Public Document Pack

OXFORDSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

Cabinet
Tuesday, 18 October 2022

ADDENDA

6. **Reports from Scrutiny Committees** (Pages 1 - 18)

Reports of the Performance & Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee

- o Citizens' Jury: Street Voice
- o Property Strategy
- o LGA Peer Review on Communications

10. **Parking Standards for New Developments** (Pages 19 - 46)

- o Addendum to the Cabinet Report
- o Updated Annex 1 Draft Vehicular and Cycle Parking Standards – changes highlighted

This page is intentionally left blank

Divisions Affected – All

CABINET
18 October 2022

Street Voice: Citizens' Jury

Report of Performance and Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee

RECOMMENDATION

1. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to —**

    a) Agree to respond to the recommendations contained in the body of this report.
    b) Agree that relevant officers will continue to update Scrutiny for 12 months on progress made against actions committed to in response to the recommendations, or until they are completed (if earlier).

REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND

2. In accordance with section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000 as amended by the Localism Act 2011, the People Overview & Scrutiny Committee requires that the Cabinet respond to the recommendations of a report submitted to it by Scrutiny within two months of the date of being served this report. The Scrutiny Committee accepts service to mean the date of the Cabinet meeting, and not the publication of the agenda.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

3. Following a request from Cabinet to do so, at its meeting on 30 September 2022, the Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report from the Citizens' Jury, 'Street Voice'.

4. The Committee welcomed a presentation from the Citizens' Jury report authors, Dr Alison Chisholm, Qualitative Researcher at the Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences and Dr Juliet Carpenter, Research Fellow at Kellogg College, two Jury members, the Jury facilitator Paul Kahawatte, and Robert Weavers from the research team. The Committee would like to thank all these people who gave up their time to update the Committee, in addition to Cllr Glynis Phillips, Cabinet portfolio holder for

Corporate Services, Claire Taylor, Corporate Director – Customers, Culture and Corporate Services, and John Disley, Head of Transport Policy, who were available to provide an internal perspective to issues raised in discussion.

SUMMARY

5.   One of the report authors, Dr Juliet Carpenter, Research Fellow at Kellogg College made a presentation to the Committee, explaining the process of how different participants were selected to be involved, and practically how it was delivered, with the key focus being on information sharing by experts, followed by facilitated discussion afterwards. Paul Kahawatte, professional facilitator of the Citizens' Jury, explained the process of convergent facilitation, which tended to produce shared views from divergent starting points rather than watered down compromise or ideas with only minority support. Dr Alison Chisholm, Qualitative Researcher at the Nuffield Department of Primary Care Health Sciences, introduced the outputs of the Citizens' Jury, its recommendations. The 41 recommendations, which were identified as particularly important to at least one jury member and which received no opposition from any others, were identified as the priority recommendations, with support from all Jury members. Other proposals were included in the report appendix, including a number of others that were also fully supported and were not opposed by any Jurors. Two participant Jurors also presented their experience of being involved, highlighting the need for realism, inclusivity for multiple groups, the value of having their own biases respectfully challenged, and the qualitative difference of the Citizens' Jury over traditional consultation.

6.   Owing to its remit as the Scrutiny Committee responsible for corporate services, including consultation, the Committee focused on this area rather than the specific merits of the different recommendations arising from the Citizens' Jury. The 55 recommendations made by the Place Scrutiny Committee's Transport Working Group are felt to cover much of the same ground as the Citizens' Jury recommendations whilst being far more informed than the Performance and Corporate Services Overview and Scrutiny Committee could emulate within a single meeting.

7.   The Committee's discussion covered a number of areas. These included:
   - The degree to which support for proposals differed depending on the degree of familiarity or non-familiarity with the concept
   - The limitations of consulting Oxford residents when such a large proportion of travel within the city involves those from outside
   - The statistical significance of divergence from precise matching of demographic characteristics owing to the small number of jurors involved
   - The limitations of exploring proposals in an uncosted manner
   - Clarifying the process of the Council's response beyond Scrutiny, the applicability of Citizens' Juries more generally and learning points from this this exercise

- The relationship between Citizens' Juries and other forms of consultation and engagement.

The Committee makes one recommendation to Cabinet concerning the broader location of citizens' juries within the Council's decision-making process.

OBSERVATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

8. The Committee did note that the Street Voice Citizens' Jury represented the first time that the Council had sought to engage with a Citizens' Jury in a substantive way as part of its policy-development and decision-making process. As part of its consideration of the report the Committee makes two observations to feed back to Cabinet by way of reflections on the process which may help shape any future use of Citizens' Juries but which do not require a formal response, as well as one recommendation, which does.

Observation 1: The Committee felt a lack of clarity over the status of the Citizens' Jury recommendations, and their ongoing treatment within the wider Council's processes.

9. Experimenting with novel ways to engage and listen to local residents is entirely consistent with the Council's strategic priorities and its values. However, rarely do new approaches work out perfectly first time, and it was the view of the Committee that in this instance there was a lack of clarity over where the Citizens' Jury recommendations naturally fitted. Specifically, it was unclear as to which Council decision the recommendations related to, the most relevant being the LTCP, a policy already adopted. Similarly, the Street Voice report recognised that its recommendations were made without reference to the cost of implementing its proposals. This makes consideration of them by Scrutiny (and indeed Cabinet) very difficult without further work being undertaken to understand the financial practicability of any proposals. Equally, it was unclear to the Committee how an endorsement of a particular recommendation would be treated; a number of members supported all the recommendations in principle, for example, but without clarity as to the effect within the organisation of endorsing any particular recommendation it was hard to address specific ideas. The Committee were grateful to all those involved with the project for giving up their time to come along, and it regrets any possibility that its hesitancy to engage with the substance of the recommendations was a disappointment. Given the intensive commitment required to be a Jury member, it is important for any future Juries that a mechanism is developed to ensure that the substance of any report is given due weight and their efforts duly recognised.

Observation 2: A difference of opinion exists within the Committee over the value for money of Citizens' Juries, particularly if used as a supplement to existing consultation methods.

10. A strong steer of the Committee is that if Citizens' Juries are to be employed as a means of consultation, they should be in addition to rather than as a substitution for existing consultation approaches. This, however, raises the cost. There was not agreement within the Committee as to whether that additional cost was merited by the ultimate outputs.

11. Those who queried the value for money held concerns over the process of the Citizens' Jury. They did so on a number of bases, including worry that the small number of participants meant it was not possible to get genuine demographic representation, concern that a representative group's directions can be influenced by the choice of speakers (who are not as rigorously balanced), caution that in seeking consensus areas of minority disagreement may not be raised, and challenge over the legitimacy of choices made without full consideration of the budgetary trade-offs involved. To those holding these concerns, questions over the process meant the legitimacy of the outcomes was in doubt, making it more difficult to justify the additional cost.

12. An ancillary point to the overall cost of Citizens' Juries was made at the Committee, which is the opportunity cost of involved. If that time and money is to be devoted to consultation, is it most effectively spent on a Citizens' Jury? The question was raised whether the time invested to select participants, develop trust between Jury participants, and to inform them on the issues might actually be more effectively spent consulting with democratically appointed members instead? It was suggested that four weekends of consultation with local members might yield a more complete picture underpin a more positive impact on ultimate policy outcomes than a Citizens' Jury.

13. The formal recommendation of the Committee falls naturally out of these two observations: that some members are unconvinced as to the value for money of Citizens' Juries, and that there was a degree of uncertainty over the status of the Citizens' Jury work and the ask of the Committee.

   Recommendation 1: That the Council develops a clear plan as to how any future Citizens' Juries would best be incorporated within the wider policy-development and decision-making processes of Council.

14. As discussed above, one issue over the Citizens' Jury is the cost. Irrespective of the differences of opinion within the Committee over the value for money of the information provided by a Citizens' Jury process, what is incontrovertible is that the value of their outputs is predicated on achieving demographically representative groups, informing them well, and ensuring that all members are given the opportunity to share their views. Achieving these requirements is expensive. The Street Voice team had to use a specialist company to identify and invite 2000 households to be involved and sift through the responses to generate a demographically balanced group. This group then were presented with the views of 13 speakers over 21 hours and four weekends. A professional facilitator was required to involve members and to identify areas of consensus. If the Council is to use such an involved process in the future, it is fair that it should seek to maximise the value and utility of the ultimate outputs. In order for this to happen, Citizens' Juries must be aligned and

integrated with the Council's existing policy-development and decision-making processes.

15.   The Committee's view is that this would largely be solved by earlier involvement; it is unfortunate that the Citizens' Jury recommendations have arrived after Cabinet, Scrutiny and Council have considered the LTCP and it has been agreed. Likewise, the Citizens' Jury recommendations themselves, having not been costed, would have been of greater benefit in informing the development of policy ideas at the outset, rather than at a late stage. It may be that if Citizens' Juries are to be used to inform specific decision-making proposals (as opposed to broader policy development) they may need to incorporate some of the constraints and trade-offs which the Council would be making in its decisions into the Jury process, the budget being the key one.

