

Comments on WODC revisions to Local Plan

Sarah Couch 9 November 2017

Main comments:

- **Both the [Cabinet report](#) and the [Sustainability Appraisal \(SA\)](#) Further Addendum Report October 2017 (appendix 3 (full)) **quote the support of the ENP as one of the main reasons for making no changes to the Garden Village and West Eynsham SDA**- ignoring the fact that (ENP p 7) *'By law, the ENP has to fit into the planning context set by the West Oxfordshire Local Plan Eynsham is required (NPPF 184) to accept the total number of new homes allocated to the parish, although residents have been shocked as this number has risen from 250 to 3200 while the ENP has been in progress. ... supporting reasons to make its case for focussing development north of the A40 in the first instance and protecting a particularly valuable open space to the south-west of the village'*.
It seems Eynsham has been very successfully manipulated and penalised for being so diligent in preparing a NP. The ENP is used selectively and, I think, misleadingly.**
- [Appendix 3](#) concludes there are **no reasonable alternatives to the GV and W Eynsham** despite commenting at length on a range of issues (see below).
- Updated plans and appendices **NO CHANGE** see Figure 9.15b – West Eynsham SDA – **still includes land south of Chilbridge**
- [Appendix 1](#): Schedule of Suggested Further Main Modifications (FMM) **NO CHANGES affecting Eynsham, Carterton or Hanborough despite looking at alternatives** (see below).
- The Eynsham sites are also preferred due to proximity to Oxford and the planned **Park and Ride**, which virtually no-one thinks is the answer to the worsening A40. **This seems to be seen as more of a positive than proximity to Hanborough Station** (10 minutes to Oxford and less carbon). Thus the potential site next to Hanborough station as an alternative to W Eynsham is dismissed partly due to the impact on the on the A4095, although otherwise impacts are similar to W Eynsham. The Enfusion SA report ([Appendix 3](#),) p 197 now acknowledges that development would have an effect on traffic levels on the A40, with an increase in journey times during the morning and evening peaks.
- **The option of splitting West Eynsham with Hanborough is assessed as having less negative impacts, but is dismissed** because a smaller development in W Eynsham would not provide the western spine road- which is opposed in the ENP. This ignores ENP 14.9 'Expansion south of the Chilbridge Road could have an adverse impact on the setting of the village' and ENP p49 REC17C Creation of a Link Road and development south of Chilbridge Road have significant drawbacks ... Eynsham Parish Council considers that the harm due to the loss of such a significant area of green space so close to the village with ready public footpath access outweighs any benefit ...'
- The Enfusion SA report ([Appendix 3](#)) looks at alternatives to the GV and W Eynsham, but the assessment methodology (in Appendix C, p 191 of pdf) is unclear and looks woolly and subjective with a great number of uncertain impacts, meaning its conclusions do not look rigorous. Some issues eg the lost medieval village receives

no mention nor other heritage issues apart from listed buildings. Other issues such as the recycling plant and loss of good agricultural land (GV and W Eynsham) are noted in the narrative but either dismissed or given 'minor negative' or uncertain value. eg the impact on health is seen as major positive despite acknowledging the recycling facility and increases in pollution. Barnard Gate and Eynsham are assessed as roughly equal; but land ownership is more complex north of Eynsham.

- [Appendix 3](#) page 193 Appendix C (alternatives to GV) plan of current control by landowners consortium- significant gaps, but does not appear to be seen as an issue.
- [Appendix 3](#) page 221 Appendix D1 (alternatives to W Eynsham) notes major negative impacts on soil and water in W Eynsham.
- Non strategic sites - new assessment of 13 additional non-strategic site options (referred to as 'grey sites'). 'The majority of sites being negative in terms of the efficient use of land as a result of them comprising greenfield land and due to the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land.' These negatives also apply to the Eynsham sites.
- **NB Appendix 3 Sustainability Appraisal Further Addendum Report October 2017 will be published for a four-week period of public consultation.**

Some [Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan](#) policies which apparently will not be satisfied:

- ENP ENV 8 A new Garden Village (p8):
ENV1-7 shall be shared by the new settlement, which shall be built according to Garden Village principles as a new, separate, community but WODC admitted at the hearing that it would **not** be a separate settlement
- ENP 4a Enhancing Biodiversity (p19)
G All new development shall result in demonstrable net bio-diversity gain for the neighbourhood area.
I Development shall seek to protect 'Best and Most Versatile' agricultural land (see ENP14 I).
Neither the GV site nor W Eynsham satisfy these- but Appendix 3 Appendix C & D note wildlife interest at City Farm LWS and loss of high grade agricultural land.