

# 7. Ensuring efficient movement into and around the city

## 7.1 Objectives

- To ensure growth in the proportion of people walking and cycling to access jobs and facilities
- To provide enhanced facilities for walking and cycling, ensuring they are the primary modes for travel around the city
- To ensure walking and cycling routes are complemented with well managed and attractive public transport routes, and that car use is minimised

## Ensuring efficient movement around the city

### National Planning Policy says:

7.2 The *National Planning Policy Framework* (NPPF) states that one of the overarching land-use planning principles is to “actively manage patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focus significant development in locations which are or can be made sustainable” (paragraph 17). The NPPF directs local authorities to move away from widespread private car usage being the basis of transport networks, towards more sustainable modes as a means to both improve the sustainability of the transport network and issues around emissions and congestion. The NPPF outlines that sustainable modes of transport should be prioritised, with priority being given to cyclists and pedestrians, (paragraph 35) with high quality public transportation also sought. The *Planning Practice Guidance* (PPG) sets out more detail on the use of travel plans and transport assessments and on the need for transport evidence in plan making.

7.3 The government’s *Manual for the Streets*, 2007, encourages increased connectivity and walkability between residential neighbourhoods, transport hubs and community services and facilities as a way of reducing people’s reliance on the private car, and improve congestion, (paragraph 4.4.2). Mixing the uses of neighbourhood areas is encouraged as a way of reducing people’s need to travel.

### The Oxford story – background evidence and the Sustainability Appraisal:

7.4 Transport remains a critical issue for Oxford. Transport and movement requires the involvement of a range of authorities and providers to affect change. The County Council has overall responsibility for transport policy as the Local Highway Authority and Highways England have the statutory duty to plan for and manage the strategic road network. The City Council in its capacity as Local Planning Authority has a key role to deliver change to the movement network through placemaking.



- 7.5 The clear priority is to promote sustainable travel over private car use so to help alleviate the current issues of congestion and air pollution. The Local Plan will need to be clear in its aim to help deliver growth that is predicated on enhanced pedestrian and cycle (or active travel) routes and high quality public transit routes. It will also need to set out how these aims will be delivered. These aims are strongly supported in the *SA Scoping Report, 2016*, which recognises that Oxford currently has relatively sustainable travel patterns; indeed within Oxford, 68% of journeys are made by a sustainable mode (pedestrian, cycle and bus). Oxford's existing road network has already reached its maximum capacity, resulting in congestion and air quality issues. While traffic counts carried out at the inner cordon (which specifies the average number of vehicles entering the city centre on any given weekday) shows a stable volume of traffic, the outer cordon of Oxford (which indicates the number of vehicles entering Oxford from beyond the city boundary) is experiencing an increase annually. The *SA Scoping Report* supports this and concludes that a continuation of existing travel behaviour, especially considering Oxford's potential growth over the plan period, would over-burden the transport network and compromise both Oxford's character and the quality of life of residents.
- 7.6 The *Oxford Transport Strategy*, prepared by Oxfordshire County Council, as part of the *Local Transport Plan: Connecting Oxfordshire 2015-2031* (LTP), includes various objectives intended to improve the sustainability of the regional transport network. Perhaps the most relevant to the Local Plan are the re-opening of Cowley branch line to passengers, improving Oxford's cycleways and improving mass transit links between park and rides which bisect the city centre. Oxford City Council's response to the LTP suggested these objectives were a progressive package of aims but more radical policies were needed, something the Local Plan could offer. In its response, Oxford City Council added further key objectives such as the city's transport network placing far more emphasis on walking as a transport method.
- 7.7 The County Council's *Local Transport Plan*, background evidence and the *Sustainability Appraisal*, all point towards the necessity of encouraging/enforcing a behavioural change in travel patterns in Oxford and a further shift away from reliance on private cars towards more sustainable modes. It is important that policy responses continue to support the high proportion of journeys made by sustainable travel modes, through continuing to make this the most attractive transport option, while seeking to improve active travel networks. The high volume of car traffic into Oxford originating from outside the city also needs addressing in policies which encourage a change of mode and encourage people out of their cars. The council will continue to support the investigations by the National Infrastructure Commission into transport improvements in the Oxford to Cambridge corridor including the first/last mile transport challenges within those cities.
- 7.8 The SA highlighted how policies which promoted sustainable travel choices would be likely to result in reduced reliance on car travel and hence have positive impacts on the SA objectives of human health, air pollution, and climate change in particular. In addition such an approach would help with poverty, social exclusion and inequality as sustainable choices are generally cheaper and would also open up access to more opportunities (e.g. to access jobs and social infrastructure) for more people. However, the SA highlights a potential negative impact on the economy and tourism in particular if the approach is taken to further restrict access to the city centre which could compromise footfall and thereby affect the vitality of this area.