16.   Along similar lines, the Committee also feels that to be useful as a tool for consultation on behalf of the Council the outputs must be related to activity which is within the Council's ability to implement. The recommendations of the Citizens' Jury bring in the Universities, NHS, central government and the private sector as well as the Council. To maximise the usefulness of a future Citizens' Jury it would be necessary to limit the initial scope so that the outputs say what Jurors want the Council to do, rather than their desired overall destination. A more focused approach may also be more time-efficient.

17.   A final question which the Committee suggests would be necessary to raise is the status of a Citizens' Jury. If, as Scrutiny members have requested and the Cabinet member has agreed to, Citizens' Juries would be supplementary to the current process of consultation and engagement, it is unclear what the rationale for focusing both Cabinet and Scrutiny time on a particular element of the engagement process would be over and above the others. It may be that the greater depth of responses afforded by a Citizens' Jury merits specific consideration, but the Committee feels that this is a question which would benefit from being actively addressed along with the question raised above about ensuring the contributions of Jurors are fully recognised.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION

18.   As per the recommendation, the Committee would wish to see greater integration of Citizens' Juries into the Council's wider processes before it considers a further one. However, the Committee is expecting to undertake further work on consultation and engagement in the form of a report on the Communications and Engagement Strategy in April 2023.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

19.   Under Part 6.2 (13) (a) of the Constitution Scrutiny has the following power: 'Once a Scrutiny Committee has completed its deliberations on any matter a formal report may be prepared on behalf of the Committee and when agreed

by them the Proper Officer will normally refer it to the Cabinet for consideration.

20. Under Part 4.2 of the Constitution, the Cabinet Procedure Rules, s 2 (3) iv) the Cabinet will consider any reports from Scrutiny Committees.

Anita Bradley
Director of Law and Governance

Annex: Annex 1: Pro forma template for Cabinet response

Background papers: None

Other Documents: None

Contact Officer: Tom Hudson
                                Principal Scrutiny Officer
                                tom.hudson@oxfordshire.gov.uk
                                Tel: 07519 667976

October 2022

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

Under section 9FE of the Local Government Act 2000, Overview and Scrutiny Committees must require the Cabinet or local authority to respond to a report or recommendations made thereto by an Overview and Scrutiny Committee. Such a response must be provided within two months from the date on which it is requested[1] and, if the report or recommendations in questions were published, the response also must be so.

This template provides a structure which respondents are encouraged to use. However, respondents are welcome to depart from the suggested structure provided the same information is included in a response. The usual way to publish a response is to include it in the agenda of a meeting of the body to which the report or recommendations were addressed.

Issue: Citizens' Jury

Lead Cabinet Member(s): Cllr Glynis Phillips, Cabinet Member for Corporate Services

Date response requested:[2] 18 October 2022

Response to report:
Enter text here.

Response to recommendations:

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
That the Council develops a clear plan as to how any future Citizens' Juries would best be		

---

[1] Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received
[2] Date of the meeting at which report/recommendations were received

Overview & Scrutiny Recommendation Response Pro forma

incorporated within the wider policy-development and decision-making processes of Council.		

Divisions Affected – All

CABINET
18 October 2022

Property Strategy

Report of Performance and Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee

RECOMMENDATION

1.	**The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to —**

	a)	Agree to **NOTE** to the observations contained in the body of this report.

REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND

2.	This report contains no recommendations, meaning Cabinet is not required to make a formal response. It may, of course, wish to respond to any of the observations detailed below when it considers this report, or the substantive Property Strategy report.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

3.	The Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee considered a report on the Council's forthcoming Property Strategy at its meeting on 30 September 2022.

4.	The Committee would like to thank Cllr Calum Miller, Cabinet portfolio holder for Finance, Claire Taylor, Corporate Director – Customers, Culture and Corporate Services, and Vic Kurzeja, Director of Joint Property Services, for preparing and introducing the report, and for attending to answer questions.

SUMMARY

5.	Calum Miller, Cabinet portfolio holder for Finance introduced the report. The Council's 905 different sites had, over recent years, seen relatively limited investment, and the Property Strategy was an attempt to refresh the approach to the Council's property assets. This approach had to contend with the

challenging financial context faced by the Council, as well as the multi-layered changes to the use of property assets by staff and the public following Covid. As the corporate owner of assets on behalf of and for the benefit of local electorate it was important the Council sought cross-party consensus on the way forward. Claire Taylor, Corporate Director – Customers, Culture and Corporate Services, updated the Committee on the progress of the report to Cabinet, highlighting the delay of the final report by a month to allow her greater oversight having only very recently assumed responsibility for the area within her directorate.

6.   In response to the presentation the Committee raised multiple issues, including the adequacy of staffing to deliver the programme, details of proposed joint ventures as well as the potential impacts on relationships with partners of co-locating with some but not others, challenges and opportunities around converting existing assets to better usage, the interaction of the Property Strategy with other corporate objectives, and the implications on the budget.

OBSERVATIONS

7.   As noted above, this report contains no formal recommendations but is simply a summary of the observations made by the Committee for Cabinet to consider as part of its deliberations on the Property Strategy report. One reason for the absence of formal recommendations is the degree to which the Committee felt hampered from doing so owing to a lack of detail. The Committee takes on board the points made in response to this, that it is necessary to agree an overall strategy prior to engaging in detailed work, and that it would be inefficient to develop multiple in-depth plans when only one would ultimately be pursued. On the other hand, the Committee also wishes to stress that there is a question of degree to how light the detail should be, and that it is difficult to assess the relative merits of different strategic options with very few figures. The value Scrutiny can add and the political consensus it can generate is contingent on the quality of data it receives. It is understood that with the Property Strategy report being delayed owing to the Council's internal reorganisation that this was not necessarily possible in this instance, but it is Scrutiny's general expectation that it should be availed of the same information as Cabinet will use when considering an item.

8.   In its discussions the Committee raised a number of suggestions for additional detail which it felt would be of benefit to the Cabinet in making its decision. These included a breakdown of the income and expenditure for each building leased out, the KPIs for the Strategy to be elucidated, and a plan with the indicative timescales for the post-Cabinet elements of the Strategy. Specifically relating to the Council's rationalisation of its office space, the Committee would want to see the Cabinet be making its decisions based on hard figures, rather than simply oblique strengths and weaknesses, and that much more detail be provided about the progress and likely positive outcomes from discussions on co-location, which underpins so much of the strategy. When the Schools portfolio is considered, the Committee suggests that the

People and Place plan, and the impacts of the recent court judgement over reversion clauses won by the Council be fully considered.

9. Whilst the Committee felt unable to make decisions between the options presented to it, it does nonetheless want to outline the principles it would wish to see the Council follow. The first of these is haste. The in-housing of Carillion staff and the Property team's restructuring has meant progress has not been as fast as would be wished. The Committee does not disagree with the strategy's contention that the Council should rationalise its estate; for example, it was informed that only 20% of its office space is currently being used currently. In light of the this level of over-capacity, and the level of potential savings in light of the Council's financial position, moving forward in this area is a matter of urgency.

10. The second principle the Committee strongly supports is co-location. Its preference is for co-location with organisations which share aims and objectives with the Council, for example other tiers of local government, or providers of health or social care. An important concern however, is that any rents charged should be on a commercial basis, and that there is no perception of disadvantage for residents of districts where co-location with a district council does not take place.

11. The final principle is a preference towards investing in the Council's own properties in order to repurpose them, and to reduce the number of leased properties. The Committee recognises that this requires capital investment and that potentially repurposing the Council's existing buildings may mean inheriting constraints which limit the Council's freedom to pursue its design principles as set out in the document considered. However, overall, the benefits of doing so are felt to outweigh those downsides.

    Observation 1: The high level of the report presented to Scrutiny acted as a barrier to Scrutiny being able to take an informed position on the preferred strategic direction.

    Observation 2: That the Cabinet will require much fuller detail to make a fully-informed decision.

    Observation 3: That there is a need to pursue the chosen strategy with urgency, and that it should be seek to co-locate with partners, and focus on using its existing buildings in preference to lease-hold buildings.

12. A further principle the Committee would wish to highlight does not relate to the content of the strategy itself, but how that strategy will be implemented. Whatever ultimate decision is made as to the Council's strategic direction for its property portfolios, this will require making decisions as to what to do with specific property assets. The Committee wishes to stress the important knowledge and perspective local members can bring to discussions over assets in their area, and makes a plea that Councillors are fully informed and consulted on proposals impacting property assets in their areas. It is important that they should be given the opportunity to make use of their grass-roots

networks to understand local reactions and concerns before any decisions are made. Equally, members of the Committee also expressed an interest to be consulted for buildings which are currently unused, and could be put to use by local communities. Related to this, the Committee highlighted the importance of having clarity over any community asset transfer policy to ensure that the Council would be clear in its aims, and that the decisions would be financially sound.

Observation 4: That local members have an important part to play in representing the views of their communities, and that they must be fully involved in discussions about the fate of property assets in their divisions.

Observation 5: That local members should be involved in discussions about unused property assets, and that the Council should be mindful of the potential for community asset transfers within a refreshed Community Asset Transfer policy.

