

Annex 5 – Online consultation Results

Results of questionnaire responses

Q1. In your view, the Design Guide will contribute to the creation of attractive streets		
Response Option	No. of responses	Percentage
Agree	15	33%
Disagree	15	33%
Don't Know	10	22%
Comments	5	11%
Total Responses	45	

Q2. The Design Guide will encourage new developments to reduce emissions, enhance air quality and support the transition to a low carbon economy		
Response Option	No. of responses	Percentage
Agree	16	36%
Disagree	17	38%
Don't Know	7	16%
Comments	5	11%
Total Responses	45	

Q3. The guidance encourages provision of sustainable transport for people with differing abilities		
Response Option	No. of responses	Percentage
Agree	15	33%
Disagree	19	42%
Don't Know	7	16%
Comments	4	9%
Total Responses	45	

Q4. The Design Guide allows for design freedom and innovation, whilst setting clear guiding principles		
Response Option	No. of responses	Percentage
Agree	17	38%
Disagree	20	44%
Don't Know	4	9%
Comments	4	9%
Total Responses	45	

Summary of comments

Summary of comments to online consultation	How has the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide been amended to address this issue?
The Guide needs to clarify what it <i>doesn't</i> include	Edited to ensure that it is clear that the design guide is for design of streets in new developments only.
Needs some clarification regarding <i>guidance</i> and <i>standards</i> , and how the guidance can be <i>enforced</i>	The design guide will become an adopted document and new developments will need to conform with its requirements. Officers will refer to this guidance when assessing planning applications for new developments.
Needs more decisive language	The document has been edited to ensure that we use more decisive language to make it clear what we are seeking from new developments.
More priority for pedestrians, cyclists and the less able	The user hierarchy has been made clearer with a new section which follows the user hierarchy set out in Manual for Streets (DfT, 2007) with priority given to pedestrians and cyclists. The design guide is also in line with Inclusive Mobility (DfT, 2005) and therefore ensures that design incorporates requirements of the less able.
More regarding <i>connectivity</i> to existing places	To be included in final draft.
Too <i>car-orientated</i>	The project team does not agree with this view, however amendments have been made to the document that we seek priority for pedestrians and cyclists with all street design.
Needs to make more commitment to <i>Manual for Streets</i> and <i>LTN 1/20</i>	Makes relevant references to both Manual for Streets and LTN 1/20 and is clear that the design guide should be used in conjunction with these documents.

Online Questionnaires Responses in Full

Question 1. In your view, the Design Guide will contribute to the creation of attractive streets.		Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Summary of Comments	Officer Response	
Not without power to refuse planning permission	We feel the design guide, along with other standards do give us sufficient weight to recommend refusal of planning application	N
Planted trees need to be mature	Street Trees Guidance written by Arboriculture team	N
Create green corridors for wildlife with evergreen shrubbery Edible planting important e.g. apple and nut trees, rosemary bushes	Not covered in this guide, would need District Councils to advice on this subject	N
Ample, invisible parking	Parking numbers will be set out in separate parking standards document	N
Legal obligations on developers needed Will be ignored by developers who will not benefit from creating attractive streets	We feel this guide will help push developers to create healthy streets, legal obligations may also be required.	N
Need to consult Environmental Psychologists	Not considered appropriate for this guide	N
Poor presentation and communication undermines message	The presentation of the document has been re-visited.	Y
Masterplans "must" (not "should") promote walking, cycling and public transport...	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
Not radical enough to achieve stated aims	Guide is in line with national guidance and gives realistic options to achieve aims	N
Do more to prioritise use of streets by cyclists and pedestrians, minimise emissions and car use.	We have revisited guide to promote LTN1/20 for this reason	Y

Fails to use current best practice and falls below standards required to support walking, cycling and high-quality design.	Guide is in line with national policy and improves upon previous local standards	N
Does not reduce space for motorised vehicles enough.	Guide prioritises walking and cycling infrastructure	Y
Still car-centric, need to emphasise active travel. No indication active travel will be improved in existing areas.	Guide prioritises walking and cycling infrastructure. It follows the user hierarchy set out in <i>Manual for Streets</i> .	Y
Segregated lanes for cyclists.	Segregated cycle lanes will be used when appropriate in line with LTN 1/20	N
Emphasis on fewer cars and fewer parking places. Facilities for car clubs.	All are supported within the guide	N
Full of "cut and paste" waffle.	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
Does not join up with Manual for Streets and OCC's policies on LTNs and Active Travel.	This has been revisited to ensure guide is in line with policies mentioned	Y
Car-centric, not focussed on needs of all other street users.	The language within the guide has been reassessed to ensure priority for sustainable travel has been made clearer.	Y
No reference how it joins up to disparate needs of District Councils.	This is covered sufficiently within guide	N
Does not address connectivity between existing and new residential areas or reduce the use of cars.	The revision of the guide addresses this point.	Y
Streets should not be dominated by traffic to be "attractive". Should feel safe for peds, cyclists and the disabled.	User hierarchy added to further promote sustainable travel for all	Y
Layout should inherently discourage car use, and encourage active, sustainable modes.	Guide has been revisited to further promoted active travel	Y

The example Masterplan has a street layout that would discourage walking and cycling. Not in line with Manual for Streets which offers conceptual layouts the Guide does not adopt.	Demo Masterplan now removed	Y
Language is weak, e.g. "should refer to" cycling design standards. Instead should state designs will be rejected if they do not comply.	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
Aspirational but no enforceable standards.	Guide will be adopted so will have some weight in planning decisions.	N
Car use and dependency central to the document e.g. two car parks shown next to a school in the plan.	Guide revisited to promote active travel	Y
Language is too vague and non-committal.	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
Potential conflicts with MfS and LTN 1/20, both of which are more ambitious and detailed. Should be made clear that MfS is the leading document and the guide is for local clarification only.	This has been revisited to ensure guide is in line with policies mentioned	Y
No directive to apply the recommended design.	Guide will be adopted so will have some weight in planning decisions.	N
Many aspirational features are a little dated.	The features throughout have been checked against the latest guidance available	N
Little guidance for updating existing streets.	The guide is for new developments but can be used on existing streets alongside other policy documents	N
Fundamentally fails to meet criteria in Manual for Streets and OCC Active Travel and LTNs.	This guide is in line with policies mentioned	N
Cycleways not always perceived by other users, so better if cyclists can afford the primary route.	Cycle guidance in guide now in line with LTN 1/20	Y

Footways wider than 2m desirable in some places, e.g. near schools etc.	This would be looked at on a case-by-case basis at the time of a planning application	N
Where higher flows, reversing on to primary route should be discouraged.	This will be looked at but difficult to enforce in practice	N
If followed, will lead to more attractive streets, but not certain it will actually make a difference.	Guide will be adopted so will have some weight in planning decisions.	N
Needs to follow hierarchy of peds, cycles, public transport then vehicles. Too car-orientated.	A user hierarchy has been added in line with Manual for Streets	Y
A high-quality street needs a balance between place, movement, legibility, adaptability, resilience and safety.	Agreed, the guide covers these points.	N
Very limited in scope, needs more emphasis on context and function.	Functionality has been covered throughout and is an important element of streets, not sure what is meant by context	N
Too much about process and not enough about the technical issues that must be overcome.	We purposely did not make the language too technical so it could be understood by a range of different users. The process is often mis-understood and was a key part of the document from an early stage.	N

