should be designed for the cycle 'design vehicle' which</p>

CMDE9

Barton Healthy New Town Steering Group	cycles	specifies dimensions that should cover most adaptive/accessible cycles
RSA Thame Group	Awareness of Thame Green Living Plan	Noted

Responses to the Walking Design Guide (WDG)

Organisation or Individual	Feedback	OCC Response and changes made to the Walking Guide
Associate of the Health Improvement Board	Raises issue of street clutter and too many signs in Oxford. Mentions raising awareness for users.	WDG quotes NPPF guidance on Transport Statements or Assessments (para 2.1.3) and also para 2.4.2. Will consider more on general issue of street clutter. The design guides are intended to be technical documents therefore would not explicitly suggest initiatives to educate or raise awareness of improving health but it is hoped their existence contributes to the wider conversations around healthy travel
A member of the Oxford Civic Society	Might be worth distinguishing between residential areas and others - retail, commercial areas, etc. Raises issue of drop kerbs for access to private driveways Suggests amendments to paragraph 2.3.5	Drop kerbs issue included Amended paragraph 2.3.5
British Horse Society	See response in CDG table above	See response in CDG table above
Independent comment 01	See response in CDG table above	See response in CDG table above
SODC Didcot Garden Town Team	See response in CDG table above. Supports both documents	Noted
Oxfordshire County Council Countryside Team	Supportive of aspirations Detailed comments on individual paragraphs in WDG e.g. reference to all non-motorised users and equestrians	Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments. Equestrian considerations are separate to walking & cycling but opportunity to review when RRDG updated
Oxford Pedestrians Association	Supportive of the content in the Walking Design Guide	Noted
Oxfordshire County Council Major Infrastructure Delivery team	Photos could be improved. Add OCC new lighting policy in 2.4.3. Would like a technologies section to be added in terms of Door to Door	Photos removed/improved, lighting text added. Technologies text added to Door to Door section
Oxfordshire County Council	Amendments proposed on a range of issues	Amended text on pelican crossings, zebra crossings and changed width

CMDE9

Traffic and Road Safety Team		guidance in 2.3.5, reference to LTN 1-95 added.
Harwell Parish Council	See response in CDG table above	See response in CDG table above
Oxford City Council Green Spaces Development team	See response in CDG table above	See response in CDG table above
HarBUG	Express a slight concern that by separating walking and cycling from general highway design, developers may not coordinate their street designs from the outset.	See response in CDG table above
Oxford Bus Company	Shared space should be referenced; Consider that separate guidance to Shared Space & Public Urban Realm should be developed and consulted on rather than hidden within walking guidance. Bullet point list of requirements for developers for bus stop facilities in Door to Door section	Walking (and cycling) Design Guidance has been developed first. Opportunity to review/incorporate when RRDG updated. Incorporated: This would be appropriate for stops particularly on Premium Bus Routes.
Oxford City Council Planning department	Issues relating to Oxford raised. Need for hierarchy, spatial dimension, steepness/gradients, shared space complexity. Some photos are poor and some WDG and CDG text on shared space not connected/consistent.	Photos improved/updated, hierarchy now covered, shared space text revised.
Peter Brett Associates LLP	Support the provision of local authority guidance for developers	Noted
Oxfordshire Cycling Network	Overall support for both CDG and WDG	Suggested amendments to the WDG have been amended accordingly
Oxford University Estates department	In section 2.6.6, it might be a good idea to distinguish between shared-use of 'cycle paths' and shared-use in pedestrianised areas. Manual for Streets principles should be followed.	Amended
SODC / VoWHDC Planning department	Improved formatting and less text heavy recommended. No quote from Inclusive Mobility or Public Health England	Diagrams have been added to make it less text heavy. Have added text from Inclusive Mobility and Public Health colleagues have provided text.
Living Streets, UK Charity	Comprehensive list of proposed changes – welcomes guidance on walking as a separate mode	Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments
OxTRAG	Comprehensive list of amendments to ensure safety for more vulnerable users	Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments

CMDE9

Cherwell District Council Planning department	Comprehensive list of helpful comments and detailed text changes	Changes have been made where possible in response to detailed comments
Oxfordshire Sport and Physical Activity	Range of comments/additions to text	Amendments incorporated where appropriate.
Oxfordshire County Council Public Health representative and member of the Barton Healthy New Town Steering Group	Comprehensive list of helpful comments from a health perspective	Amendments incorporated where appropriate
RSA Thame Group	Awareness of Thame Green Living Plan	Noted