13. That the move towards home working has been accelerated by Covid, thereby increasing the mismatch between demand and supply for office space within the Council, is recognised within the draft Property Strategy. The Committee welcomes the overall point put forward by both the Cabinet member and officers that as a consequence, the labour market and the need for office space are indelibly tied together. The Committee notes that in a tight labour market, staff conditions are extremely important for both recruitment and retention. Thus, the forthcoming work to understand better the differing needs of an Agile workforce must be very much linked with the Property Strategy, not only in the amount of office space required, but also in the design and function of facilities when staff do come into the office. It is important that the contours of this learning are fed into the Property Strategy so that all staff needs are met. For example, younger staff may tend to want to come into the office more, meaning service areas with a younger workforce may require more space than other areas where a higher proportion of staff are content to work from home.

14. Of course, not all staff can work from home. It was noted during discussion that the locations of some of the proposed hubs were in places not well-served with public transport. Concern was raised that the effect of this would be to remove choice from staff over how they would get to work, making them rely on private cars. This clearly runs counter to the Council's intention to reduce private car journeys as part of its response to the Climate Emergency, but further, it reduces the flexibility for staff also. The example of Samuelson House was put forward during discussion as an example of the problems arising from the application of car-reducing policies in locations without sufficient alternatives. In this instance an excess of demand for car parking spaces compared to supply causes inconvenience to both staff and the public as staff are unable to park on-site and must seek and use whatever alternative parking is available nearby. This point is put forward to stress the need for careful consideration over the location of hubs if the Council's Climate Emergency aspirations are not to be undermined, but also to recognise that

there are sometimes trade-offs between competing priorities, and that the need, for example, to provide good care for residents may mean providing enough car parking spaces for staff at hubs, even if that does undermine the Council's climate agenda elsewhere.

Observation 6: That forthcoming office rationalisation must be closely integrated with the Council's other strategic priorities and plans, particularly with reference to staff and the Climate Emergency, and that trade-offs should be made consciously and transparently.

FURTHER CONSIDERATION

15.   The Committee will not be considering this item again formally, but the Directors involved, Claire Taylor and Vic Kurzeja have offered to provide a briefing to answer questions on any additional information which comes out in the Cabinet paper which was not available to Scrutiny members - as requested by the Committee.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

16.   Under Part 6.2 (13) (a) of the Constitution Scrutiny has the following power: 'Once a Scrutiny Committee has completed its deliberations on any matter a formal report may be prepared on behalf of the Committee and when agreed by them the Proper Officer will normally refer it to the Cabinet for consideration.

17.   Under Part 4.2 of the Constitution, the Cabinet Procedure Rules, s 2 (3) iv) the Cabinet will consider any reports from Scrutiny Committees.

Anita Bradley
Director of Law and Governance

Annex: None

Background papers: None

Other Documents: None

Contact Officer: Tom Hudson
                                      Principal Scrutiny Officer
                                      tom.hudson@oxfordshire.gov.uk
                                      Tel: 07519 667976

October 2022

This page is intentionally left blank

Divisions Affected – All

CABINET
18 October 2022

LGA Peer Review on Communications
Report of Performance and Corporate Services Overview & Scrutiny Committee

RECOMMENDATION

1. **The Cabinet is RECOMMENDED to —**

   a) Agree to **NOTE** to the observations contained in the body of this report.

REQUIREMENT TO RESPOND

2. This report contains no recommendations, meaning Cabinet is not required to make a formal response. It may, of course, wish to respond to any of the observations detailed below when it considers this report.

INTRODUCTION AND OVERVIEW

3. The Performance Overview and Scrutiny Committee were provided with a presentation on the outcomes of the recent LGA peer review of communications at its meeting on 30 September 2022.

4. The Committee would like to thank Cllr Glynis Phillips, Cabinet portfolio holder for Corporate Services, Claire Taylor, Corporate Director – Customers, Culture and Corporate Services, and Susannah Wintersgill, Director of Strategy Insight and Communications, for preparing and introducing the report, and for attending to answer questions.

SUMMARY

5. Glynis Phillips, Cabinet portfolio member for Corporate Services introduced the report. The review's origin lay in the need for an independent peer assessment of concerns causing disquiet amongst certain members in relation to the Communications team. The review sought to clarify whether the current

ways of working supported the strategic direction of the Council, the level of innovation in communications with both members and the public, whether the team was clear about the Council's priorities, and the adequacy of the resourcing for the Communications function. The report which came back contained both strengths and weaknesses but was on balance extremely positive. Reviewers were extremely complementary about the competence and leadership of the team and found the level of resourcing to be adequate.

6. Susannah Wintersgill, Director of Strategy, Insight and Communications, drew out this feedback further. The review had found that the Communications team was both talented and passionate, and that talent found its opportunity for impact with an ambitious and engaged leadership wanting to make their mark. Relationships with partners, developed particularly during the pandemic, had continued and were a source of strength. The timing of involvement from Communications was key, with early involvement helping to smooth policy implementation, with later-stage involvement tending more towards firefighting. Further work was required to cultivate relationships with the diversity of media locally, whilst also building relationships at a regional and national level. Finally, given the time of the review, the LTN issue was highlighted as engulfing much of the Communication team's capacity. The Committee was updated on key actions taken in response to the recommendations made by the report. These included the integration of Communications into strategic planning meetings, the development of new Video and Media Strategies, trialling training on political awareness, and a review of the Council's digital presence.

7. In response to the presentation the Committee noted the professionalism of the Communications team. Issues discussed included the learning from the Council's experience around LTNs, the management of political risk and the Council's risk appetite, the role of Cabinet portfolio holders in communications, the balance of investment between Communications and other areas of the Council and the degree to which the scale of resourcing was necessitated in response to the Council's policy, and whether the geographical focus of communications was equitably distributed.

OBSERVATIONS

8. The Committee agreed to make a number of observations to Cabinet. These are not formal recommendations requiring a response, but important areas of feedback for the Cabinet's consideration.

9. The need to have communications be embedded within the Council's policy-forming and implementation process from the very outset is a clear priority within the review. The Committee is pleased to hear the actions taken by officers in response to this. Multiple changes are being made to ensure Communications are informed of forthcoming policy changes, and that processes are in place to ensure that the involvement and scope of the Communications team is considered and its actions reviewed throughout the entire process. Having heard from officers that the experience of the Council

with LTNs was largely caused by the late involvement of the team in the process, the Committee would like to add its weight in identifying this as the core priority for the Council in responding to the review and looks forward to seeing further progress when this topic is reviewed in the future.

Observation 1: That recent experience demonstrates that upstream integration of Communications is crucial to successful policy development and implementation and should be pursued as a priority.

10. As the review notes on a number of occasions, the Communications team is well-led and its members are highly professional. Committee members' experiences corroborate this assessment. However, the review does recognise that the team is not immune to pressures. Described as 'bruising', the Council's the LTN experience was felt by reviewers to have had a material effect, and reduced the Council's appetite for risk. Although understandable, the Committee is keen to make the point that some of the Council's policies are highly ambitious and designed to alter deeply-embedded behaviours. As such, they are liable to challenge. To the Committee's view, if the Council does play safe in its communications and not address more contentious issues, the ultimate consequence will be that where pushback against those policies exists, it will not be extinguished but simply left to a later point in the process and become harder to manage. The Council must not, therefore, be reticent about talking about its policy agenda, even if it may be controversial.

11. Pressure on the Communications team is not simply external, however. The need for training on political awareness identified as a recommendation is an indication that the political environment of the Council is a source of internal pressures on staff also. As referenced, the Committee wants to reiterate its recognition of the professionalism of the team, but at the same time wishes to draw attention to the ongoing challenge the team faces in balancing its responsibility to communicate messages on behalf of the Council, which is run by an administration, and not allowing that to elide into communicating on behalf of the administration.

Observation 2: Notwithstanding the clear professionalism of the Communications team, they are subject to pressures and there remains a risk that Communications may tend towards excessive risk-aversion or to politicisation.

12. One issue identified within the LGA's feedback was picked up by the Committee as not having an action to deliver it, namely that there should be 'a more proactive approach to communicating Scrutiny.' The Committee wholeheartedly believes that Scrutiny's role as a critical friend means it can help to smooth the progress of important and contentious topics. Not only does it offer a suitable forum for members of the public who want to engage in policy debate to make their views on these topics heard before decisions are made, but it also provides an assurance role for the wider public. As noted by the review, the Council's experience with LTNs illustrates how valuable this niche can be. Proactive communication of Scrutiny would amplify engagement with this opportunity, and the Committee is keen that sufficient resource is

devoted to Scrutiny's work that the value it can add to the Council is maximised.

Observation 3: Communications resources for Scrutiny remain unresolved

FURTHER CONSIDERATION

13.   The Committee has agreed to include an update on progress made against the review's recommendations as part of its item on the Consultation and Engagement Strategy in April 2023. Relating to discussions over the relative adequacy of resources in other parts of the Council, a review has been requested in the next civic year to consider the performance of the Law and Governance function.

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

14.   Under Part 6.2 (13) (a) of the Constitution Scrutiny has the following power: 'Once a Scrutiny Committee has completed its deliberations on any matter a formal report may be prepared on behalf of the Committee and when agreed by them the Proper Officer will normally refer it to the Cabinet for consideration.