**The clear priority is to promote sustainable travel over private car use so to help alleviate the current issues of congestion and air pollution.**

### Responses to first steps consultation:

- 7.9 The Issues stage consultation revealed many concerns about transport in and around Oxford. This was regarded as a critical issue which needs addressing with a strong policy direction. Stakeholders expressed concerns with Oxford's existing transport capacity and made various suggestions, such as enhanced Park & Ride facilities and congestion charging.
- 7.10 Many respondents raised concerns with cycleway safety and connectivity while 66% of respondents strongly agreed with the necessity of segregating cycle and pedestrian routes from vehicular traffic as a means of achieving these aims.
- 7.11 Regarding public transport, most concerns were levelled at the bus services within Oxford with many people raising concerns towards the unaffordability of services and others adding that improved routes, connectivity and reliability are key issues.
- 7.12 Poor air quality, resulting from vehicular emissions, is of great concern to Oxford's residents with many mentioning concerns over air quality specifically; 65% of people either agreed or strongly agreed that more restrictive emissions policies were required to combat air pollution.

### Potential policy responses:

- 7.13 **Understanding and mitigating the transport implications of developments**  
It is important the transport impacts of a proposed development are appraised and considered as part of the determination of a planning application. Two key tools for this are Transport Assessments and Travel Plans. A Transport Assessment (TA) is a comprehensive and systematic process that sets out transport issues relating to a proposed development; it identifies the impact of the development in 'person trips', which are then broken down by transport mode. A Travel Plan is a package of actions designed by a workplace, school or other organisation to encourage safe, healthy and sustainable travel options.

**It is important the transport impacts of a proposed development are appraised and considered as part of the determination of a planning application.**

### Opt 79: Transport Assessments and Travel Plans (include servicing and delivery plans)

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<b>A) Preferred option</b> (Combination of A + B): Require TAs and TPs to review transport impacts and show transport measures proposed to mitigate them for all development that is likely to have significant transport implications.	This approach will encourage measures which reduce the need to travel and manage congestion. In addition, more sustainable modes of travel are promoted as part of these assessments. Transport Assessments should include, for example, targets associated with the proportion of journeys made to and from the development site by more sustainable alternatives to the private car and measures such as bus passes.
<b>B) Preferred option</b> (Combination of A + B): Require transport assessments to also include servicing and delivery plans, where relevant.	Including service and delivery plans as part of the assessment process will also help reduce the impacts of freight and service vehicles by requiring measures to minimise these issues, such as managing delivery times. This is particularly important in busy and confined areas such as the city centre and also for sites in close proximity to residential areas.
<b>C) Alternative Option:</b> Do not include a policy requiring transport assessments.	The assessment and mitigation of transport impacts of development schemes are crucial to their success or failure. Requiring an assessment as part of a planning application is the only way to secure the required information on which to make a sound planning decision. Without management of traffic impacts there would be an increase in congestion and a lack of encouragement and provision for active travel.

#### 7.14 Encouraging walking, cycling and public transport

The following options tables address transport issues that cannot wholly be delivered by the City Council through the Local Plan. These options are particularly reliant on other parties, including the County Council as Local Highways Authority as well as service operators. However, the City Council is working closely with the County Council in order to ensure that a transport strategy is in place that will support the Local Plan. A key aspect of the transport strategy will be the aim to increase the attractiveness of walking and cycling so that they are the predominant means of travel within the city, which will require improvements to facilities and particularly improvements to routes to ensure that there is a comprehensive network of safe routes for walking and cycling across the city. The reopening of the Cowley Branchline for passenger services would bring obvious benefits for the city, and the likelihood of growth and intensification of uses at the Science Park, Business Park and in Blackbird Leys would all help support the case for its delivery. However, it cannot be delivered by the Local Plan. These options have been included for testing through the Preferred Options process as they are considered to be of particular significance to the future operation of Oxford and as the Local Plan can at least assist in their delivery.

