

Pre-submission Consultation Feedback Report

Summary and purpose :

This document presents the feedback Eynsham Futures Steering Group (EFSG) has received to its emerging Neighbourhood Plan.

Successive versions of the plan were made available to local groups and individual residents through the Parish Council website from August 2016 and residents were asked to review and comment with articles in Eynsham News and at events such as that held on October 5th.

The plan went through a number of iterations, partly in response to this feedback but also to reflect the changing planning context following the announcement of WODC's expression of interest in a garden Village and then their allocation of a substantial additional number of houses west of Eynsham when their updated local plan was re-published for public consultation.

Pre-submission consultation with various landowners and statutory bodies began in December through to January 2017 and the responses are included in this document also.

The names of respondents are held as a separate list to protect individuals anonymity.

The left-hand column records the comments received. The right-hand column records EFSG's reply including references to the relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies which have been adjusted where the comment has highlighted an opportunity to improve the Plan.

EFSG thanks all those who responded for their constructive and helpful comments which have allowed us to significantly improve the Eynsham Neighbourhood plan.

Some references may be slightly in error as significant changes to the Plan had to be introduced following the proposal of an alternative Garden Village site in an adjacent parish during the consultation period. References in earlier replies may be slightly out of sync with the latest ENP version.

ENP comments received

<p>CF no. 1.</p>	<p>Date: 27/08/2016; ENP draft 0.9</p>
<p>ENP5- climate change -Housing standards- could you mention SUDS?</p>	<p>SUDS will be compulsory (I am assured) under WODC Local Plan anyway so not strictly necessary to repeat in ENP; have added ENP2.13 as you are not the first to mention the point though.</p>
<p>ENP 7 Transport: Can the plan stress more the need for good public transport and well maintained cycle/walking connections to Hanborough and Oxford (and Witney), as well as connections to the village? This will obviously help the village centre congestion too. Maarten made some good suggestions on this. I note that the Park and Ride could include a service to Hanborough which would be great, and also that CIL (18.2) could be used on the community path. I support that option very strongly. One good thing about the huge garden village idea is the cycle route to Hanborough- I would definitely use it – the current road is far too dangerous. Tackling congestion and provision of alternatives to the roads must be a pre-requisite of any development. I have often thought restricting the right turn from the A40 traffic lights would help the Acre End Street/High street congestion problem. Or a western bypass....</p>	<p>Our focus has been on things we can deliver not just support. The need for cycle routes on all new links roads is in the ENP but we cannot insist on these elsewhere – but we can suggest CIL money could be used. A cycle route beside Lower Road will be mentioned in the Site Options and a cycle path is also proposed to the P&R from where a Hanborough Station bus looks a good prospect. A western bypass would be one of the benefits of Option W2 but the same bypass will ensure that land south of Chilbridge Road is built on which is not our preferred option. Preventing residents turning into Witney Road will force those living on the western side of the village to use Spareacre Lane or Mill St/Acre End St routes – through traffic <i>should</i> use the Eastern Bypass to the Southern Industrial zone but it is blocked by the Toll Bridge queues! Most traffic problems in village seem to be caused by parking, lost HGVs or buses.</p>
<p>ENP 13 Trees- one thing I feel very strongly is the lack of trees (or much public open space) in Eynsham; also the general approach of developers and LAs to provide small ornamentals rather than the traditional forest scale trees which give historic and rural character. Can there be a requirement for forest scale street trees in new development on the edge of the village?</p>	<p>Public open space is limited in Eynsham. Often the only 'green' is the remaining mature trees. We haven't been specific about tree types except for 'appropriateness' of planting; sometimes a non-native type may be more appropriate and we try not to be too prescriptive. WODC does have a very good tree expert who won't let anything unsuitable through the planning stage. Of course 'forest scale' trees are native species which have been growing for 50 years and we do have a problem in places where badly chosen trees have got so big in 30 years that they have had to be cut down which is very depressing and another 'inappropriate' planting we want to avoid.</p>
<p>I strongly support policies to improve the public realm- far too often given too little attention in the UK. As well as street trees, and green-space, can you include something about the roundabouts? CIL money and /or a policy? I suppose Highways are responsible but what a terrible entrance to Eynsham they form. I am always appalled at the basic maintenance (cut almost everything down once a year) and now even more appalled that they have also felled the good small rowans which did not affect sight lines. What can we do?</p>	<p>CIL money will be directed to some public realm projects and we do make some stipulations about green space. Roundabouts are a real problem for the Parish Council – even when a sponsor is available OCC have been unwilling to agree until recently but it isn't something the ENP can control. We have stipulated a maintenance plan with local representation for all green infrastructure that goes with developments but I don't think we can apply this to</p>