<p>Partly agree - We agree that the Design Guide is helpful in setting out some guidance on what developers and urban designers should not do. However, we consider that significant amendments are required. The document attempts to cover areas of design related to streets but does not achieve this in a way which would clearly assist developers, applicants or officers successfully, and it may be contradictory to best practice. The language used throughout , excluding a few technical sections referring to specific standards, is in some cases ambiguous, unclear or contradictory.</p> <p>The guide should also do more to highlight which document takes precedence where there is a conflict with local guidance - presumably this should be the local Design Guide as it is the local guide that will consider the character of the area?</p>	<p>The language throughout the document has been amended to make the requirements clearer. We have made further reference to other policies including more of an emphasis on Manual for Streets and LTN 1/20. Agree that the District Council Design Guide will carry greater weight, this is clear within our document.</p>	<p>Y</p>
---	--	----------

Question 2. The Design Guide will encourage new developments to reduce emissions, enhance air quality and support the transition to a low carbon economy		Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Summary of Comments	Officer Response	
Road layout should discourage rat-runs for cars between major roads	We have included further information on modal filters within the guide	Y
Should promote reduced parking and set maximum parking requirement.	This will be covered by a separate Parking Standards document.	N
Switch to electric cars will not fix CO2 emissions or wider issues.	Whilst we include design for electric cars, the emphasis is on promoting active travel.	N
Charging points must not block pedestrian and cycle access.	This has been looked at and amended where necessary.	Y
Frideswide Square (and Poynton Junction) are poor examples as contain no cycling provision. Some aspects make cycling more dangerous.	Frideswide Square is included as an example of reallocating street space, giving more space to pedestrians whilst also allowing the free movement of vehicles.	N
Will achieve this if it can be enforced. Without legal backup, encouragement is not enough.	This guide will be adopted so will have weight.	N
Will achieve the aims if it leads to decisions being carried out.	Guide will be adopted so will have some weight in planning decisions	N
Active and Sustainable travel must be prioritised, not just promoted.	Agree, this has been made clearer in the guide	Y
Ease of Movement statement altered to prioritise sustainable transport and physical activity i.e. continuous footpaths and narrowed junctions.	This has been looked at further and improved.	Y

Good introduction to High Quality Streets but fails to use this approach.	Comment needs to be more specific	N
Maps do not depict public realm or show true permeability for active travel, instead walking and cycling routes are alongside car infrastructure.	Modal filters and Local Traffic Neighbourhoods have been introduced in the latest draft.	Y
Wrong to expect car ownership to reduce - will stay the same or increase. Have to provide for this.	Not in line with national and local trends or policy.	N
Achieving these aims requires a reduction in car use.	This is one of the key aims of the guide.	N
Focusses in making car use and parking "prettier".	Comment needs to be more specific	N
Road provision for bikes is minimal.	Further provision has been included whilst also adding further links to LTN 1/20	Y
Do more to prioritise use of streets by cyclists and pedestrians, minimise emissions and car use.	Guide prioritises walking and cycling infrastructure. It follows the user hierarchy set out in <i>Manual for Streets</i> .	Y
Is substandard; won't achieve high standards, best practice, improvements to air quality, provision for walking and cycling	The guide is in line with current standards and policy.	N
Only if accompanied by strict emissions controls.	Outside the remit of this guide	N
Emphasis on the car means that it will not achieve these aims.	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision.	Y
Completely car-centric. Does not link up with OCC policies or Manual for Streets.	This has been revisited to ensure guide is in line with policies mentioned	Y
Little about Active Travel connectivity to surrounding areas. Should require, as a condition, that Active Travel Network Planning is undertaken with LHA, as stated in Govt. Cycling and Walking Strategy.	Current revision discusses the need to look at routes comprehensively.	Y

Does not discourage car use or encourage walking and cycling enough.	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision.	Y
Language is weak, guidelines can be ignored, must be standards to achieve safe streets.	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
Could be linked to housing density - higher standards for walkers and cyclists in denser developments.	This is reflected in LTN 1/20 which the guide supports.	N
Car sharing should be promoted.	Car sharing is supported	N
No approval unless walking and cycling paths to key facilities.	This occurs through the planning process	N
Continued norms of car-based activity, only 'encouraging' or 'promoting' cycling.	The language throughout the document has been amended to make our commitment to sustainable travel clearer.	Y
Much consideration to accommodating parking but little to address the need for car use. Will do nothing to reduce car dependency and reduce emissions.	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision.	Y
Remains focussed on motor vehicles. Needs to be more prescriptive.	Revisited to further promote active travel above car use but car use has to be catered for and design for currently.	Y
Does not adopt best practices and policies. No evidence that it will achieve these aims.	This has been looked at and amended where necessary.	Y
Off-street private parking will facilitate EV charging.	EV section has been amended	Y
Agreed planning restrictions must prevent conversion of garages.	Not within the remit of the design guide	N
Where peds cross a cycleway away from a junction, tactile paving must not be L-shaped (illustration is incorrect p.23).	This has been corrected in the current version.	Y
Must be sufficient space for people waiting at bus stops (incl. mobility scooters etc.)	this will be taken into account during design	N

Main thrust is hierarchy of roads and how to park all the cars.	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision.	Y
Does not address route design for peds and cyclists.	Comment needs to be more specific	N
Secure cycle storage is noted, but more crucial for expensive e-bikes.	This is being added to guide	Y
EV charging that does not obstruct or clutter streets.	EV section has been amended	Y
Too weak to deliver these aims.	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
Aims are wrong, should be "zero" not "low" carbon.	The current revision refers to zero carbon.	Y
Landscaping considerations may override integration of new development and sustainable travel.	Balance is sought between landscaping and movement	N
Partly agree. We consider that the sections on additional landscaping, street trees, SUDS etc. and provision for electric cars will help support this. However, we would like to see more information provided on how to deliver these within schemes.	A balance needs to be struck between provision of guidance without being too prescriptive to allow discussions to take place between officers and developers. The solution for each site is in many cases unique.	N

Question 3. The guidance encourages provision of sustainable transport for people with differing abilities.		
Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Cyclists likely to be "doored" if bike lanes not separated from car parking.	Use of cycle lanes has been discussed with our cycling officer and is in line with LTN1/20. A buffer of 0.5m is afforded between cycle lane and car parking.	N
No provision for cargo bike parking.	This has now been added.	Y
More should be done.	Comment needs to be more specific.	N
Segregated cycle routes wherever possible. Dropped kerb/stepped cycle lanes where not possible (e.g. crossovers)	The use of cycle routes will be determined in line with LTN 1/20	N
Not just buses; trains, trams and smaller buses too.	Trams are not planned in Oxfordshire within the LTCP and although the increased use of trains is supported, these do not typically impact on streets, hence they are not mentioned within the design guide.	N
Upstairs on double-deckers not suitable for older people.	This is noted; however, double decker buses are considered appropriate for busier routes to carry a larger number of passengers. Most buses provide priority seating for elderly and mobility impaired users on the lower level of the bus.	N
Ideally all cycle tracks separate from the road. Roundabouts should be "Dutch" style with provision for cycle tracks.	The use of cycle routes will be determined in line with LTN 1/20	N