#### Opt 80: Supporting city-wide pedestrian and cycle movement

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<p><b>A) Preferred option (Combination of A + B + C + D):</b> Identify key links in the pedestrian and cycle network for completion or improvement and require these as part of development through site allocations.</p>	<p>This approach will benefit the general accessibility and thereby permeability of Oxford on foot and by bicycle which will encourage active travel. This in turn will increase the health of Oxford's residents and work force while also alleviating congestion by reducing use of private cars.</p> <p>Potential cycle routes to be introduced or improved are shown on the map below.</p>
<p><b>B) Preferred option (Combination of A + B + C + D):</b> Require developers to demonstrate how their proposals connect to the city pedestrian and cycle network.</p>	<p>This approach will mean that new developments are likely to have good connectivity for active travel which will both reduce car travel and associated congestion while also encouraging a healthy lifestyle. This approach would ensure that future development has good connectivity and provision for active travel modes.</p>
<p><b>C) Preferred option (Combination of A + B + C + D):</b> Require developers to demonstrate how their street design ensures a good walking environment.</p>	<p>This would apply to larger new developments that result in the creation of new streets, or that require significant new public realm improvements to existing streets. It will help to promote active travel through requiring developers to create an environment that makes walking an attractive option for residents/workers. The walking environment affects everyone's experience of moving around the city. As well as being a mode of travel in itself, walking is used to access other modes such as buses, trains, cars and cycles. The design of the pedestrian environment should ensure there is space for walking, passing, meeting and street furniture, aiming to make streets a place to spend time and enabling community cohesion, rather than focusing simply on them as somewhere for people to travel through.</p>
<p><b>D) Preferred option (Combination of A + B + C + D):</b> Require developers to demonstrate how their street design ensures a good cycling environment.</p>	<p>Improving the cycling environment will help to promote active travel through requiring developers to create an environment that makes cycling an attractive option for residents/workers.</p> <p>Good highway design is important so that people can cycle directly and be and feel safe, so that cycling becomes the chosen choice more often. As well as a connected network of routes, it is important that streets are designed to properly accommodate cyclists, and in many cases good cycle provision will require a dedicated cycle facility.</p>

Map 3: Potential local cycle routes to be implemented and improved. This would create a network of routes that connect to premium cycle routes and to main centres, transport hubs and areas of employment



© Crown Copyright and database right 2017. Ordnance Survey 100019348

### Opt 81: Supporting walking, cycling and public transport access to new developments

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<p><b>A) Preferred option (Combination of A + B):</b> Introduce a travel hierarchy to prioritise walking, cycling, then public transport, then electric vehicles and car share then car share/car clubs over private car use, for example by reallocating road space.</p>	<p>This option encourages sustainable forms of transport over other modes, reducing emissions and improving air quality. Including public transport as a priority alongside walking and cycling is likely to be more effective in terms of changing behaviour rather than focussing entirely on pedestrians and cyclists, as this will also help manage medium to longer distance travel, whereas walking and cycling is focused on much shorter distances. Public transport is inclusive as it offers a more sustainable mode for those with mobility issues. Additionally it offers a broader range of options for those that the policy is trying to tempt out of their cars.</p>
<p><b>B) Preferred option (Combination of A + B):</b> Require specific access measures to improve access by walking, cycling and public transport to allocated sites through their allocation policy.</p>	<p>The allocation policies for the larger sites (which is likely to include larger employment sites such as the Science Park and hospitals) offer an opportunity to identify site-specific access measures to address these issues alongside the more general policy. This would have significant benefits in terms of locally specific solutions and in terms of offering clarity for the developer. This is likely to include provision of new walking and cycling routes and access points that better connect to the wider transport network.</p> <p>Helping commuters to make sustainable travel choices is likely to be a key element of the strategy to change overall behaviours. Identifying specific improvements to the networks which link into areas of employment is likely to significantly assist with this aim. This could take the form of specific measures being identified in the site allocation policies for major areas of employment for example (this would be dependent on the options selected for those areas).</p>
<p><b>C) Alternative Option:</b> Do not include specific measures in site allocation policies but rely on general access and transport policies.</p>	<p>This approach would miss the opportunity to identify bespoke site specific solutions for traffic mitigation for the major sites in the city. Instead it would involve relying on the general policy approach, leaving such solutions for discussion at the planning application stage. It is likely to be more effective to identify a local issue/measure at the earliest possible stage ie. site allocation.</p>