	roundabouts.
Design- there is mention of aesthetically pleasing design- very hard to define and can lead to Prince Charles style pastiche. There is a place for innovative modern design- although I note mention of modern design in 2.8. How about suggesting RIBA run design competitions for development over a certain size to encourage excellence and proper place making?	There is a disparaging references to 'pastiche' in the current text. The nearest we have got to a recognised standard for design is The Built-for-Life (BfL12) which we 'encourage' developers to aspire to. If they get a 'green' commendation (as opposed to 'red' – not eco-green) in all 12 design categories they achieve a national award/commendation but it isn't clear if this is enough of a spur to them. Latest White Paper (Feb.2017) also recommends use of BfL12
No mention of landscape character assessment- is this covered by WODC planning? I think it important that the historic landscape character is documented, understood and protected in the way that any new development fits into the landscape- not just a visual assessment (LVIA). Retention and planting of 'correct' trees and hedgerows important here, as you mention.	WODC would normally do this, along with an SEA. Some strengthening of policy seen in ENP3b. As you say we do mention the typical 'hedgerows with a few mature trees' landscape which provides wildlife corridors as well as a visually pleasing countryside.
Can large new development be required to offer improved sports provision as well as general greenspace for the village?	The general requirement is that facilities should be provided in proportion and ENP 3Hexplicitly requires land to be made available for all such facilities where necessary.
ENP14-E says up to 750 new homes but 14.11 suggests 750 people- is that right? Need for minor edits/typos etc- assume you have that covered.	No, this is a mistake. The two 750 figures are correct but they are not referring to the same thing. Objective of this para is to show what rate Eynsham has been able to absorb people in the past – just under 100% increase in 40 years. That's 37% in 15 years or 1650 from current levels, about 750 homes at 2.2 people per household – so 750 houses is similar to what we have done in the past and an indication that this figure is reasonable although many more homes would be more problematic.
Much that I thoroughly support- e.g. Green corridors for pedestrians/cycling, provision of self build sites, (what about larger co-housing sites too, could also be self build), allotment provision, burial grounds (inc green burial?), emphasis on green infrastructure, high environmental standards for new build/passive house (hope this can really be enforced outside the 5 year restriction, or better within it!), idea of residents' parking and parking time restrictions in some areas	Provision of different tenures (e.g. co-housing) is encouraged but I don't think we have authority to insist. We haven't been prescriptive about the burial site – not really a decision for the NP team but there is nothing to prevent it either

CF no. 2.	Date: 02/09/2016 – draft of v1.0 submitted for proof-reading
02 The village A lot of the suggestions in this next bunch are due to the fact that the ancient	

<p>nature of Eynsham is not set out clearly in this introduction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • p.3 para 1 should add that Eynsham was founded in the 11th Century and grew during medieval times up to the present day. • P3 para 3 photo of the scene described could be added here. • P3 para 4 add date of Toll bridge construction • P3 para 4 there is some dualling of A40 between Witney and Eynsham – could say ‘remains largely single carriageway’ • P4, para 3 add photo of this view • P4, para 4 link reference to classic medieval town to Eynsham’s own earlier and medieval development • P4 map include view into village from the Fishponds. Also the footpaths and bridleways are not clear – do we have a better quality map? Could the Village phasing start with the 11th century - 1914 	<p>Abbey founded 1005 added</p> <p>opened 1769 added wording changed</p> <p>Key notes 'pre-1914' development, anything else is too complicated</p>
<p>04 Policies</p> <p>p6 1.1 this is the third time I have pointed out that young families who want open-market starter homes (i.e., who are not on waiting lists for social housing) should be added to the 3 groups in this section. The evidence is very strong for this group, so I don’t know why, Richard, you never add it in!!</p> <p>p.7 Note B – should the DIY be added to third bullet point as it is in the 300 metres I imagine and is a village hub.</p> <p>The 300m diameter central zone not shown on Map 1 as stated in Note B.</p> <p>P17 9.1 Include photo of parking hazards –</p>	<p>Fourth category added</p> <p>While it is well used this was considered in the same category as pet/car accessory shop in Mill Street.</p> <p>The maps have all been updated in the new version.</p> <p>There are a limited number of photos in the current version. Pictures tend to be of extremes which won't play well at examination.</p>