Pavement widths are too narrow.	This is in line with MfS and Inclusive Mobility and is generally considered a minimum.	N
2m insufficient for mobility scooters, wheelchairs and other mobility aids. Also social distancing.	This is in line with MfS and Inclusive Mobility and is generally considered a minimum. MfS shows the widths of different users.	N
Pavements should be level (disability-friendly), not sloping for driveways.	This would not enable cars to access driveway so has not been carried forward.	N
Preference for driving over walking and cycling, unnecessarily wide carriageways.	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision	Y
Yes, but other important elements not mentioned: - Need to adopt LTN 1/20 and be explicit about that. - Not enough mention of public transport. - Consideration of micro-mobility e.g. e-bikes, cargo bikes, e-scooters, not just regular cycles.	This has been revisited to ensure guide is in line with policies mentioned. Further information added for micro-mobility.	Y
Primary Streets section has no consideration for wheelchair users or other adapted transport. Dropped kerbs difficult for most vulnerable users.	The guide is in line with Inclusive Mobility	N
Principle on Movement and Access should include children.	Agreed and the design guide considers different users	N
Recommend reference to Urban95, 8-80 Cities and Living Streets.	Not considered appropriate	N
Much is about car traffic and parking. Nothing about transport for people with physical or mental disabilities.	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision	Y
Do more to prioritise use of streets by cyclists and pedestrians, minimise emissions and car use.	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision	Y

Substandard and misses a major opportunity.	Comment needs to be more specific	N
User groups should have been consulted before.	Several workshops with different stakeholder groups were held and this consultation sought to engage stakeholders.	N
Emphasis on the car does not indicate provision of sustainable transport for people with differing abilities. Token support, nothing meaningful.	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision	Y
No reference to other authorities that are doing it well. No reference to research.	The guide refers to District Council guidance and national guidance	N
Does not set out what good design principles are.	This is covered on pages 14 and 15	N
Weak language will not ensure good practice is followed.	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
No standards, and the discussed provision is insufficient. e-bikes, scooters and cars difficult for deaf people. Where are the Dutch principles?	The document will be an adopted guide, therefore will have weight in planning decisions. The guide has been written in line with Inclusive Mobility considering the needs of users with varying abilities. The guide has been brought in line with current national guidance and standards.	Y
'encouraged' mirrors the weak and aspirational tone.	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
Substandard provision for all people.	The guide has been written in line with Inclusive Mobility considering the needs of users with varying abilities.	N
Woolly, doesn't deal with interconnected communities very well.	Current revision discusses the need to look at routes comprehensively.	Y
Does not adopt established best practice.	Guide is in line with current national guidance and standards.	N

No evidence it will encourage provision of sustainable transport for differing abilities.	The guide has been written in line with Inclusive Mobility considering the needs of users with varying abilities	N
Designers should consult with a member of the National Register of Access Consultants.	Not considered relevant.	N
D&AS should include inclusion issues and decisions.	This document does not cover the content of DAS.	N
Site levelled and ramps/steps avoided if possible.	Agree, however, this is not always possible.	N
Parking for disabled persons assessed and enforced.	This will be set out in parking standards document.	N
People with visual impairment must be considered for all streets, especially shared surfaces.	The guide has been written in line with Inclusive Mobility considering the needs of users with varying abilities	N
Approach is hierarchy of roads, not movement of peds and cyclists.	User hierarchy has been added prioritising pedestrians and cyclists.	Y
No discussion on access to school by walking or cycling, only car access.	School section has been updated to reflect the need to prioritise walking and cycling.	Y
Insufficient emphasis on public transport for people of all abilities.	We have tried to add more into the guide to cater for all needs	Y
Inclusive design issues not addressed.	The guide has been written in line with Inclusive Mobility considering the needs of users with varying abilities	N
Cyclists and drivers given more priority than pedestrians.	We believe that the guide requires streets to be designed to give priority to pedestrians and cyclists.	N
Young and able-bodied given more priority than elderly, visually- and mobility -impaired.	The guide has been written in line with Inclusive Mobility considering the needs of users with varying abilities	N

<p>Partly agree - the document contains some positive messages about the anticipated modal shift brought about by encouraging change from the use of the private car to more sustainable methods of transport (page 35). However, the Guide doesn't explain how this will be achieved.</p> <p>For example, there is little articulation of key topics including modal shift, pedestrianisation, design of shared surfaces, cycle lanes and routes, electric bikes and scooters and electric vehicle charging points. If cycle use increases will it be possible to expand cycle lanes on primary routes? Will there be an increase in the use of electric bikes and scooters for example and will future schemes be able to accommodate this?</p> <p>These are all key topics which a SPD on street design could address. The document should set out the specific technical standards sought by the County along with new innovative strategies on these subjects, explained, and illustrated within the document.</p> <p>We also have a concern regarding the approach to be taken by OCC within the document around increasing unallocated on-street parking for dwellings. We consider that in some locations this could increase the potential for on-street congestion and parking disputes. This is also counter intuitive from the design rationale of modal shift and sustainability. From a developer's perspective, this would most likely (unless in high density areas) make schemes less viable.</p>	<p>This guide sits under LTP4 and the emerging LTCP and therefore the policy background in relation to modal shift is contained within these documents.</p> <p>The guide comprehensively covers street design with provision for pedestrians and cyclists in line with <i>Inclusive Mobility</i> and <i>Local Transport Note 1/20</i>. It also discusses the flexibility of design which is why on-street parking is encouraged as this space may be given over to other uses as car use decreases.</p> <p>The revision covers e-bikes and e-scooters.</p> <p>It is envisaged that there will be a reduction in car use in the future and a shift towards sustainable transport which is the reason for seeking to create more on-street parking which can be converted to other uses in the future. This is supported by national policies and the LTP4 / LTCP.</p>	<p>Y</p>
--	--	----------

Question 4. The Design Guide allows for design freedom and innovation, whilst setting clear guiding principles.		
Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Looks nice, but how will it improve traffic?	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision	Y
Street lighting should use LED bulbs. Pale yellow better than bright white. Light-free areas good for stargazing.	The decision over which bulbs are used is made by the Street Lighting team which make these decisions based on a number of considerations. There are several light free areas within the county which do not include street lighting in new schemes.	N
Hard to tell how much developers will take notice unless they have to.	The document will be an adopted guide, therefore will have weight in planning decisions.	N
Guiding principles do not support or direct innovation.	We have included more information on innovation to help support developers	Y
Recommend direction to: Urban95, 8-80 Cities, Arup "Cities Alive", Sport England/Grosvenor Voice Opportunity Power, Lucy Saunders' Healthy Streets, Sustrans, CROW Manual	The revision refers to Healthy Streets	Y
Allows freedom for developers to do as they please. Does not set guiding principles to achieve stated aims.	The document will be an adopted guide, therefore will have weight in planning decisions.	N
Do more to prioritise use of streets by cyclists and pedestrians, minimise emissions and car use.	The guide prioritises walking and cycling.	N
We all need to be free of pollution	Agreed, the guide will help achieve this.	N