### Opt 82: Tourist coaches

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<p><b>A) Preferred option:</b> Provide facilities just outside the city centre to the North/South for tourist coach drop off and pick up, with tourist coach parking provided at Park and Ride sites or other suitable locations that can be identified, likely to be on the edges of the city.</p>	<p>This option seems to strike a reasonable balance between supporting tourist access to the historic city centre and limiting the effect of tourism coaches on Oxford's arterial roads, assuming these facilities for coach drop-off points are suitably located. Additionally, this option will both protect the setting of the historic city core by limiting coach traffic through it while also permitting relatively easy access for visitors. It will be important that locations for drop off and pick up facilities are considered in conjunction with the zero emission study, as this will affect how far from the centre facilities can be located.</p>
<p><b>B) Alternative Option:</b> Only provide facilities at Park and Ride and ask tourist groups to use service buses as their connection into the city centre.</p>	<p>This approach would give the best outcome in terms of preserving the character of Oxford's city centre and limiting the detrimental effect tourist coaches have on the city centre. However, the feasibility of this option in terms of providing sufficient services for large tourist groups would be difficult to predict and manage and would likely impact on current users of these services. This solution could be less attractive to tourists and tour operators, although a dedicated, state-of-the-art bus showcasing zero-emission technology could help to make the proposition attractive for tourists.</p>
<p><b>C) Rejected Option:</b> Continue to provide facilities within the city centre for drop-off and pick-up.</p>	<p>This option reflects the current situation, which has a negative effect on the setting of Oxford's city centre as well as adding to the traffic on arterial roads. While this option grants tourists direct access to key visitor attractions, it does have significant negative effects to the local environment. It is likely to conflict with ambitions to introduce a zero emission zone in the city centre.</p>

### Opt 83: Scheduled coaches (i.e. long distance coaches to London and the airports)

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<p><b>A) Preferred option:</b> Assess whether there could be a change to where the scheduled coaches stop and circulate around the city centre, with the particular aim of avoiding the High Street.</p>	<p>This option does provide direct access to the city centre without needing to change bus, which will encourage visitors as well as improve the commuting possibilities both in and out of central Oxford. It will ensure those in east Oxford who are used to being able to board the bus easily will continue to do so, and it should mean no increase in people deciding to drive to the Park and Ride to access the bus. However, the impact of the very large coaches on the historic High Street is significant, so if an alternative route and termination point can be found, that would be highly beneficial. The Zero Emission Zone study recommendations will affect implementation of this approach; it is likely that any vehicle entering the city centre will need to be able to operate without creating emissions in the future.</p>
<p><b>B) Alternative Option:</b> Terminate scheduled coaches (those to London and potentially also those to the airports) at Thornhill Park and Ride to reduce number of vehicles in the city centre. Use other bus services to provide the link to the terminus. This option could allow coaches access into the city centre at night when normal services from the park and ride site and traffic levels in the city centre are both reduced.</p>	<p>The need to change buses, often twice for those intending to use scheduled coaches and not with access to existing bus services to Thornhill, would mean access use of scheduled coaches is less convenient, which may deter its usage for visitors and commuters. It may also encourage car use from within Oxford to the Park and Ride. However, passengers will be disembarked at a major transport hub which can provide quick access to the city centre. This option will offer significant benefits by cutting coach traffic from Oxford's arterial routes and the city centre. Coaches are the largest vehicles on city centre roads.</p>
<p><b>C) Alternative Option:</b> Reduce the number of intermediate stops between city centre and Thornhill Park and Ride to ease congestion on arterial routes, for example so buses don't stop in the High Street or St Clement's.</p>	<p>This will mean a continuation in volume of traffic along the London Road and High Street. It could ease congestion slightly by ensuring coaches are stopping less frequently while offering the continued benefits of having direct access to the city centre.</p>
<p><b>D) Alternative Option:</b> Find an alternative terminus within city but outside of city centre core.</p>	<p>This option would be dependent on a potential location being identified; no work has yet been done to see if there is any potential location. Depending on the locations of the coach terminus, this option could offer ease of access to the city centre while improving congestion issues. However, this may still cause traffic issues along Oxford's arterial roads due to maintained coach traffic.</p>