15.   Under Part 4.2 of the Constitution, the Cabinet Procedure Rules, s 2 (3) iv) the Cabinet will consider any reports from Scrutiny Committees.

Anita Bradley
Director of Law and Governance

Annex: None

Background papers: None

Other Documents: None

Contact Officer: Tom Hudson
                            Principal Scrutiny Officer
                            tom.hudson@oxfordshire.gov.uk
                            Tel: 07519 667976

October 2022

Divisions Affected – All divisions

ADDENDUM TO CABINET REPORT – 18 October 2022

PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS

Report by Corporate Director for Environment and Place

DEFERRAL REASON

1. The revised Parking Standards for new developments was scheduled to go before Cabinet on 20th September 2022. The report and supporting documentation were deferred, to be presented again at Cabinet meeting on 18th October 2022. The report was deferred by the Leader to *'allow further work on targets for this very important policy as part of the aim of reaching net zero by 2050'*. It was also agreed that the issue should go before Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee.

Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee

2. On the 7th October 2022 Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee reviewed the proposed Parking Standards for New Developments document and has made the following recommendations for the cabinet to consider:

3. Response to recommendations:

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected, or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
Item 1: Officers review the evidence available on the relationship between both residential and non-residential parking availability and private car use and report to the Cabinet and Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee.		Information to follow and presented at cabinet meeting.
Item 2: Table 4(b) of the Parking Standards for New Developments be revised to clarify the maximum levels of parking permitted for dwellings with four bedrooms.	Accepted	Table 4(b) has been updated in Annex 1, as have Tables 3 and 4(a). Amendments highlighted in yellow text in Parking Standards for New Developments document.
Item 3: The Committee endorses the differentiation of the city, towns, and rural areas in the Parking Standards for New Developments. However, those areas should be more clearly defined.	Accepted	The document has been updated to reflect this recommendation with rural areas identified as villages and hamlets (highlighted in yellow text). Oxford City, Edge of Oxford City (Local Plan) sites and Towns remain as presented. In additional, paragraph 6.2, Edge of City Sites parking standards wording has been amended. The proposed amendment confirms that edge of city sites are required to be car free (subject to meeting the car free criteria), or a reduced Oxford City standard will be accepted, subject to robust justifications. Amendment highlighted in yellow text in paragraph 6.2.

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected, or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
Item 4: Officers use what data is available to produce a best estimate of current private car trip rates in Oxfordshire and use that estimate to produce numerical values for the Local Transport Connectivity Plan (LTCP) headline targets regarding private car journeys – this should accompany the Parking Standards for New Developments report to Cabinet; and use those estimates to review, and if necessary revise, the maximum levels of parking proposed in the Parking Standards for New Developments, applying the Decide & Provide approach.	Partially accepted	Current position There is not a readily available data source for the quantum of car trips across Oxfordshire, which has not previously been monitored by OCC. Work is currently ongoing to create a monitoring tool for the LTCP. This seeks to combine data sources to allow monitoring of the LTCP targets and KPIs in one platform, to establish how we can successfully monitor vehicular trips and how this work can be resourced. Once a methodology has been established and agreed, the LTCP can be updated with the number of car trips. Scope of work To support the development of the LTCP monitoring tool, officers have been working with the council's Innovation Hub (iHUB) to develop a scope and work programme for the tool and begin to map existing data sources. Two funding bids have also been submitted to the governments 'Regulators Pioneer Fund'. The two bids request funds to build the LTCP monitoring tool or Local Authority Transport Impact Monitoring (LATRIM). A summary of each bid is provided below: **RPF/LATRIM 1** - *Project LATRIM1 is part of a two-bid sequence, aiming to develop a tool for monitoring the implementation of Oxfordshire County Council's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. LATRIM1 will build a data hub, combing various transport data sets. The output of the project will enable the development of data analysis tools needed to monitor specific targets.*

		RPF/LATRIM 2 - *Project LATRIM2 is part of a two-bid sequence, aiming to develop a tool for monitoring the effects of the implementation of Oxfordshire County Council's Local Transport and Connectivity Plan. It builds on the previously developed data hub to develop tools for monitoring specific targets and key performance indicators. The tool will allow evidence-based decision-making process to be adopted by the council.* Bids were submitted on 30 September, with successful bidders due to notified in November. Alternative funding is being identified to begin progressing the project if the bids are unsuccessful. <u>Timescales</u> Anticipated timescales for work on LTCP monitoring are outlined below. Please note that these assume both bids are successful. **November 2022** – Regulators Pioneer Fund outcomes **January 2023 – August 2023** – Project LATRIM1 **August 2023** – LTCP annual monitoring report published **Autumn 2023** - Outcomes from project (including LATRIM1) to inform revised approach to Parking Standards at 12 month review stage **September 2023 – March 2025** – Project LATRIM2
Item 5: Parking must be planned with regard to public safety implications.	Accepted	The inclusion of secure by design provisions has been incorporated into paragraphs 2.5 and 4.11 (first bullet point) and are highlighted in yellow text. Please note this design consideration is identified in the council's adopted Street Design Guide (Section 3.2) and the local planning authorities own Design Guides.

Recommendation	Accepted, rejected, or partially accepted	Proposed action (if different to that recommended) and indicative timescale (unless rejected)
Item 6: The Parking Standards for New Developments be reviewed at an appropriate time sooner than 12 months post adoption if practicable.	Accepted	The text stating the proposed document will be reviewed every 12 to 18 months has been amended. The document says it will be reviewed every 12 months (highlighted in yellow text). This is to ensure the first review aligns with the LTCP monitoring project's expected conclusion as set out in item 4 above.
Item 7: The levels of cycle parking required under the Parking Standards for New Developments must align with the LTCP ambitions for the future mode share for cycling.	Accepted	The adopted LTCP sets a headline target for 2030 to increase the number of cycle trips in Oxfordshire from 600,000 to 1 million cycle trips per week. Several policies within the LTCP regarding cycle parking to support this target are identified, such as Policies 23 and 33. Both policies seek to ensure cycle parking is to be provided in secure and accessible locations and influence the design of a development site's overall parking requirements, for all modes of transport. The revised Parking Standards for New Developments has been written with consideration to these LTCP policies (paragraph 4.10 of the proposed document under 'Design Considerations') and has increased the existing cycle provision standards from a maximum level to a minimum level. The number of spaces to be provided have also been increased. Table 1 in Annex 1 (residential cycle parking standard) has been updated due to the recommendation of the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee. The level of cycle parking has been increased by 100% from the recommended levels quoted in Local Transport Note 1/20 but are still set to a minimum level (highlighted as yellow text). The level of cycle parking proposed for commercial developments remain as a 50% increase from the existing standards.

Local Transport Connectivity Plan (LTCP) targets

4. The monitoring of Key Performance Indicators (KPI) of the LTCP is in its early stages and the trip monitoring work being undertaken by the LTCP team is not yet in place and is subject to the programme of work and funding outlined above.

5. The monitoring of these trips in Oxfordshire will not be able to be directly linked to reduced car parking standards for new developments until a monitoring system is in place.

6. The revised parking standards document has been prepared to support the implementation of OCC's LTCP Policies through restricting / reducing the on-site car parking provision at a destination location i.e. a workplace. This document on its own will not reduce car trips on the highway network, it is part of fan of policies and strategies that will be implemented to influence travel behaviour and encourage alternative modes of travel to be used throughout Oxfordshire.

Risk Management

7. In addition to the risks identified in the Cabinet report dated 20th September 2022, while the revised parking standard document remains unadopted, new development sites (including many large and strategic development sites) will continue to be promoted within the county using the existing high levels of car parking. For example, over the last 6 months, an estimated 700 planning applications and planning condition discharges have been submitted to the council for comments (this excludes minor applications). Meaning officers will miss the opportunity to be able to fully implement the LTCP policies and influence travel behaviour at these sites from their early stages of implementation.

Recommendation

8. The revised 'Parking Standards for New Developments' document has now been updated to reflect the recommendations by the Place Overview & Scrutiny Committee and is ready for its formal adoption by the Cabinet as a supplementary document to the LTCP by Cabinet. This document is a 'live' document and will be reviewed and updated alongside the LTCP monitoring project and local / national policy.

BILL COTTON
Corporate Director for Environment and Place

Contact Officer: Jason Sherwood, Growth Manager South & Vale, 07795 684708, jason.sherwood@oxfordshire.gov.uk

October 2022

This page is intentionally left blank

WORKING DRAFT (October 2022): Parking Standards for New Developments

Service Improvement Programme

Contents

Vehicular and Cycle Parking Standards

1.0 Introduction

1.1. The availability of parking, at both source and destination, has a significant influence on the type of transport people choose for their journeys. Striking the right balance by providing an appropriate level and type of parking, whilst also protecting highway safety for all users, and promoting active and sustainable transport modes is essential. This revised document has been prepared with this design rationale in mind, and in support of the adopted Local Transport Connectivity Plan (LTCP) Policies and the County Council's targets to:

- *Replace or remove 1 out of every 4 current car trips in Oxfordshire by 2030.*
- *Deliver a net-zero transport network and replace or remove an additional 1 out of every 3 current car trips in Oxfordshire by 2040.*
- *To deliver a transport network that contributes to a climate positive future by 2050.*

1.2. New development sites will need to work collaboratively with Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) to help achieve these targets. One key component to support this approach is to revise the existing parking standards for new developments, ensuring they will accord with the council's objective to reduce 25% of car trips by 2030, and a further 33% by 2040. In essence, the approach being taken for development proposals is that if on-site parking is restricted at both the origin of a journey and its destination location, this will influence people's travel behaviour and encourage alternative modes of travel to be used rather than that of the private car.