Best practice for cycleways to be followed, e.g. Amsterdam-style roundabouts, where cyclists give way no more than other vehicles	The guide is in line with LTN1/20	N
Does not meet local and national policies and standards. Does not adopt current best practice.	The guide is in line with national and local policy and standards.	N
Does not set clear requirements. Language is hopeful, developers can ignore it.	The language throughout the document has been amended. The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision	Y
Not very strong in this ambition. Hopes and aspirations rather than saying what will happen if plans do not achieve the ambition.	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision	Y
Guiding principles are not clear. Perpetuates out-of-date thinking and weak requests that national design guides 'should be referred to'.	The guide is in line with national and local policy and standards. The guide requires it to be read in conjunction with national guidance as listed within the document.	Y
Allows design freedom and innovation without restriction. Guiding principles should be replaced by standards.	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
Allows a great deal of freedom due to lack of focus on strong principles. No reason it will drive innovation, more likely to allow a lack of innovation to continue. e.g. upper limit on footpath width (p. 22, 1.8-2.0m)	The language throughout the document has been amended. The footway widths are in line with current national guidance.	N
Some suggestions are good but not worded strongly enough.	The language throughout the document has been amended.	Y
Does not set clear guiding principles but provides examples of typical existing practice.	The guide is in line with national and local policy and standards.	N

<p>Reference must be made to other documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> > DfT 'Inclusive Mobility Guidance' > Guidance on the use of tactile paving surfaces > English Heritage "Streets for All" > DfT 'Accessible Public Transport Infrastructure, Guidelines for the design of Interchanges, Terminals and Stops' 	<p>This has been revisited to ensure guide is in line with policies mentioned</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>List of principles (p. 15) not carried through into the details, e.g. Sustainable Transport Set of ideas rather than mandatory improvements.</p>	<p>This has been looked at and amended where necessary.</p>	<p>Y</p>
<p>Most developers will do as little as they can get away with. Only firm guidance will deliver the innovation.</p>	<p>The document will be an adopted guide, therefore will have weight in planning decisions</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Some material from old guide should be retained or improved - balance between innovation and risk.</p>	<p>Comment needs more detail</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>Being a source of inspiration rather than a set of rules is welcomed, however it is inconsistent and mandatory requirements should be removed unless safety related.</p>	<p>Comment needs more detail</p>	<p>N</p>

<p>Comment - We agree that the guidance puts the onus back on the developer to be flexible. However, we consider that the guidance is too open ended as it doesn't provide information about what will be accepted by the County. We have provided detailed examples of where we consider this should be addressed below.</p> <p>The document should narrow its focus to the technical design of streets, with reference to design aspects which accompany this, sustainability, landscape, drainage, lighting, services and refuse.</p> <p>Whilst doing so, where providing or encouraging designs approaches, the County must take explicitly clear via supporting text and diagrams, what the Highway Authority is able to adopt. This requires addressing through revisions to the document.</p> <p>There is also very limited reference to the National Design Guide, so reference to this should be included.</p>	<p>The guidance provides examples of street design and sets out the basic standards expected within streets. However, there needs to be a balance between overly prescriptive and allowing for flexibility in design to reflect local characteristics, etc. The examples of street design clearly show the adoptable areas and features. Reference to National Design Code now included.</p>	<p>Y</p>
---	--	----------

Question 5. Is there any element you feel is factually incorrect or difficult to understand?		Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Summary of Comments	Officer Response	
To avoid confusion and be consistent with LTN 1/20 it is best to refer to on-carriageway infrastructure as lanes and segregated or stepped as tracks.	The use of cycle routes will be determined in line with LTN 1/20	Y
Bright white LED are intrusive and more like floodlighting than streetlighting.	Street Lighting team determines lighting with each application	N
Hard to tell how much developers will take notice unless they have to.	The document will be an adopted guide, therefore will have weight in planning decisions	N
The maps in Part 2 do not depict any of the innovative, people-focused use of public realm that is referred to in Part 3, undermining the messaging of prioritising streets for people.	This has been looked at and amended where necessary.	Y
Large elements are simply incorrect	More information is required	N
Clearly written and reasonably concise.	This is one of the key aims of the guide.	N
Why aren't you doing more to prioritise cyclists and peds, minimise emissions and car use?	The prioritisation of sustainable travel has been made clearer in the current revision	Y
Claims are bogus	More information is required	N
No proper commitment to Low Traffic Neighbourhoods or low speed limits	The guide is designed for 20mph speed limits. Revision discusses LTNs and modal filters.	Y

Nothing about what improvements are to be made to existing streets.	This guide is for new developments, but there are relevant sections and principles which will assist in re-designing existing streets	N
Would be enhanced by presentation of facts relating to best practice.	Further information required	N
No mention of interconnectivity between settlements and how to be addressed.	The focus of this guide is streets within new developments. However, developers are required to assess and improve walking and cycling routes beyond the development deemed appropriate	Y
Existing streets or just new ones?	This guide is for new developments, but there are relevant sections and principles which will assist in re-designing existing streets	N
Parking for bicycles and other non-motorised vehicles.	This is covered within the guide	N
Which types of trees are allowed and which ones not allowed?	This will be covered by separate guidance which will form an annex to the guide later on	N
Bizarre that Manual for Streets is barely mentioned	Included further reference to MfS	Y
Difficult to understand how it will ensure developers comply with guidelines	The document will be an adopted guide, therefore will have weight in planning decisions	N
Fails to reflect Manual for Streets and other OCC policies. Conflicts with other policies will make it difficult to understand.	Included further reference to MfS	Y
Footways incorrectly identified as "footpaths".	This has been corrected in the current revision	Y

Recommended locations of swales in streets are needed.	Too specific for this guide but further guidance could be provided as an annex to the guide	N
Larger diagrams would be easier to understand.	Noted	Y
Not clear where this fits in relation to DC design guides.	Designed to be read alongside district guides	N
Is it applicable to existing as well as new developments?	This guide is for new developments, but there are relevant sections and principles which will assist in re-designing existing streets	N
Encourage community's social interaction through street design guidelines	We feel this has been encouraged through the guide by allowing space for interaction	N
Poor provision for cycling.	Further provision has been included whilst also adding further links to LTN 1/20	Y
Street hierarchy should not be deemed essential (have moved on since DB32).	Manual for Streets recommends that a user and street hierarchy is established	N
LTN 1/20 has core design principles. Advises against tokenism; the guide is tokenistic.	Guide is in line with LTN 1/20	N
Give consideration to separate routes for different modes.	This would be decided on a case by case basis	N
Parking reference material is very dated. Best addressed at District level.	Parking numbers will be set out in separate parking standards document. Detail around parking is up to date and should be used across county rather than individual districts.	N

<p>Guidance on shared surfaces is vague and should be expanded in light of the withdrawal of government guidance.</p>	<p>Guide is in line with government guidance over shared surfaces</p>	<p>N</p>
<p>It is important that the contents of the County Council's Guide complements and does not contradict guidance set out in our own Design Guide, otherwise it may result in confusion for officers at our Councils as well as developers.</p> <p>The Council's Landscaping Officer has commented that the document is easy to understand and follow. However, it could helpfully be amended to address some recurring issues, not fully expored in this draft guidance, which come up during the process of commenting on planning applications and the coordination of District planning application process wih the County Highways processes including Section 38 adoption. The Oxfordshire Street Design guidance could help remove areas of conflict when we assess schemes, but while the document does touch on many of the themes it does not currently provide sufficient details to help inform developers to avoid the key issues that often arise.</p> <p>Our specialist Officers have also requested that additional advice should be included regarding S278 highways works. Often these are not addressed at the planning stages and left until afterwards, the end result being the full impact of the development is not being assessed at the panning application stage. Emphasising in the Guide the need to provide this information</p>	<p>Agreed. We are looking to produce more guidance as an annex to this guide on landscaping. We are also working on a Materials and Standard Details specification document which will form an annex to this document.</p>	

at the planning stage could help to address this matter and set developers expectations.