### Opt 84: Safeguarding Cowley branch line

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<p><b>A) Preferred option:</b> Safeguard land that would be required to deliver the potential expansion of the Cowley branch line into a passenger railway line and the potential new stations.</p>	<p>If the expansion of the line were to be achieved, it would benefit existing employers in the area, those who currently commute there and those who live in the area offering an attractive alternative sustainable travel option. It could also attract considerable investment into the area. This will also encourage the use of trains for long distance travel through connections via Oxford Railway Station as well as travel to central Oxford from areas to the south around Littlemore, which is a more sustainable option.</p>
<p><b>B) Rejected Option:</b> Do not include a policy to safeguard any land for the Cowley branch line.</p>	<p>If the opportunity to expand the Cowley branch line were lost then it could limit the potential investment in southern Oxford. Whilst the funding and timing of the delivery of a passenger line is currently uncertain, it would not be appropriate to release land that might be required for its delivery to other uses given the significance of the potential benefits of the line.</p>

## Parking

### *National Planning Policy says:*

- 7.15 A 2015 written statement to parliament be read alongside the NPPF said that: "Local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network." Paragraph 39 of the NPPF says that, if setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account the accessibility of the development, the nature of the development, the availability of public transport, local car ownership levels and an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.

### *The Oxford story – background evidence and the Sustainability Appraisal:*

- 7.16 Since the introduction of a low emission zone in Oxford in 2014 there have been improvements to air quality. However, levels of air pollution still exceed target levels in some areas, in particular in the city centre, at junctions on the ring-road and in the district centres. The city also suffers from areas of traffic congestion. The impacts of motorised traffic and also the need to make best use of land suggest low car parking levels are required.
- 7.17 Oxford's existing cycle and car parking standards have been compared to the comparable locations of Bath, Brighton, Bristol, Cambridge, York, Westminster and Islington. This comparison looked at residential and non-residential parking and other aspects of policy, for example how standards vary across areas. Car-free residential development is broadly supported in all comparison areas. Oxford's residential parking standards are broadly similar to the comparison areas. There are variations for non-residential parking standards, but Oxford's current standards for employment (office) use are generally quite high.
- 7.18 The SA highlighted how policies which limited the amount of car parking (whether that be residential, non-residential or public) would be likely to result in reduced reliance on car travel and hence have positive impacts on the SA objectives of human health, air pollution, and climate change. In addition such an approach would result in more land being available for the provision of priority uses such as housing or open space. However, the SA highlights potential negative impacts on the economy if levels are held too low and notes that Lower levels of residential car parking and 'car-free' developments may adversely impact less affluent households where dwelling occupancy levels may be higher than expected. It also notes however the impacts of this may be less significant in hub locations with good public transport links.

### *Responses to first steps consultation:*

- 7.19 The majority of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that number of car parking spaces should be limited in new residential developments (114 compared to 48 neutral and 64 disagree or strongly disagree). There were very similar results for the same question on limiting parking spaces in new workplaces. A few respondents commented that car free developments don't work for family housing, as families need a car. Other groups considered to need a car were also referred to, including midwives, tradesmen, disabled and elderly.

**The impacts of motorised traffic and also the need to make best use of land suggest low car parking levels are required.**



- 7.20 Several respondents were concerned that encouraging high-density housing will increase parking problems, although the comment was also made that less space should be given to cars. A few said that there should be less residential parking available if the development is located on a bus route and a few thought all encouragement should be given to reducing car use, including through parking restrictions.
- 7.21 Parking to support shops and leisure was seen as important and parking and a few respondents mentioned parking at the hospitals.