<p>CF no. 3.</p>	<p>Date: 02/09/2016. ENP v1.0 dated 09/08/2016 – confidentially pre-released to WODC for their comments before publication</p>
<p>Please find attached comments from Chris Hargraves, Joseph Walker, Dene Robson, Mel Dodd (our ecologist), Phil Shaw and myself on the draft Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan. Some of these are in the form of tracked changes and some are comments in the margin. (Formatting seems to have gone awry in places!)</p> <p>We welcome the recognition that Eynsham is going to change and your wish to be involved in this change and strongly influence it, rather than focusing on</p>	<p>Over 120 individual comments and corrections submitted as 'recorded changes'. All have been addressed and (two) replies sent back to WODC for further comment.</p> <p>Many comments accepted as received as improving the ENP.</p> <p>Numbers of cases where the particular circumstances of Eynsham (almost no 'in-fill' opportunities but 2 very large sites for possible allocation) has coloured the wording of some policies</p>

resisting it. Dene said it was refreshing that the plan is looking at the 'bigger picture', including the knowledge spine and the proposals for the A40.	
The supporting text often introduces new policy statements and goes well beyond the justification for the policies themselves. In some instances more is said in the supporting text than the policy. The general approach should be that the policy requirements are clearly stipulated in policy, with the rationale and reasoned justification set out in the supporting text. Put simply, the really important stuff should be in the policy.	The policy statements (in blue boxes) are the essence of the policy. The rest of the text supports the policy by providing examples and details as to how the policy is to be interpreted. It could be argued that all the numbered paragraphs are also part. In some cases an extra policy or recommendation has been added or used to replace an explanation
More clarity is needed in lots of places about what scale of development certain policy requirements apply to. Often it is inferred that it is all development that will be expected to do something and yet in the case of single dwellings etc. much of what is being asked for will not be achievable.	The wording reflects the particular position of Eynsham. The wording has been amended to cover developments of a much smaller scale (even though there are few possibilities). In each case this has been possible without altering the nature of the policy as applicable to the large sites that are a feature of developments for Eynsham.
The plan includes a number of very subjective statements and assertions which should be amended.	These have been addressed.
A central theme is restricting development to 1.2km from the village centre - this tends to be too simplistic. e.g. the Plan recognises that there is not a commercial centre as such to the village and that services and facilities are scattered. Also, actual distance, perceived distances, physical barriers (such as the A40), means of transport and the purpose of a journey all influence this distance.	The argument is closely made – and extra explanation added in the Q&A of Appendix C – and we think is defensible. After all, the establishment of 'settlement envelopes' is part of WODC practice so as to define 'open countryside' as opposed to 'urban' areas; we think the ENP makes a very objective case for setting the limit for Eynsham. Some of the wording has been changed to make it less prescriptive while focussing on 1000m as the target and 1200m as acceptable but beyond that an 'exceptional' case must be made.
Has any consideration been given to social enterprise e.g. for retention of community facilities (policy ENP8)	No, this wasn't considered part of an NDP. Local businesses all seem to be doing reasonably well and should be helped by extra people in the village. The Children's Centre (ex- Sure Start) is the most likely candidate for closure and there have been thoughts along these lines but no workable business case has emerged
We've had some debate as to whether the spatial policies should be set out before the land use policies – no conclusion!	No wish to change so left as-is.
Our ecologist is keen to see more reference to biodiversity which could be fitted into all policy sections, including Climate Change! 'More should be achieved through the business (retail, industry) and education sectors, etc.	This sounds interesting and would be a popular addition the the ENP as many people are concerned about the loss of habitat and of one or two more bio-diverse sites (although none is officially recognised as significant)

<p>Biodiversity is not just for biodiversity's sake, it is also for our sake and impacts upon our physical and mental health, wellbeing and enjoyment of the outdoors. Loads of research out there about the positive effects of trees and green spaces on the mental health of teenagers, as well as the rest of us. Mainstreaming biodiversity is a key concern for conservation efforts nationally. Biodiversity and wildlife should definitely be mentioned in the section on Local Green Spaces (LGS) and policy ENP12. The separate document about LGS does mention wildlife as one of the "criteria" used to designate/allocate these spaces ("Richness of wildlife"). The importance of green spaces for wildlife in an urban /semi-rural context is high and the allocation of LGS is an opportunity to identify and recognise those spaces that provide key wildlife habitats as well as for the enjoyment of local people.'</p>	<p>This will have to wait until the next revision – what would be useful is some suggestions for changes which have been worked though with other planning officers to make sure they are relevant to a NDP</p>
<p>It is probably best for the plan to avoid the site options type issues at least for now given our proposals are at an early stage. It is not appropriate for example to be trying to determine access arrangements for a western expansion or northern garden village.</p>	<p>Currently we intend to offer an assessment of the sites available with a view to informing the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan which will allocate sites. We do think the ENP has a role in establishing how development will occur which includes the important issue of traffic through the village – both during and after construction</p>

Comments 1 to 3 were received before the release of V1.0 and were therefore included in that version.