1.3. Due to the diverse nature of development that is promoted in Oxfordshire a wide range of social and economic circumstances means OCC must have a flexible approach to identifying appropriate levels of parking provision. Such an approach is expected to provide a level of accessibility by private car that is consistent with the overall balance of the transport system at local levels as well the County Council's nine priorities as set out in OCC's Strategic Plan 2022 - 2025.

1.4. OCC, in its role as the local highway authority, is a statutory consultee in respect of planning considerations that affect the public highway and responds to planning application proposals when consulted by all local planning authorities. OCC provides advice to local planning authorities on the transport implications, such as parking levels of development proposals to assist in their decision-making process. OCC is also consulted during the preparation of local and neighbourhood plans and may provide advice on the soundness of policies that relate to parking in new developments.

1.5. Concerns relating to deficiencies in car parking leads to a desire amongst local communities for more car parking spaces. On these occasions OCC may express concerns about accommodating for car parking demand in areas that might already have congestion and air quality issues.

1.6. Oxfordshire, particularly Oxford City and the towns within the county continue to benefit from the popularity of cycling both for commuting and leisure purposes. This means that the inclusion of high-quality cycle parking is essential in all new developments to complement the infrastructure that is being delivered by development sites; and schemes that are identified in the emerging LTCP Area Strategies and Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans. In addition, all electric vehicles are to be catered for with electrical charging points being integral to all new development.

1.7. This parking standards document has been prepared to outline OCC's revised approach to parking at new developments. It is to be used to help determine the level of parking at all new developments and provide the basis for the County Council's advice to the local planning authorities on development proposals and the soundness of policies related to parking for new developments.

1.8. This document replaces OCC's previous parking guidance "Transport for New Developments Parking Standards for New Residential Developments" dated December 2011; the 2015 Second Edition of the County Council's Residential Road Design Guide and paragraph 2.4.1 of the Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards document dated 2017.

2.0 Background

National Policy Context

2.1. The car and cycle parking standards that OCC has been using when assessing development proposals were prepared some time ago and had fallen behind national and local policies. This document is intended to update these standards while incorporating the guidance provided in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) dated July 2021. Paragraph 107, confirms that when setting local parking standards for both residential and non-residential development, policies should consider:

a) the accessibility of the development.
b) the type, mix and use of development.
c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport.
d) local car ownership levels; and
e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

2.2. The NPPF (paragraph 108) also confirms that '*Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town*

centres and other locations that are well served by public transport (in accordance with chapter 11 of this Framework). In town centres, local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking so that it is convenient, safe, and secure, alongside measures to promote accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.'

2.3.   The NPPF also describes the plan-making system which includes local and neighbourhood plans that guide local communities to develop and shape their own surroundings. These plans often contain policies on car and cycle parking.

Local Context

2.4.   Oxfordshire is a large county and has many local characteristics from dense urban areas, through market towns, to rural villages and hamlets. These variations influence the demographics and economic situations of the county, and consequently car ownership and the parking behaviour of Oxfordshire residents in its distinctly different areas.

2.5.   This parking standards document should be used alongside OCC's Street Design Guide and secure by design provisions. When used together they accord with the NPPF requirements by supporting a flexible approach to development proposals according to local circumstances.

3.0.   Structure of this document

3.1.   The following principles outline OCC's approach to parking for all new development (and redevelopment) proposals and is to be used to inform the design process of a development site. This document is considered to be a 'live' document and will be reviewed alongside local and national policy as appropriate. It is anticipated that reviews of this document will take place every 12 months.

4.0.   Principles of this document

4.1.   The general content of this document should be read in conjunction with:

- LTCP adopted July 2022.
- OCC's Street Design Guide adopted September 2021.
- Oxfordshire's Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy adopted March 2021.
- Manual for Streets' (MfS) published 2007 by the Department of Transport Communities and Government.
- Manual for Streets 2' (MfS2) published in 2010 by the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation.
- Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design; and
- Car Parking: What Works Where.

4.2. This document is not intended to favour the private car as the main mode of transport but emphasises the need to control and design parking levels for new developments at a reduced level without increasing the risk of indiscriminate parking. The amount of car parking available must be enough to avoid any adverse effects to highway safety by not providing a sufficient level. Parking provisions for new developments are required to provide a sufficient level (unless car-free) to accommodate the parking demand of a site, while also utilising and encouraging the potential for sustainable and active travel by other modes of transport.

4.3. In revising the car parking standards, car ownership levels across Oxfordshire (excluding Oxford City) have been reviewed using the 2011 Census data. This review has confirmed that on average the car / van ownership per household is 1.5. This data has been used in determining the car parking standards shown in Tables 3, 4(a) and 4(b).

4.4. If car parking is expected to take place on existing streets, then it must be demonstrated there is adequate capacity on-street through a robust parking capacity survey (paragraphs 9.1. to 9.7.) while also proving there will be no highway safety implications from such a proposal.

4.5. Parking demand in residential developments are to be determined by taking into consideration the following factors:

a) *A site's location.*
b) *Dwelling size (rooms) and tenure.*
c) *Parking provision (allocated or unallocated); and*
d) *Parking controls / enforcement.*

4.6. The calculation of expected levels of parking demand is to be based on local or comparable data taking into consideration forecast changes in demand for the local plan period. Tables 2, 3, 4(a) and 4(b) provide residential car parking provisions to be used to calculate the parking demand for a new development proposal.

4.7. Determining the parking demand for non-residential developments within Oxfordshire has been revised to accord with the council's objective to reduce 25% of car trips by 2030, and a further 33% by 2040. The approach being taken for such development proposals is that if on-site parking is restricted / reduced at a destination location this will influence people's travel behaviour and encourage alternative active travel modes to be used rather than that of the private car.

4.8. Each non-residential development will continue to be assessed on its merits and in accordance with OCC's new *Decide and Provide* approach to development. Each development proposal will be assessed on its location, land-use; the trip rate associated with the development and the employees / visitors of the site, access to local facilities and public transport services. Such development proposals are encouraged to provide an operational need only provision of car parking as a starting point.

Where this may not be practical for the operation of the site, a robust evidence-based justification must be made for the parking levels provided in Table 5 to be considered.

4.9. Due to the diverse nature of development that is promoted in Oxfordshire, OCC welcomes innovative ways to provide parking solutions. While this is the case all stakeholders involved in designing a development must be mindful of the parking principles identified in this document and guidance provided in OCC's Street Design Guide.

Design Considerations

4.10. Parking design is an important factor when preparing a master plan for a development proposal as it ensures an appropriate number of spaces are provided without detracting from the character of a place to live or work in. Developers are expected to provide a balanced, mixed, and flexible parking provision, while ensuring that all spaces are useable without creating highway safety issues, such as vehicles overhanging footways and cycle routes and requiring cyclists to travel in the 'door zone'. Such designs are required to reflect the guidance within the documents referenced in paragraph 4.1.

4.11. To ensure that developments function safely and efficiently, the following parking design requirements are to be considered:

- Parking provisions are to be designed in accordance with local and national standards ensuring 'secure by design provisions' are observed.
- On-plot garages must be at least 6m into a plot to allow for a full car space whilst being able to open the garage door.
- Garages (and car ports) must have minimum internal dimensions of 6m in length and 3m in width. These dimensions are clear dimensions measured between any internal structure, such as piers.
- If garages are counted towards parking allocations. They must also have a planning condition which removes any permitted development rights to ensure continued use for that purpose.
- All houses (and flats / apartments) with on-plot / allocated parking should have an electrical vehicle charging point.
- Provide adequate visitor parking at new residential developments for people arriving by car and by cycle.
- High standard cycle storage facilities should be provided on-plot. This provision may vary subject to dwelling size and type. Such levels are to be provided to a minimum level as set out in Table 1 below.
- Cycling parking is to be provided in a convenient location close to building entrances and bus stop locations. Such provisions are to be covered, lit (where appropriate) and in the style of a Sheffield stand, which are individually installed permanently into the floor material (e.g. not toast-rack style stands bolted to the floor).
- Double decked or vertical cycle parking should not be used unless agreed by OCC in specific circumstances.

- The spacing of stands should be as per LTN 1/20. If raised on a kerb, dropped kerbs must be provided in suitable locations. Cycle parking should cater for non-standard cycles e.g. cargo bikes.