#### **Potential policy responses:**

- 7.22 Levels of car parking have a number of important impacts. Car parking uses land, and in a compact city such as Oxford where land is scarce and there are so many competing demands on the land, consideration should be given to minimising parking to ensure efficient use of that land. Different approaches will be needed for provision and management of different types of car parking. For example, private residential parking could be minimised through introduction of car-free development and car clubs; a workplace parking levy (currently being considered by the County Council) could help in minimising private workplace parking; and public parking could be restricted or repurposed for other uses.
- 7.23 Provision of parking spaces can affect the urban design and feel of a place. For larger developments with new streets, it would be expected that the majority of car parking would be unallocated car-parking on-street.
- 7.24 **Cycle and car parking levels in private developments**  
The Local Plan can set out the number of parking spaces permitted for new developments. Parking levels can influence urban design, efficient use of land and transport choices, so this is an issue that should be addressed in the Plan. To achieve this effect it is essential that there are viable alternatives, which is certainly the case across most of Oxford. A potential unintended effect of low or no car developments could be that surrounding streets are used for parking instead, creating a nuisance for local residents. This potential negative effect is mitigated if there is a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ). The Local Plan cannot implement CPZs, so options relate to whether they should be supported in the Plan.

**A potential unintended effect of low or no car developments could be that surrounding streets are used for parking instead, creating a nuisance for local residents.**

#### **Opt 85: Car parking standards – residential**

<b>Policy approach</b>	<b>Consequences of approach/discussion</b>
<p><b>A) Preferred option</b> (Combination of A + B + C): Set low maximum/optimum car parking standards. Allow 'car free' residential development across the city (as long as there is a CPZ).</p>	<p>The majority of the city has an excellent existing level of public transport provision, as well as good connectivity by walking and cycling, so car-free developments are feasible. Criteria could be included in the policy to ensure the development is well enough connected to support car free or low car housing, either by existing connections or provision of new connections. In a Controlled Parking Zone any potential negatives with unsociable parking in neighbouring streets can be avoided.</p> <p>A low standard for car parking provision means that a greater proportion of scarce land can be used for providing homes, and also avoids issues of parking creating poor urban design. Reduced car parking and therefore car ownership and car trips is likely to reduce air pollution and noise levels. Fewer cars using the roads improves the attraction of walking, cycling and play. The policy will need to allow or require some parking, for example for disabled and visitor parking, ensuring there are not negative consequences for accessibility for the elderly, disabled and vulnerable groups. This may not need to be allocated.</p>

	<p>'Car-free' residential developments should be considered in dense urban areas where residents are well served by public transport and can use sustainable travel options. Developers can choose not to provide private off-street parking places or a local authority may require a developer to comply with an agreement not to provide off-street parking as part of planning permission. Action by the local authority will be necessary to prevent on-street parking at that location, or overspill to nearby areas.</p> <p>High bike parking standards will be particularly important with this option, and sufficient provision for powered two-wheelers will also need to be considered.</p>
<p><b>B) Preferred option (Combination of A + B + C):</b> Require the provision of electric vehicle charging points on all homes with a private drive and a % on roads with unallocated parking.</p>	<p>A move towards cars with reduced or zero emissions will help mitigate continued car use. Requiring charging points to be provided is one way to help support their uptake and use. Current 'best practice' is to have at least one charging unit for each home with a dedicated parking space and at least 1 charging point per 10 unallocated spaces. There should also be appropriate cable provision to prepare for increased demand in future years.</p>
<p><b>C) Preferred option (Combination of A + B + C):</b> Include a policy that provision of car clubs will be supported.</p>	<p>Car-clubs can help enable people to give-up personal car ownership and promote the attractiveness of car-free or low-car developments. Provision of on-street or dedicated parking facilities could encourage car-clubs. Electric parking facilities at car club parking spaces could increase access and availability of electric cars. Car-club provision is likely to be strongly reliant on there being interest from a car club operator, and this will not be forthcoming in all locations.</p>
<p><b>D) Alternative Option:</b> Set fairly low maximum/optimum car parking standards. Allow 'car-free' residential development near to facilities and transport hubs and along public transport corridors only (in Controlled Parking Zones).</p>	<p>As most areas of Oxford have access to excellent public transport provision and access to walking and cycling networks, it is not necessary to limit car free developments to a few areas of the city; they will be viable in most areas.</p>
<p><b>E) Rejected Option:</b> Set low car parking standards for smaller units only.</p>	<p>The nature of the housing market in Oxford means that it is likely to be too simplistic to take this approach. This may not meet the needs of those living in smaller units who require parking. It would allow ownership of a car by families in larger units, but not by those in smaller units, which may be less affluent families or elderly for example.</p>
<p><b>F) Rejected Option:</b> Set higher maximum car parking standards similar to standards across the rest of Oxfordshire.</p>	<p>This would result in the least efficient use of land, and could lead to compromised design as space is made for parking. It would provide for those who require car use, but also enable car use where it is not necessary; it would not reflect the sustainable nature of Oxford and how accessible the city is.</p>