Question 6. Any further comments?		
Summary of Comments	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Worried about bikes being doored by passengers if cycle track alongside parked cars.	A buffer of 0.5m is afforded between cycle lane and car parking.	N
Need to consider parking for cargo bikes, could it be in a car parking space?	This has now been added.	Y
Encouraging to see segregated cycle lanes.	The use of cycle routes will be determined in line with LTN 1/20	N
Include something about right of way - should not give way at side roads. Cycles should only give way where cars do too.	Further provision has been included whilst also adding further links to LTN 1/20	Y
Unenforceable guidelines will not achieve anything.	The document will be an adopted guide, therefore will have weight in planning decisions	N
Doesn't show how existing narrow congested areas will be improved. Cowley Road in particular, what are the plans for that?	This guide is for new developments, but there are relevant sections and principles which will assist in re-designing existing streets	N
Need to reference other relevant design manuals. E.g. Sustrans Handbook for Cycle Friendly Design (note, I cannot find this on Sustrans website so may be superseded, but is available at https://bicycleinfrastructuremanuals.com)	The guide has been reviewed against relevant policies and amended where considered necessary. A list of documents that this guide should be read in conjunction with has been provided at the start of the guide.	Y
A welcome concept that must lead to safer road and pathway usage. Covered most things, Congratulations!	This is one of the key aims of the guide.	N

Roundabouts, especially if no signals or cycle provision, should be discouraged as incredibly hard to make them safe for cyclists.	The use of roundabouts will be decided on a case by case basis depending on benefits	N
Sets out a great vision but will only ever be that without legal force compelling developers to comply with the requirements.	The document will be an adopted guide, therefore will have weight in planning decisions	N
Please check out Lily Berheimer's book "The Shaping of US", about the role of psychology in designing built environments that are good for wellbeing and community.	Noted	N
Needs more to discourage car ownership and have green and public transport options by default.	Revisited to further promote active travel above car use	Y
Should prioritise walking, then cycling, sustainable public transport, taxis and cars.	User hierarchy has been added	Y
Car-centric guide does not promote alternative social infrastructure in public realm, such as parklets, street furniture etc.	Revisited to further promote active travel above car use	Y
Has old-fashioned hierarchy of streets rather than hierarchy of users as per manual for Streets and LTN 1/20.	Manual for Streets recommends that a user and street hierarchy is established	N
Requires significant rework	Comment needs to be more specific	N
Should not be building large numbers of houses in the countryside. Will inevitably depend on car transport.	Not the purpose of this guide	N
Do more to prioritise use of streets by cyclists and pedestrians, minimise emissions and car use.	Revisited to further promote active travel above car use	Y
Why are you not following best practice and standards?	Comment needs to be more specific	N

Cycle ways beside parked cars are vulnerable to car doors being opened.	A buffer of 0.5m is afforded between cycle lane and car parking.	N
Cycleways need to be suitable for all users, without pinch points or give-ways.	Use of cycle lanes has been discussed with our cycling officer and is in line with LTN1/20.	N
Trying to invent new solutions to problems that were solved in Amsterdam years ago.	Comment needs to be more specific	N
Should state that Manual for Streets is the guide of choice.	Further reference to MfS has been added	Y
Guide is muddled and lacking in strength. Recommends guide is withdrawn and re-written.	The guide has been subject to wide consultation and a Critical Friend Review. The guide has been revised following these consultations.	Y
No more shared ped/cycle areas like Frideswide Square as dangerous to both.	Shared surface policy is in line with government guidance	N
School drop-off areas (p.40) are wrong; should be free of traffic around school with parking well away.	Walking and cycling to school will be prioritised.	N
Profoundly disappointed how it falls short of expectations.	Comment needs to be more specific	N
Doesn't follow Manual for Streets or national/county policies on active travel.	Further reference to MfS has been added	Y
Masterplan will perpetuate poor quality car-centric designs.	Masterplan has been removed	Y
The language is weak. Standards should be a condition of planning consent, not "referred to", as will be ignored.	Language throughout guide has been revisited	Y
Must be a set of standards, ref. Manual for Streets.	Further reference to MfS has been added	Y

Additional standards for rural Oxfordshire. Longer travel distances to work so integrated public transport needed to discourage car-dependency.	Each site has to be assessed on its own merits. The guide covers more general areas which are common to urban and rural developments.	N
<p>Suggested standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> >all streets have footpaths on both sides >all streets to include traffic calming >no rat runs >15mph speed limit of streets and cycle paths >%age area allowance for green space/play areas/tree planting/allotments >play areas to have railings >off-footway bin storage and car parking >no right-angle bends on cycle paths >provision for car clubs 	This has been looked at and amended where necessary. Footway provision is in line with Manual for Streets and Inclusive Mobility. The guide requires all streets to be designed to 20mph. The guide now presents Modal Filters and Low Traffic Neighbourhoods. The guide does not cover bin storage, play areas and green spaces in detail as these are District matters.	N
> "very large cycle stores" (p.38) devalues the necessity. Inefficient use of land for car parking not mentioned. Active travel needs much higher status.	Noted.	N
> "where practically feasible" (p.23) What are feasibility criteria? Active travel provision can be limited by such wording and loopholes.	Reference has been taken out	Y
> Guide accepts parking as fundamental part of housing development. Measures needed to reduce car dependency, not crude restrictions on parking availability.	Reducing level of parking assists in reducing car dependency alongside other measures	N
Needs to be part of a more holistic plan.	The guide sits under LTCP and alongside other local and national guidance	N
Needs to incorporate existing, more advanced manuals.	The guide sits under LTCP and alongside other local and national guidance. Further guidance on Materials and Standard details are due to be published as an annex to this guide in the future. Detail on other topic areas may also form further annexes.	N

I urge that the draft be withdrawn and reconsidered.	Comment needs to be more specific	N
P. 14 should read "Understands and addresses the needs of all potential users, <i>including disabled people</i> , to ensure inclusive design"	Disabled people are considered within all users	N
No mention of cycleways and paths/alleyways that are not alongside a road.	Comment not clear.	
No provision for vehicle deliveries, which will become more commonplace.	Provision of delivery vehicle tracking under Further Advice section	N
Flexible, collaborative and innovative approach is welcomed.	This is one of the key aims of the guide.	N
Should place greater emphasis on innovative solutions to street design and development management and operation, particularly refuse collection and servicing.	Included further section on innovation and its uses going forward	Y
Should not set fixed 'rules' about the design approach but be informed by local context.	We have tried to keep approach flexible but there must also be set standards where appropriate	N
Flexible and pragmatic approach to street geometry is supported but reference back to MfS geometries undermines this. Needs to be clearer on the approach and standards OCC will apply and adopt.	The guide endorses Manual for Streets but each development will be assessed on its own merits. The adoptable areas of each street example is shown within the guide.	N
Agree that innovative and flexible approach to parking strategies should be applied.	This is one of the key aims of the guide.	N
Needs greater technical guidance to ensure consistency at different stages i.e. pre-planning, planning applications, S278/S38 to minimise risk and support delivery.	Further technical guidance will be produced separately	N