Table 1: OCC minimum levels of cycle provision required

Type	Dwelling Size	Cycle Parking Provision (per unit)
House	1 bedroom	2 spaces per bedroom
House	2 bedrooms	2 spaces per bedroom
House	3 bedrooms	2 spaces per bedroom
House	4+ bedrooms	2 spaces per bedroom
House	Multiple Occupation	1 space per bedroom
Flats		2 spaces per bedroom
Visitor	1 space per Flat	

- *Motorcycle parking – provisions should be consistent with 'MfS'.*
- *Bin storage must be designed away from cycle and car parking facilities to ensure access is not obstructed.*

Car Free Developments

4.12. Car-Free development means that no car parking spaces are provided within the site other than those reserved for disabled people, car clubs or operational uses. The concept of car free developments is fully supported by OCC where any such development proposal satisfies the following criteria:

   a) The proposed site is located within a city / town with (or will be provided with) parking restrictions imposed within its vicinity.
   b) The site has access (or will be provided with) excellent connections to pedestrian & cycle infrastructure and should be within 400m direct walking distance of frequent (15 – 20 minute) public transport services.
   c) The site is to be located within 800m walking distance to a range of local amenities and services.
   d) Consideration is to be given to parking provisions for people with impaired mobility.

4.13. For developments that wish to promote a car free approach or one with reduced on-site parking provisions, OCC will require such sites to incorporate a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) into a site's master plan where a CPZ does not already exist. Such development proposals will be required to provide the necessary infrastructure to bring forward such a scheme and the associated costs i.e. Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). These CPZ requirements will be included as part of any legal agreement associated with an appropriate planning permission and when the CPZ is needed to be operational.

4.14. It should be noted that the delivery of a CPZ on existing public highway infrastructure is subject to a separate public consultation process outside the planning process of a site, which a developer must consider carefully before a site is promoted.

Car Clubs

4.15. Promoting a site wide car club is an innovative concept OCC encourages. Car clubs can be provided on-site, and alongside other initiatives, to reduce car ownership levels and parking levels.

4.16. Developers are expected to work with OCC and the local planning authority to bring forward such parking solutions into areas of public realms as part of a master planning process. This may involve dedicated on-street car parking spaces being allocated on the carriageway or being provided within local community facilities, such as local shopping centre, public car park, church, or leisure centre. Electrical vehicle charging infrastructure should be provided in such locations; subject to appropriate licences and maintenance agreements with OCC for such equipment being placed within the public highway.

Further advice on car clubs can be found via: local authority toolkit - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk).

Electrical Vehicle Charging Infrastructure

4.17. Policy EVI 8 of Oxfordshire's Electrical Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy (adopted March 2021 Oxfordshire Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy) and Policy 29 of the adopted LTCP requires the provision of electrical charging points at homes, workplaces, and key destinations.

4.18. For all residential developments, active (live) on-plot charging points for electric vehicles and e-bicycles are to be provided. Off-plot residential car parking provisions i.e. a privately maintained parking area is to be provided with at least 25% (with a minimum of two) active charging points for all parking spaces. Such infrastructure is to be provided in accordance with the Autonomous and Electric Vehicles Act (2018), Building Regulations Document S, and the governments ambitions on 'Smart EV Charging'.

4.19. 'Active' charging points for electric vehicles for new non-residential development proposals are to be provided at a minimum level of 25% for all parking spaces with ducting provided at all remaining spaces to 'future proof' such spaces to be upgraded in the future.

Further advice on Oxfordshire's Electrical Vehicle Strategy is available via Electric vehicles | Oxfordshire County Council

Parking for People with Impaired Mobility

4.20. Consideration must be given in the design of a site for the provision and location of spaces for impaired mobility people (Blue Badge Holders). Generally, the spaces should be within the curtilage of the property and have level access to the main pedestrian access. At the least, these parking spaces must be within 50m of the dwelling entrance (Blue Badge Holder range).

4.21. Where developers are proposing to build flats with unallocated off-street parking and the level of mobility impaired residents is unknown then 6% of spaces should be designed and allocated for their use. This level of provision should also be considered for non-residential developments. Such provisions should also be located near to the main pedestrian access to the building and have level access. Reference should be made to Department for Transport's Inclusive Mobility standards.

4.22. A parking bay space should be marked with a British Standard Disabled Symbol to conform to Access to and use of buildings Approved Building Regulation Document M [Access to and use of buildings: Approved Document M - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](www.gov.uk).

4.23. All development proposals will be expected to promote inclusive cycling, provision for cycles for disabled people and other needs (such as tricycles, cargo bikes, tandems, mobility scooters and adapted bicycles). Such parking facilities are required to be provided in accordance with LTN 1/20 standards.

4.21. Buildings specifically for the elderly or mobility impaired people should comply with the relevant higher requirements and standards (as shown in OCC's Street Design Guide).

5.0. Residential Car Parking Standards for Oxford City

5.1. Oxford City has lower car parking standards than the rest of the county as it has lower rates of car ownership and generally has very good accessibility by non-car modes to a wide range of facilities and services. Even within the city there are differing degrees of access to local facilities and public transport with car ownership being lower in the city centre than the outer areas. Oxford City Council has its own transport and parking standards approaches to development, Policies M2, M3 and M5 of Oxford Local Plan 2036. The recently adopted Technical Advice Note 12, dated March 2022 [Planning Policy - Technical Advice Notes (TANs) | Planning Policy - Technical Advice Notes (TAN) | Oxford City Council](#)) also supports Policies M3: 'Motor Vehicle Parking' and M5: 'Bicycle Parking' of the adopted Oxford Local Plan 2036. As such the Oxford City Council parking standards have been incorporated into this document and will be implemented appropriately for new development sites proposed in Oxford City.

5.2. These standards are to be treated as maxima, reflecting excellent overall accessibility by non-car modes, and the need to use land efficiently. If a car free approach is not promoted by a development site then shared off-plot parking, combined with on-plot parking will be encouraged where appropriate.

5.3. Development proposals which are considered to have over generous car parking will not be accepted. Equally, proposals with significantly reduced parking may be assessed as unacceptable if this will result in unacceptable parking pressure on existing streets, which cannot be reasonably mitigated. In such circumstances a developer must robustly demonstrate that there is an acceptable level of parking provision provided with no adverse impact to highway safety from indiscriminate parking.

Table 2: Oxford City Council Technical Advice Note 12 - Parking Standards for car-permitted development

Development Type	Parking Provision
Any dwelling	1 space per dwelling to be provided within the development site.
Houses in Multiple Occupation	Parking Standards to be decided by case by case on their merit
Wheelchair accessible or adaptable houses and flats.	1 space per dwelling to be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling (must be designed in accordance with Part M of Building Regulations)
Retirement Homes	1 space per 2 residents' rooms
Sheltered/extra care homes	1 space per 2 residents' rooms plus 1 space per 2 staff
Nursing Homes	1 space per 3 resident's rooms plus 1 space per 2 staff
Student accommodation	0 spaces per resident room. Operational parking and disabled parking to be considered on a case-by-case basis in accordance with Policy H8
Motorcycle and powered two-wheeler parking	1 space per five dwellings.

6.0. Residential Car Parking Standards for Edge of Oxford City sites

6.1. There are several Local Plan development sites allocated around the edge of Oxford City to support Oxford's unmet housing needs. Master planning these developments and understanding the local facilities, services, pedestrian, cycle connectivity and public transport provisions that will be available to these sites is key to setting the on-site parking provisions for these development sites. As these sites progress a design approach focused on promoting active and sustainable transport planning initiatives will be required, to support OCC's target, to reduce car trips by 2040. With consideration to Oxford City's parking

standards and to accord with the 'National Policy Context' of setting parking standards, Table 3 is provided to support the progress of these sites and any future speculative housing proposals located around the edge of the city's boundary.

6.2. For phases of a development that will be located within 400m of frequent (15 to 30 minute) public transport services with direct pedestrian and cycle connections, and within 800m walking distance to a range of local amenities and services, a car free approach is required, or a reduced level of on-plot car parking will be accepted to Oxford City standards; subject to a robust justification. Such approaches must be supported by an approved site wide master plan, a robust travel plan (including a fixed monitoring period), high quality pedestrian and cycle infrastructure provided early in the life of the development site, including sufficient and convenient residential and visitor cycle parking to influence travel behaviour away from using the private car. The introduction and implementation of a CPZ, funded by the promoter of the site will also be required.

Table 3: Edge of Oxford City Sites Car Parking Standards

Development Type	Parking Provision
1-2 bedroom dwellings	Up to 1 space per dwelling to be provided within the development site.
3-bedroom dwelling	Up to 2 spaces per dwelling to be provided within the development site
4+ bedroom dwelling	Up to 2 spaces per dwelling to be provided within the development site.
Wheelchair accessible or adaptable houses and flats.	1 space per dwelling to be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling (must be designed in accordance with Part M of Building Regulations)
Student accommodation	0 spaces per resident room. Operational parking and disabled parking to be considered on a case-by-case.
Motorcycle and powered two-wheeler parking	1 space per five dwellings.