### Opt 86: Car parking standards – non-residential

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<p><b>A) Preferred option (Combination of A + B):</b> Set low maximum/optimum car parking standards. Allow low car development across the city (as long as there is a CPZ) and allow only low car (operational and disabled parking) development near to transport hubs.</p>	<p>The details of this approach would vary depending on the exact type of use, although the most important factor will be the location; uses that attract high numbers of people should be located in the city and district centres in order to reduce car travel because of their accessibility to highly sustainable travel networks and central position within wider residential areas. All retail development (including restaurants, take-aways, food and non-food retail), offices, research and development and industrial sites, conference centres, entertainment venues, leisure centres, libraries, community centres, halls and places of worship should be in accessible locations precisely so that there is minimal need for travel by car, and therefore parking.</p> <p>The hospitals have a particular need for visitor parking. The hospital locations in congested residential areas mean that increasing on-site car parking provision to meet all staff and visitor needs is not desirable. Other solutions including</p>

	innovative management approaches and provision of staff car parking away from the hospital sites should be considered. If site-specific policies are included for larger sites to cover a range of issues, there will be scope to promote rationalisation of parking provision on the hospital sites, for example into shared multi-storey car parks.
<b>B) Preferred option (Combination of A + B):</b> Require the provision of electric vehicle charging points on non-residential developments.	Policy could require, for example, that at least 10% of permitted parking at a non-residential development should have an electric charging point, with appropriate cable provision for expected increased demand in the future. A move towards cars with reduced or zero emissions will help mitigate continued car use. Requiring charging points to be provided is one way to help support their uptake and use, and charging points will be needed at destinations with car parking, as well as at homes.
<b>C) Rejected Option:</b> Set higher maximum car parking standards similar to other Oxfordshire districts' standards.	Oxford's standards for employment parking are already higher than other comparable locations such as Brighton, Bristol, Cambridge and York. Staff parking at the hospitals is similar to other locations, although visitor parking is more generous. In a city such as Oxford that suffers from traffic congestion, relaxing parking standards is not appropriate. More parking spaces will result in more people driving, which will worsen congestion and reduce air quality.

### Opt 87: Controlled parking zones (CPZ)

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<b>A) Preferred option:</b> Support introduction of CPZs in areas of the city not covered currently, so that the whole city is covered by CPZs.	The Local Plan cannot require a CPZ - it will remain a decision to be taken by the County Council as Local Highway Authority. However, this option would give support and encouragement of an approach which would reduce the number of vehicles entering the city unless they need to and enable low parking across the city. This would help to encourage travel by means other than the car.
<b>B) Alternative Option:</b> Do not include a policy on CPZs.	With this option, the County Council may still decide to introduce CPZs to cover areas of the city that currently remain without one, but the opportunity will not be taken to promote this and to show the potential of CPZs to bring positive benefits in conjunction with other policies.