Written Responses in Full

South and Vale District Council

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
	<i>Replies to online consultation questions dealt with separately.</i>		
Foreword	How will it fit with DC Design Guides and National Design Guide	The Foreword has been amended to refer to national and local guidance	Y
Purpose of the Guide	Focus should narrow to the technical design of streets	The focus is considered appropriate	N
	Transition to 'net zero-carbon Oxfordshire by 2050'	Corporate documents refer to 'zero carbon' as per Oxfordshire County Council 'Climate Action Framework'	Y
This is Oxfordshire	Inappropriate photo of parked cars	This photo has been replaced	Y
The 5 Districts	Relationship to National Design Guidance	This is now covered in more detail in the updated Guide	Y
What do we want to achieve?	Intent is blurred, combines masterplanning and street design	The objectives have been refined	Y
Collaboration from the outset	Planning process diagram considered unnecessary	Decided to leave in Guide as demonstrates the interaction between different parties and likely timescales.	N
Demonstration masterplan	Is this the best way to communicate the information?	The masterplan approach has been removed	Y
The Masterplan	Accessibility and ecology concerns	The masterplan approach has been removed	Y

Character Zones			
Street Hierarchy	Images not clear. Text should be rearranged. Authors and dates should be included.	Images and labels considered appropriate. Text has been adjusted. Authors etc. included.	Y
The Masterplan Street Hierarchy	Existing roads should be categorised.	The masterplan approach has been removed and the primary focus of this guide is new streets	Y
Primary Street	Should be dimensions on drawings. Refer to LTN 1/20. 2m min. width for cycle lanes.	Specific street dimensions deliberately not given as we want to encourage flexibility. Any distances that are critical have been provided such as footway widths. LTN 1/20 referred to. Cycle lane widths amended in accordance with LTN1/20	Y
Cycle Routes, Bus Stops etc.	Diagrams too small, lack technical detail.	Layout of document has been altered/improved	Y
Secondary routes etc.	Should be dimensions on drawings, and less conceptual.	See above. Drawings have been reviewed and considered appropriate to stimulate discussion.	N
Street Space Allocation	Discusses innovative approach but does not provide solutions	Guide states OCC will work with designers and developers on this concept.	N
Parking	Pages could be clearer. Need illustrations, not just photos.	Images and labels considered appropriate. It is not the purpose of the design guide to design parking. The purpose of the design guide in relation to parking is to encourage the incorporation of parking into the	N

		street with respect for other users and with future modal shift in mind.	
Cycle parking	Not just Sheffield stands. Cycle parking at bus stops. School drop-off areas.	Other parking solutions are shown. Cycle parking at bus stops has been added. High-level guidance on school drop-off areas only required.	Y
Drainage	Lack of definition on what would be adoptable.	Early engagement with OCC encouraged. More detailed guidance could become a future annex to the document.	N
Landscaping	Lack of definition on what would be adoptable. Does not cover assessment/retention of existing features.	Early engagement with OCC encouraged. Text considered appropriate. More detailed guidance could become a future annex to the document.	N
Street Trees	Further guidance is important	More detailed guidance could become a future annex to the document.	N
Street Tech	Section should be expanded.	Section has been renamed 'Innovation' and has been extended.	Y
Street lighting	Concerns re lighting and trees. Reference OCC Street Lighting Policy (2018)	A link to the guidance will be provided in the final draft.	
Electric Car Charging Points	More information required.	This section has been extended.	Y
Refuse collection	Should include diagrams of RCV access requirements. Should be reference to Building Regulations.	Not considered appropriate. References to Manual for Streets, which in turn references Building Regulations.	N

	<p>Appropriate/enough parking to remove obstructions to RCVs. Space required at front of properties to present bins for collection.</p> <p>Space required between on-street parking bays to wheel bins to collection points.</p> <p>Bins may cause an obstruction to peds and road users on shared spaces.</p> <p>Correct distances for bin collection points. Refer to District Design Guide.</p> <p>Allow space for litter bins at bus stops.</p> <p>Cycle storage must be separate from bin stores.</p> <p>Landscaping must be suitable for moving bins, i.e. paths through verges.</p> <p>Cross-check landscaping and transport plans.</p> <p>No mention of bin stores for flats. More advice on integrated/standalone stores and how they impact streets.</p> <p>Developers should consider access, lighting etc. to standalone stores in car parks.</p>	<p>Parking covered elsewhere in the document.</p> <p>Agreed, but not specifically covered in the Guide.</p> <p>Agreed, but not specifically covered in the Guide.</p> <p>Agreed, but not specifically covered in the Guide.</p> <p>Although not specifically referenced, developers would be expected to consult District Guides.</p> <p>Agreed, but not specifically covered in the Guide.</p> <p>Agreed, but not specifically covered in the Guide.</p> <p>Agreed, but not specifically covered in the Guide.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Not considered necessary. Not considered necessary.</p> <p>Agreed, but not specifically covered in the Guide.</p>	
--	---	--	--

	<p>Emphasise relevant local authority waste planning guidance.</p> <p>More emphasis on recycling – amend title to ‘Recycling and Refuse’</p>	<p>Although not specifically referenced, developers would be expected to consult District Guides.</p> <p>Agreed – title amended.</p> <p>Note that all District Council Waste departments were reconsulted (end March 2021) and none expressed a wish for changes to the content of the Guide.</p>	
--	--	---	--

West Oxfordshire District Council

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
General comments	‘tightening up’ of language required	The document has been reviewed and the text reworded where necessary.	Y
	More emphasis on the National Design Guide and Manual for Streets	The Guide has been redrafted to place more importance on these documents	Y
Foreword	Reference the role of residents and community involvement	The Foreword has been rewritten.	Y
Page 10	The masterplan does not reflect best practice	The masterplan has been removed	Y
	Street hierarchy success depends on a variety of factors	Noted	N

Page 14	Aspirational objectives could be added	The objectives have been reconsidered	Y
Cycle parking	Specific reference on electric bikes and their implications	Parking of electric cycles no different from standard cycles however a new section on 'Innovation' discusses e-bikes	Y
Pages 38 and 39	Bike stands can be an opportunity for public art	This has been incorporated into 3.2 Parking: Bicycles	Y
Page 41	Stronger statement about SUDS	Guide has been amended to "requires the use of SUDS."	Y
	Further guidance on SUDS regarding design and adoption.	Guide makes it clear that early involvement with drainage bodies is essential. More detailed guidance could become a future annex to the document	N
3.4 Landscaping	New planting schemes and existing features	Noted	N
	Will OCC adopt trees in the highway as a matter of principle?	OCC as an organisation is looking to plant more trees in the highway and will look to adopt more trees, however this needs be assessed on a case by case basis.	N
Page 42	In highlighted box, does "early conversations..." relate to areas to be adopted or all schemes?	The former; further clarification considered unnecessary	N
Page 43	More information on tree planting requirements	More detailed guidance could become a future annex to the document	N
	Early input required.	Recommended on previous page.	N
	Street lighting provides potential conflict	Noted. Risk mitigated by consulting Street Lighting early on the master planning stage.	N

Section 3.5	Reduced street lighting levels in rural areas	Wording amended accordingly	Y
Page 45	Fire 'engines', not 'trucks'	Agreed, reworded	Y