6.3. Flats and apartments will generally be treated as standard dwellings. However, when using land efficiently to provide residential dwellings, the parking arrangement for flats / apartments tend to be designed within a parking court / communal style arrangement. In such cases it is strongly recommended that they are controlled by a third-party organisation i.e. a management company on behalf of those who will use the spaces. This approach allows flexibility in specific spaces being allocated to a property, assigning them to a particular group or promoting such spaces as unallocated in appropriate locations.

7.0. Residential Car Parking Standards for all areas of Oxfordshire (other than Oxford City and Edge of City sites)

7.1. The car parking standards for all other areas of Oxfordshire are set out in Tables 4(a) and 4(b) below. These standards have been revised from the 2011 and 2015 provisions to ensure their inclusion in development proposals is simpler to incorporate. Car-free developments or reduced on-plot car parking proposals will be considered by officers if specific requirements are provided as part of a site wide master plan.

7.2. For developments that will be located within towns that are able to access frequent (15 - 30 minute) public transport services and have direct pedestrian & cycle connections to amenities and services a car free approach or a reduced level of on-plot car parking will be considered. Such parking reductions must be supported by a robust transport submission with appropriate mitigation measures, that may include the introduction and implementation of a CPZ, funded by the promoter of the site.

Table 4(a): Town Car Parking Standards for Oxfordshire

Towns	Parking Provision
1–2-bedroom dwellings	Up to 1 space per dwelling to be provided within the development site.
3+ bedroom dwellings	Up to 2 spaces per dwelling to be provided within the development site
Wheelchair accessible or adaptable houses and flats.	1 space per dwelling to be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling (must be designed in accordance with Part M of Building Regulations)
Student accommodation	0 spaces per resident room. Operational parking and disabled parking to be considered on a case-by-case.
Motorcycle and powered two-wheeler parking	1 space per five dwellings.

7.3. It is recognised that for development proposals that are located in rural areas of Oxfordshire, such as villages and hamlets, access to frequent public transport services and high standards of direct pedestrian and cycle connections is not always available (unless it is provided by a new development). This tends to mean that the range of facilities and services expected to accommodate a reduced level of car parking provision is not always possible without causing indiscriminate carriageway parking and highway safety issues. On this basis, the parking standards in Table 4(b) are appropriate to use. When such standards are used a justification will be required within a transport submission.

Table 4(b): Car Parking Standards for the rest of Oxfordshire (Villages & Hamlets)

Rural Oxfordshire	Parking Provision
1-bedroom dwelling	Up to 1 space per dwelling to be provided within the development site.
2-bedroom dwelling	Up to 2 spaces per dwelling to be provided within the development site
3 – 4-bedroom dwellings	Up to 2 spaces per dwelling to be provided within the development site
5+ bedroom dwelling	Up to 3 spaces per dwelling to be provided within the development site.

7.4.   Flats and apartments will be treated as a standard dwelling for sites in located towns and the rest of Oxfordshire. However, when using land efficiently to provide residential dwellings, the parking arrangement for flats / apartments tend to be designed within a parking court / communal style arrangement. In such cases it is strongly recommended that they are controlled by a third-party organisation i.e. a management company on behalf of those who will use the spaces. This approach allows flexibility in specific spaces being allocated to a property, assigning them to a particular group or promoting such spaces as unallocated in appropriate locations.

Houses of Multiple Occupations (HMO)

7.5.   HMOs are a type of development infilling which is becoming increasing more popular for sites within or on the outskirts of Oxford City and towns in Oxfordshire. Such proposals tend to give rise to an increase in parking unless appropriate parking provision is provided. The parking provisions for HMO proposals that are located within Oxford City will be assessed on their merits. For HMO sites outside the city, where indiscriminate on-street parking is likely to occur, will be required to provide a provision of 0.5 on-plot space(s) per bedroom. Such parking arrangements must be designed for practical use, accessible and be free from on-site obstructions. In addition, OCC will require the local planning authority to impose a planning condition limiting 1 occupant per room to assist in managing the parking requirement of an HMO proposal.

7.6.   Transport submissions for HMO proposals must justify the parking provisions to be provided if these are not in accordance with the standards quoted in this document. If an HMO is proposed within an area that is known to have car parking stress and is either not providing any on-plot car parking (car free) or not to a suitable level, robust evidence must be provided to justify why such a proposal will not cause indiscriminate on-street parking and any associated highway safety issues. All such development proposals will be assessed on their merits.

Visitor Car Parking Standards

7.7. Developers are expected to take an approach that is consistent with national research which suggests, *"that no special provision should be made for visitors where at least half of the parking provision associated with the development is unallocated. In other circumstances it may be appropriate to allow for additional demand for visitor parking of 0.2 spaces per dwelling"* (DCL, 2007, Residential Car Parking Research).

7.8. For some residential developments this approach may not necessary be feasible. If this is the case, a maximum visitor parking level of 1 car parking space per every 5 residential units will be considered. Any such proposal will require a justification to be provided as part of a transport submission.

7.9. If a development proposal is larger than 10 or more dwellings, visitor parking should be arranged in clusters and / or evenly spread throughout the site and relate to the development types in that area. In some circumstances for large / strategic housing sites that may include mobility / transport hubs being considered as part of a site wide masterplan. All such spaces are to be unallocated.

7.10. As part of a planning submission, an applicant will be required to provide a schedule of parking provision, detailing the number of allocated and, unallocated parking spaces, including those in garages, as well as details on carpools or other shared vehicles, and electrical charging facilities (both active and passive). Such planning submissions will be expected to explain how the proposed parking provision for the site meets the standards set out in this document and the needs of the development, including how these needs are expected to change in the future.

8.0. Non-residential Parking Standards for Oxfordshire

8.1. Commercial / employment development proposals (both new and redevelopment opportunities) are required to promote sustainable and active travel behaviour by encouraging employees to travel to their work destination by non-car modes and reduce the number of commuter / commercial car trips on the highway network. This approach is emphasised within OCC's adopted LTCP which supports sustainable travel measures and seeks to reduce the availability of car parking at such sites.

8.2. Since the publication of the previous OCC car parking standards, there has been a change in direction in government policy and more flexible working practices have been established. One of these changes was shifting the responsibility for determining parking standards to individual authorities and indicates that local circumstances should be taken in account when setting such standards, including accessibility of the site, the likely demand for parking, and the viability of the site.

8.3. Therefore, this section of the parking standards document has been specifically revised for commercial / employment development proposals by reducing on-site car parking provisions by 50% to accord with the County Council's objective to reduce car trips by 25% by 2030 and by a further 33% by 2040. As such developers must undertake a site-specific assessment (as described in paragraph 8.7) and seek to balance its operational needs, space requirements, efficient use of land and costs attributed to providing parking, whilst also demonstrating that efforts to reduce car and commercial vehicle trips have been appropriately explored.

8.4. Car parking that is over provided for will not be accepted. For car parking where daily usage is shown to be lower than previously assessed from site-wide monitoring, development sites will be encouraged to repurpose such areas. Repurposing may include conversion of areas for active travel measures or benefit the local community and employees through landscaped / biodiversity improvements.

8.5. For all non-residential development proposals located within Oxford City and town centres in Oxfordshire, the delivery of a car free site is required unless an evidence-based justification is provided as part of a robust transport submission. Such provisions must accord with the criteria as identified in the 'Design Considerations' section of this guidance document.

8.6. Table 5 sets out OCC's non-residential standards on vehicular and cycle parking requirements by land-use class as set out in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended up to 2021. This table sets out the expected **upper limit** of car parking provision that may be acceptable once the steps detailed in paragraph 8.7 have been undertaken to establish the appropriate quantum as related to the development-specific criteria. However, should the assessment described in paragraph 8.7 identify a smaller quantum of provision, this will take precedence over the numbers identified in Table 5.

Table 5: Non-Residential Parking Guidance for Oxfordshire

Use Class	Vehicular Standards (see supporting text)	Minimum Cycle Standards
City / Town development proposals for all non-residential land uses.	Car Free / Operational use only with supporting evidence.	Standards below apply and are encouraged to be exceeded where practical.
B2 General Industrial.	1 space per 75sqm	1 space per 175sqm for staff and 1 space per 250sqm for visitors.
B8 Storage.	1 space per 300sqm	1 space per 250sqm for staff and 1 space per 500 sqm for visitors.
C1 Hotels.	1 space per bedroom	1 cycle space per 5 car-parking spaces provided.