### Opt 88: Cycle parking standards – residential

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<b>A) Preferred option (Combination of A + B):</b> Require high levels of residential cycle parking.	This option will help to encourage cycling, which brings positive benefits in terms of air quality, congestion, greenhouse gas emissions and encouraging active and healthy communities.
<b>B) Preferred option (Combination of A + B):</b> Require specific facilities to facilitate cycle parking – e.g. secure, indoor storage for all new dwellings.	This will help to ensure that new homes meet the needs of those wanting to travel by bike, and make it easier and more attractive for people who wish to travel by bike. A requirement to provide indoor cycle storage may reduce the amount of outdoor amenity space on schemes or impact on indoor space, although separate policy requirements to ensure good standards of provision would help mitigate this.
<b>C) Rejected Option:</b> Lower the standards for residential cycle parking from existing levels.	Lower levels of cycle parking may make it more difficult for people to travel by bike, so there will be reduced benefits in terms of air quality, congestion, greenhouse gas emissions and encouraging active and healthy communities.

### Opt 89: Cycle parking standards – non-residential

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<b>A) Preferred option (Combination of A + B):</b> Includes minimum standards for non-residential cycle parking set at a high level (likely to be an increase from existing).	Requiring sufficient cycle parking at destinations could further encourage cycling, with associated health and environmental benefits and increasing accessibility of essential services and facilities. This option links particularly strongly to the option to minimise non-residential car parking.

	However, there are currently not enough cycle parking facilities in the city centre and district centres, so greater cycle parking at new destinations within these areas as well as in other locations is required. Oxford already has lower levels of cycle parking requirements at hospitals than other comparable cities, and the ambition to manage traffic generation from the hospitals should be matched with increases in cycle parking provision.
<b>B) Preferred option (Combination of A + B):</b> Require specific types of cycle parking provision and facilities at major employment destinations to facilitate cycle parking e.g. showers and lockers.	Showers are currently required for offices of over 500m <sup>2</sup> and most other uses over 2500m <sup>2</sup> . Similar thresholds are likely to be used. This option helps to make active travel to non-residential destinations attractive and feasible. Good cycle parking facilities, such as covered and enclosed areas that are also easily accessible, sited appropriately will help to encourage cycling commutes.
<b>C) Rejected Option:</b> Lower the standards for non-residential cycle parking from existing.	This option is not sensible when there are already reported issues with a shortage of parking, and especially with an aspiration to increase cycling in the city in order to reduce congestion and improve air quality and health.

### 7.25 Public parking

The availability of public parking facilities will influence the way people travel to centres. A set of options is included for off-street public car parks. There will be those who need to drive or who drive to access certain areas at certain times and for particular types of trips and. The needs of people to access services, and the provision of sufficient parking to ensure the operation and vibrancy of centres, must be balanced against the negative effects of car traffic generation.

7.26 Achieving a step-change in the proportion of people cycling in the city will require increased provision of public cycle parking, particularly in the city centre and at district centres. This can't easily be influenced through local plan policies; therefore, options around public cycle parking have not been included. However, where it is relevant to specific site allocations it can be incorporated into those policies.

### Opt 90: Off-street public car parking

Policy approach	Consequences of approach/discussion
<b>A) Preferred option:</b> Don't allow additional off-street public parking spaces in the city centre and district centres.	This option relates to existing permanent spaces in public car parks. It offers the most efficient use of land, as no additional land would be lost to car parking. It avoids increasing negative effects of parking in terms of sense of place and character and it encourages people to travel by other modes, including active travel. Any potentially negative impacts on centres where car parking is found will be minimised if alternative travel forms are readily available and efficient. Minimising car traffic will improve congestion and thus the attractiveness of other travel modes.
<b>B) Rejected Option:</b> Do not limit new off-street public parking spaces in any location.	This option may appear to potentially support provision of essential services and facilities in district centres and the city centre, but the resulting increased car journeys, congestion and air pollution will seriously outweigh any benefits. However, increased car journeys will also have a negative impact on congestion and air quality, which can discourage people from using centres anyway.
<b>C) Rejected Option:</b> Select locations with potential demand for new off-street public parking and allow new public parking spaces in those locations.	This option could potentially lead to increasing amounts of land being lost to parking, although this could be minimised if new spaces were required to be provided on-street, underground or in decked parking. It may have a positive impact on the accessibility of essential services and facilities, especially where there are limited alternative options. However, it would also lead to an increase in car traffic.