Cherwell District Council

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
	Street hierarchy in relation to density variation between urban streets and rural areas.	Hierarchy based on location, use, role, user hierarchy, place and movement. Will depend on size and nature of the development.	N
	Historic Routeways, upgrading historic streets be included.	This is a matter for discussion with the District Council in relation to heritage and conservation so is not covered by the guide.	N
Page 12	Understand and analyse existing street hierarchy	The Guide is for new streets and developments.	N
Pages 16 & 17	Add PRoW etc to masterplan	Masterplan has been removed	Y
	Cycleways and bridleway connections to streets	Not considered necessary for inclusion	N
	Secondary/Primary/Tertiary street connection details	Being considered further	N
Pages 22-27	How are service ducts etc. incorporated into the streets?	This is a matter for detailed design and therefore not covered in the guide. Further information may be provided as part of the Standard Details which is due to be published in the future as an annex to the guide.	N
Page 35	Rear parking courts – only acceptable for apartment blocks	Discouraged, but should not be limited to apartment blocks only	N

	How is successful on-street parking achieved?	Addressed in the Guide. Space allowance must be made at masterplanning stage.	N
Page 38	Poor secure cycle parking picture	Replaced with better picture	Y
Page 42	Standard designs for root barriers, tree pits, rainwater drainage	Not currently included in the guide but could become part of a future annex to the guide	N
Parts 3 and 4	Standard cross-section details at level changes	Not currently included in the guide but could become part of a future annex to the guide	N
Page 44	EV charging points – picture shows trip hazard	Replaced with better image	Y
Page 45	Refuse collection – apartment blocks	Not considered necessary for inclusion	N
Part 4	List of acceptable paving materials	A palette of materials is to be provided as a separate annex in the future	N

Oxford City Council

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Page 22	The maintenance of Parklet features may be a deterrent	Text added re parklet topic paper which will provide further information.	Y
Page 23	Cycle lane widths and principles in LTCP topic papers	Not added as it will be covered in the relevant LTCP topic paper	Y
Page 30	Could a picture of an Oxfordshire parklet be included	Being considered with the redesign	N
Page 32	'footways' rather than 'footpaths'	Noted and corrected	Y

	Provide link to Oxford City Parking Technical Advice Note	Added	Y
Page 33	Ref to County parking standards	Text revised to refer to Local Plans	Y
	Parking for motorcycles, scooters, etc.	Dedicated m/c parking not usually required. Covered in Local Plans where necessary. E-scooter parking text added.	Y
	EV parking and charging	Has been expanded in update	Y
	Spaces for last-mile deliveries	Cargo bike parking now mentioned	Y
Page 38/9	Should be "District and City..."	The City is considered to be a District, ref "This is Oxfordshire" section	N
Page 45	RCVs using the whole carriageway at junctions for manoeuvring. Is this a recommendation or statutory guidance?	Text references Manual for Streets, which says (6.8.1) "On streets with low traffic flows and speeds, it may be assumed that they [service vehicles] will be able to use the full width of the carriageway to manoeuvre."	N
	No reference to the number of bins	This is considered to be a matter for the District Councils	N
	More emphasis on the needs of children	Noted	N

Eynsham Parish Council

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Vision	Recommended that the Guide is design specific to the Districts	It is not considered practical or reasonable to have different	N

	rather than applied flexibly across the County	guidance for the five Districts which would also undermine the District's own design guide documents	
Objectives	Dead ends/cul-de-sacs should be linked	Agreed. Emphasis added on connectivity	Y
Street hierarchy	Noise pollution reduction measures not addressed	Covered in Manual for Streets, which is to be read in conjunction with the Guide. 20mph streets will lead to lower vehicle noise.	N
Primary Streets	20mph speed limits are supported where designed appropriately	Noted	N
Secondary Streets	Insufficient weight or detail to needs of cyclists	Modifications have been made to add more detail around accommodating cyclists within the street and reference has been made to LTN1/20	Y
Tertiary Streets	Insufficient weight or detail to needs of cyclists	Modifications have been made to add more detail around accommodating cyclists within the street and reference has been made to LTN1/20	Y
Street space allocation	Elderly and less-able pedestrians may feel their safety is compromised due to passing vehicles	Shared spaces will be low-speed environments where drivers are more aware of pedestrians and give sufficient priority to non-motorise users etc.	N
Parking	Off-street/driveway parking beneficial to disability/wheelchair users	The Guide acknowledges "that there will still be a place for on plot solutions". Detailed parking standards to follow	N

	Undercroft parking may raise the building height	Noted, will need to be considered at the masterplanning stage with advice from the Planning Authority	N
	Schools should accommodate all cars going to the site and drop off points should be within their boundary	School on-site parking provision will be agreed on a case by case basis with input from the OCC Schools team. Disagree that drop off points should be within the boundary as this does not discourage car usage and has safety implications	N
Drainage	Use of SUDS is fully supported	Noted	N
Landscaping	Inclusion of trees is fully supported. All developments must have trees planted	Noted.	N
Street tech	Support the need for on plot EV charging. Potential on-street charging point hazards need to be overcome	Noted and agreed. The section on EV charging has now been expanded.	Y

Oxford Pedestrians Association

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
	Guide seen as weak because of being very car-centric	Guide prioritises walking and cycling infrastructure. It follows the user hierarchy set out in <i>Manual for Streets</i> . This has been made clearer in the final version.	Y
	1.8m is too narrow for pavements	Revised to show all footways 2.0m	Y

	Does not adopt Manual for Streets principles	The Guide refers to Manual for Streets	N
	Manual for Streets is based on a user hierarchy with walkers at the top	The Guide has been revised to include the MfS User Hierarchy. This has been made clearer in the final version.	Y
	No mention of direct, comfortable, unobstructed, flat walking routes to local amenities and services	Required in two of the Core Objectives in the revised Guide	N
	The Guide is written in weak language	The language used has been reviewed and reworded where necessary	Y
	Fear that walking routes will be added after roads for motorised vehicles have been placed centrally	The Guide promotes early engagement to ensure the masterplan is developed with the user hierarchy a primary consideration	N

CPRE Oxfordshire

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
	Rural proofing. No guidance to address the design of developments adjacent to existing villages, risking suburbification	The Guide deals specifically with the design of streets and does discuss the need for design within the local context	N
The Vision (p. 4)	Include "environmental well-being" in the vision statement	Not sure what this means	N

Objectives (p. 14)	Objective relating to EV charging and/or future-proofing for energy requirements	Noted and EV charging is covered within the guide. An objective on EV charging has not been added as it not considered to have the same importance as the other objectives on this page.	N
	'no net loss of habitat' is out-of-date, should be a 10% net gain	Noted. Requirement will be captured by other planning policies	N
	Active travel includes horse riders. Should look to upgrade PRow to bridleway status	Noted, although the Guide is principally concerned with the design of streets within new developments	
Consultation (p. 15)	Streets are to be vehicle tracked and tested – does this extend to cyclists/pedestrians?	Design of pedestrian and cycle routes will be carried out with regard to design standards adopted by the county council and nationally.	N
Design Principles (p. 15)	The wording around environmental impact is too unambitious, minimising impact rather than net gain	Noted. Requirement will be captured by other planning policies	N

Urban Design Group

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Page 8	Street photo has no people	Noted	N
	Little mention of grass verges and whether they would be acceptable	Verges are shown on the street plans and sections, therefore acceptable in principle	N
Page 9	No people in any photos	Noted	N