Use Class	Vehicular Standards (see supporting text)	Minimum Cycle Standards
C2 Residential Care Homes.	Site specific assessment required based on travel plan and operational needs.	0.5 spaces per bedroom available to residents, visitors, and staff.
E Commercial, Business and Services - Shops and retail.	1 space per 30sqm	1 space per 50sqm for staff and 1 space per 50sqm for customers.
E Commercial, Business and Services – Financial and Professional Services.	1 space per 45sqm	1 space per 100sqm for staff and 1 space per 250sqm for visitors.
E Commercial, Business and Services – food and drink (mainly in premises) i.e. restaurants and cafes.	1 space per 10sqm of public floor area	1 space per 4 staff and 1 space per 25sqm for customers.
E Commercial, Business and Services – office, research and development and light industrial process.	1 space per 45sqm	1 space per 100sqm for staff and 1 space per 250sqm for visitors.
E Commercial, Business and Services – Non-residential institutions (medical or health services, creches, day nurseries and centres.	1 space per 4 medical staff, plus 1 space 4 non-medical staff. Plus 1 parking space per consulting, examination, treatment, therapy room & A&E cubicle.	1 space 50sqm or 1 per 30 seats capacity. Plus 1 space 5 per employees.
E Commercial, Business and Services – Assembly and Leisure (indoor sport, recreation or fitness, gyms).	1 space per 30sqm of public floor area	1 space 50 sqm or 1 per 30 seats capacity. Plus 1 space 5 per employees.
F.1 Non-residential institutions (education, at gallery, museum, public library, public exhibition hall, place of worship, law courts).	Site specific assessment required based on travel plan and operational needs.	Staff provision 1 space per 20 staff. Students; 1 space per 10 students.
F.2 Shop no larger than 280sqm (selling mostly essential foods and at least 1km from another similar shop); community hall, outdoor sport/recreation area, indoor or outdoor swimming pool, skating rink.	1 space per 30sqm of public floor area	1 space per 50sqm for staff and 1 space per 50sqm for customers.
Sui Generis, Public House, wine bar, drinking establishment.	1 space per 10sqm of public floor area	1 space 4 staff and 1 space per 25sqm for customers.
Sui Generis, Hot Food Takeaway.	1 space per 10sqm.	1 space 4 staff and 1 space per 25sqm for customers.
Sui Generis, Cinema, Concert Hall, Bingo Hall, Dance Hall, Live Music venue.	1 space per 30sqm.	1 space per 20sqm for staff plus visitor / customer cycle parking.

8.7. As set out in Table 5, the type of land use will determine the maximum amount of commercial / employment vehicle parking per development site. Should a reduction in parking provision be proposed, each application will be individually assessed on its merits, but must be based on the following criteria:

a) Trip rates (including base and forecast mode shares) associated with the development accounting for the vehicular trip rate reductions in accordance with the requirements set out in OCC's 'Implementing Decide & Provide: Requirements for Transport Assessments' document,

b) The policies in OCC's LTCP, notably the transport user hierarchy (Policy 1), which requires that development proposals give primacy to walking, cycling and public transport, and the LTCP targets to reduce dependence on the private car,

c) The specific user group of employees / visitors of the site (including shift patterns),

d) Location and risk of displaced parking.

8.8. The number of spaces for operational vehicles i.e. Light Goods Vehicles (LGV) and Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) may also be calculated using the same methodology above or compared to vehicle operating licences for similar buildings / operations.

8.9. While non-residential developments are expected to provide a minimum level of active charging points (25% of all vehicle parking spaces), in designing this type of infrastructure, there is a need to consider the likely parking behaviour i.e. expected duration of people's stays which may affect the number of 'active' spaces. In designing provisions for disabled users parking at non-residential developments, where the total number of parking spaces exceeds 200 spaces, consideration must be given to providing less than 6% of spaces for disabled parking to ensure there is not overprovision of spaces. Disabled cycle parking is to be provided in accordance with LTN 1/20.

8.10. The developer of a site proposal is responsible for ensuring high quality facilities are provided on site for the proposed use, including cycle parking, staff changing, washing and storage facilities.

8.11. Any planning submission must be supported with details of the site's operation once it is in use, whether the site stores vehicles not in use, the frequency of vehicles visiting the site for deliveries, or the type and size of vehicles using the site. The majority of such details would be expected to be provided as part of transport submission for a future planning application and accompanying Travel Plan Transport Development Control (TDC) | Oxfordshire County Council.

8.12. As part of any planning application submission, the staff and visitor ratio for each land use should be clearly identified as they are likely to be distinct to each land use class and may change over the life of the building, particularly if occupied by another business user. For example, land uses such as retail uses (E Commercial, Business and Services - shops) and health centres/leisure uses (E Commercial, Business and Services, Assembly and Leisure (indoor sport,

recreation or fitness, gyms, and hospitals (class C2)) will generally have two user groups accessing those types of developments, staff/employees, and customers/patients. Another example to consider, such as employment uses, (class B2-B8) will generally only be accessed by staff/employees with occasional visitors. In essence, each development proposal is assessed on its merits due to each land-use having its own unique characteristics.

8.13. In addition to the above, other characteristics of non-residential developments needs to be taken into consideration when determining parking arrangements, such as:

   a) The geographical location of the site and the levels of accessibility for non-car mode users.
   b) Survey (or business) data to determine the peak parking period and demand.
   c) Local on-street parking conditions; and
   d) Local data i.e. census travel to work data about mode share and supporting Travel Plan information.

9.0. Parking Capacity (Beat) Surveys

9.1. The information provided in this section of this document is to assist developers and their consultant team when assessing the parking implications of new development for a transport submission (Transport Assessment or Statement) to accompany a planning application. The guidance seeks to ensure that any parking capacity surveys undertaken are robust and that the information collected and presented is in a consistent and concise manner, providing a reliable source of data for decision making purposes.

9.2. Parking capacity surveys are required to satisfy the criteria outlined in this guidance and should be agreed with OCC as part of a scoping exercise for a transport submission. Such surveys should only be undertaken when it is reasonably expected that parking will take place on existing streets and should follow calculation of the expected levels of vehicle ownership and consider how this parking can be provided. Any surveys undertaken will be expected to be presented in the form of a summary report as part of a wider transport submission.

9.3. The survey area is expected to centre on the development site and extend 200 metres (not as the crow flies) for residential uses and 500 metres for commercial uses and is to extend where a 200-metre route is close to joining another and include areas that are most likely to be used for parking by those living in, or visiting the site and will, therefore, need to consider site access arrangements.

9.4. These parking surveys are to be undertaken when usage / demand of available parking is at highest i.e. peak times in the agreed survey area. Where commercial parking is considered, a number of surveys should be undertaken during the operational times for the proposed use, while residential parking demand is to be undertaken when the majority of residents would be expected

to be at home i.e. 00:30-05:30. A development that is expected to have large impact on on-street parking in an area where demand is high, may be required to undertake an extensive survey throughout the day.

9.5.   A parking capacity survey is generally undertaken as a beat survey (also known as Lambeth Methodology survey) where an enumerator walks an agreed route at regular intervals recording the registration details of parked vehicles. The information expected to be collected should include the following:

   a) The rate of turnover of vehicles on each street expressed as a number of vehicles leaving / arriving per hour.
   b) The number of vehicles parking on each street; and
   c) An estimate of the parking capacity of each street and an explanation of how this is calculated.

9.6.   If the development site is located within a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), the summary report to be provided should also include the details of the existing resident permit take-up or any waiting lists. The summary report should also be accompanied with a map of the area surveyed, details of the date and times when a survey was undertaken, and any parking restrictions imposed in the survey area.

9.7.   When the results of a parking survey are being prepared, a summary report of the capacity surveys is to be provided and should be accompanied by:

   a) A suitable scaled map displaying the geographical area that has been surveyed.
   b) Details of the dates and times of day the survey(s) took place.
   c) The details of any parking restrictions imposed within the study area; and
   d) Confirmation that the study area has been agreed with OCC officers before any survey(s) have been undertaken.

10.0 Reference Documents

- Oxfordshire County Council Strategic Plan 2022 – 2025 [Strategic Plan 2022-2025 (oxfordshire.gov.uk)](#).
- Local Transport and Connectivity Plan (adopted July 2022) [Connecting Oxfordshire | Oxfordshire County Council](#).
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) dated July 2021 [National Planning Policy Framework (publishing.service.gov.uk)](#).
- Oxfordshire County Council Street Design Guide [Street Design Guide (oxfordshire.gov.uk)](#).
- Oxfordshire's Electrical Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy (Adopted March 2021) [Oxfordshire Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy](#).
- Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards 2017 [cyclingstandards (oxfordshire.gov.uk)](#).
- Transport for New Developments Parking Standards for New Residential Developments dated December 2011.
- Manual for Streets published 2007 by the Department of Transport Communities and Government.
- Manual for Streets 2 published in 2010 by the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation.
- Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design [Cycle infrastructure design (LTN 1/20) - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk)](#).
- Oxford City Technical Advice Note 12, dated March 2022 [Planning Policy - Technical Advice Notes (TANs) | Planning Policy - Technical Advice Notes (TAN) | Oxford City Council](#)).
- West Sussex County Council Guidance in Parking at New Developments (September 2020) [Guidance on Parking at New Developments (westsussex.gov.uk)](#).
- Surrey County Council Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (January 2018) [Parking Guidance for Development January 2018 (woking.gov.uk)](#)
- Buckinghamshire County Council, Buckinghamshire Countywide Parking Guidance (September 2015) [parking-guidance-september-2015-2.pdf (buckscc.gov.uk)](#).
- Office of National Statistics [Home - Office for National Statistics (ons.gov.uk)](#).
- BREAM UK New Construction [BREEAM non-domestic manual - Cover (bregroup.com)](#)
- Building Regulations 2010: Approved Document S: Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles [Approved Document S: Infrastructure for the charging of electric vehicles (publishing.service.gov.uk)](#).