Page 10	Hierarchy is complex and based on movement function	The Guide has been updated to give more emphasis to Manual for Streets and the user hierarchy recommended therein	Y
Page 11	Page omits place functions	Noted, but does not affect intrinsic guidance in the document	N
Page 13	Helpful to identify the photos	Photos now have a description	Y
Page 14	Objectives should be people-centred	Objectives have been reviewed and considered appropriate	Y
	List the people covered by the Equality Act	Not considered to be necessary for this document	N
	Discussion about acceptability of delays to traffic resulting from ped/cycle crossings	Noted but considered to be a matter to be assessed on a case by case basis	N
	Should reference zero carbon target	Now included	Y
Page 15	Too busy, use worked example	Page considered acceptable	N
Page 16	Numerous concerns with demonstration masterplan	The masterplan has been removed from the Guide	Y
Page 20	Higher density examples needed	Examples are indicative of a typical street hierarchy only	N
Page 22	Several requested additions to the Primary Street plan	The plan is intended to be indicative, a potential layout. It is not intended to illustrate every scenario	N
Page 23	Several requested additions to the plans	The plans are intended to be indicative	N
Page 24	Diagrams too small	Document layout is being reviewed	Y
Page 25	Disabled parking bays?	Plan is indicative	N
Page 27	Photos show a bleak environment	Photos considered to be representative of varying environments	Y
Page 30	A poor example as no people in the photo	The photos are to show how the car should not dominate the street scene	N

Page 31	More guidance on major streets, e.g.A41 Bicester	The Guide is specifically for 20mph streets within new developments	N
Page 32	Parking standards tailored to location	Parking standards to follow	N
	Development locations should be chosen to limit the need for car ownership	To be considered on a site by site basis in accordance with District Council policies	N
Page 33	Undercroft parking example is ugly, has an inactive frontage and interrupts the footway	Footway crossing cannot always be avoided.	N
Page 34	Issues with the photos	Photos are intended to illustrate the parking discussion	N
Page 35	What are the criteria for good design of courtyard parking?	Primarily security and surveillance, but OCC strongly discourage their use	N
Page 38	Cycle parking box unattractive	Photo has been replaced	Y
Page 40	Landscape should be considered from the outset. Signage and clutter minimised	Agreed	N
Page 41	SUDS integrated with tree planting.	Noted	N
Page 42	Is it the intention to adopt verges?	Verges shown withing adoptable area in Secondary Route plan	N
Page 44	Street lighting must be integrated with tree planting	Agreed	N
Page 45	Show underground waste management options	Noted and may be developed further as part of future modifications to the Guide.	N
	Utilities should be in shared service ducts	Noted	N
Page 48	Avoid light pollution	Agreed	N
Page 49	Beware using swept path tracking to override other policies and statutory	Swept path analysis is one consideration in the overall design.	

	duties, and illustrative diagrams. Refuse collection is not the overweening design objective. Swept paths that use the opposite side of the carriageway should be acceptable.	Text references Manual for Streets, which says (6.8.1) "On streets with low traffic flows and speeds, it may be assumed that they [service vehicles] will be able to use the full width of the carriageway to manoeuvre."	
	Why no loose material on driveways?	It can get carried on to the highway	N
Page 50	Concerns on standing advice for schools	This advice has been removed	N

Cyclox

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
The process of production	Only covers new streets or redevelopment of existing streets?	The intention is that it is a guide for new residential developments, but the principles may be applied to other situations if appropriate	N
National standards and policies	Fails to embed Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2	This has been addressed in latest revision	Y

	Does not acknowledge LTN 1/20 sufficiently	This has been addressed in latest revision	Y
	Relationship with District Council guides unclear	It is necessary that each District Council has its own bespoke general design guide distinct to the area which is referred to within the guide	N
	How will it relate to LTCP5?	Introduction amended to reference the LTCP	Y
Masterplan	The masterplan does not adopt best practice	The masterplan concept has been removed from the Guide	Y
It will not constrain developers	The words are too passive. Should be definitive statements with mandatory adherence	The language has been modified to be stronger. By definition, the document is a guide which encourages innovation	Y
	Developers will find loopholes	Noted	N
	Needs to be tested 'to destruction'	Not sure what this means	N

Defence Infrastructure Organisation

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
Weight to be applied to the guide	How will the Guide fit with SPDs, District Council Local Plans and policies, and their Design Guides and Standards? Which would take precedence?	The Design Guide will be adopted and therefore will need to be considered alongside other planning policies and guidance. Any potential conflicts should be resolved with early engagement, which is strongly encouraged. The Local Highway Authority will need to be satisfied	N

		with any areas that are to be adopted.	
Design Principles	Flexible, collaborative and innovative approach welcomed	Noted	N
	Greater emphasis on innovative solutions to street design	The Guide includes a section on Innovation which has been expanded.	Y
	Agree no 'hard and fast rules'	Noted	N
	Support flexible approach to street geometries, but unclear given reference to Manual for Streets geometries	Manual for Streets contains recognised best practice. In the Guide, MfS geometries only referred to in Recycling and Refuse Collection section.	N
Vehicle Parking	Agree with the flexible and innovative approach	Noted	N
	Clarification on allocated and visitor parking. Should recognise a preference for allocated spaces, where possible	Disagree. "Oxfordshire County Council therefore encourage developers to consider alternative parking arrangements to on plot which allow for more flexibility and more efficient land use."	N
	School parking and access	This advice has been removed from the Guide	N

Member of the public

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
P.14 Objectives	Horse riding is active travel. Give examples of how streets/surfaces can be designed to be safe for	Noted, although the Guide is principally concerned with the design of streets.	N

	horses. PRow within new developments should be considered for upgrade to bridleway status		
P.16 Demonstration Masterplan	Opportunities for safe, multi-user routes should be explored	The demonstration masterplan has been removed	Y
P.20 Street Hierarchy	No on-street parking should be allowed on bus routes as it causes delay to the bus	Currently this will be considered on a case by case basis but could form a future modification to the Guide	N
P.31 Not Just for Quiet residential Areas	Frideswide Square not a good example	It is generally accepted that the redevelopment of Frideswide Square has been successful in creating a pleasant environment whilst accommodating high traffic flows	N
P.32 Parking	Refers to cars and motorcycles. Also vans, trucks, caravans etc. which will not fit in a garage	It is not reasonable to attempt to accommodate oversize vehicles.	N
P.34 On Plot	Minimum garage size needed for an SUV. Open bays (undercroft) preferable as more likely to be used for parking. Does not recognise that garages have internal columns	An appropriate internal dimension 6.0m x 3.0m is given. Stated that this is between any internal structures, such as pillars. Undercroft parking is one of the innovative options available	N
P.36	Photo shows cars wider than parking spaces	Spaces will be minimum 2.5m wide if to be adopted	N
P.37	Scenario 2 very similar to page 32 (80's solution)	Scenario 2 is a single space only. Needs to be well designed.	N

P.38	Garages used for cycle parking!	If a suitable size, i.e. min. 6m x 3m, a garage will accommodate an average car and one or more cycles	N
P.44 Street Lighting	Does the lighting policy comply with industry best practice		

Transport Consultant – IMA Associates

Document Section	Key Themes for Objections or Concerns	Officer Response	Modifications to Design Guide? Y/N
	On-street, communal, non-allocated parking is promoted. EV charging on-street needs developers to come up with solutions. This challenge may need OCC to provide supplementary guidance.	This section has been expanded and further guidance provided in the final version. We would welcome working with developers to agree solutions to such challenges.	Y
	Access requirements for schools do not seem reasonable	The advice relating to schools has been removed from the Guide.	Y