<p>CF no. 4.</p>	<p>Date: 14/09/2016 - ENP v1.0</p>
<p>Respondent is concerned about the possible loss of mature trees along the northern border with the Primary School and the possibility of using the school site as an extension of Dovehouse Close should the school be rebuilt elsewhere.</p> <p>He also notes that the Eastern Bypass (B4449) is not listed with other 'main access roads' in ENP 7A, ENP7.2</p> <p>They additionally requests that the following statement be added to ENP6.7:</p> <p>The Disposal of School Land and Playing Field Land requires appropriate Public and Council Consultation at the time, as does a Planning Application for the site.</p>	<p>Will make clear that reference in ENP 13 refers to the 'entire' belt of trees along the northern edge of the Primary School site.</p> <p>Typo which incorrectly lists road as B4049 is now corrected.</p> <p>As ENP 6.7 doesn't really add anything in an environment where there is already a presumption for sustainable development, the paragraph will be removed. (ENP 7A and 7.2 will still be in place to ensure that access to any site covered by the ENP should be from external roads such as the B4449)</p>
<p>CF no. 5.</p>	<p>Date: 16/09/2016 - older version ENP v0.8 dated 02/06/2016</p>
<p>The county council is the only body with a statutory duty to ensure sufficient school places.</p> <p>Eynsham Partnership Academy (EPA) is currently the sole provider of education in the village, but this situation could change. The sponsorship of any new school is a decision for the Regional Schools Commissioner, who might approve EPA to run any new school but might also choose to increase choice and diversity by approving a different sponsor for any new school.</p> <p>Likewise, any expansion of an academy has to be agreed by the Regional Schools Commissioner, and expansion onto a satellite site is specifically considered a potentially contentious proposal which will need a full business case.</p> <p>It cannot, therefore, at this stage be confirmed that any future expansion of education capacity would be under the control of EPA, nor can we be sure at this stage that secondary school expansion would be through a satellite site, or specifically a new sixth form centre (as opposed to a new establishment) even if this is the local aspiration.</p> <p>As such the NP needs to allow for other potential solutions. The Eynsham Partnership Academy trust itself may not stay as it is –i.e. it could change name,</p>	<p>Education section will be re-written to correct this.</p>

merge with another trust, etc. Potentially naming the EPA specifically could cause difficulties later down the line.	References to the EPA are to the current provider. It might be noted that OCC may be abolished during the currency of the ENP which would also cause potential issues!
CF no. 6.	Date: 16/09/2016 - ENP v0.8 dated 02/06/2016
Multiple comments supplied as marked-up version of the ENP	<i>Actioned where practical</i>
CF no. 7.	Date: 19/09/2016 - ENP v1.0
<p>The 77 dwellings on the old Nursery site will inevitably add to traffic congestion within the village, and to tailbacks along Witney Road to access the A40. It will also increase the pressure on existing facilities including shops, schools, and the doctors' surgery.</p> <p>I think development north of the A40 is preferable, but ONLY with a realignment of the A40. Whether such development is a smaller, integrated development or a Garden Village should be equally conditional on such realignment, leaving the current route for local traffic and buses. The only way Eynsham could retain its present character would be if the new village was entirely self-supporting, including provision for a new secondary school.</p> <p>The additional traffic that such a development would generate would make dualling the A40 inevitable, and that would be much better done away from Eynsham, north of the new development.</p> <p>The plans for the Park and Ride and bus lane include a number of crossing points, some pedestrian controlled. These seem likely to slow the flow of traffic even more than is currently the case; it would be far better to encourage crossings of a road that was not the main route from west to east, and direct traffic further north, where it could flow unimpeded.</p>	<i>This is a summary of the comments made</i>
CF no. 8.	Date: 25/09/2016 - ENP v1.0
Realised that section SA4.8 and 4.9 had not been updated to reflect the conclusions noted in the Site Assessment document referenced after SA4.11.	The conclusions of the Site Assessment have been edited into section SA4.8 and 4.9

There was an error during editing.	
------------------------------------	--

CF no. 9.	Date: 12/10/2016 - ENP v1.0, Vision and ENP 1
<p>Vision for Eynsham 2031 is inadequate – development north of the A40 should be self-contained in terms of health, education etc leaving Eynsham as it currently stands to prevent it becoming a small town. All large developments should be north of the A40 – this should be included in the Vision.</p> <p>Eynsham primary school is near capacity and GP surgery already pressed – should be specifically highlighted in the vision – no new developments without new/additional provision of these.</p> <p>ENP1D doesn't make sense – seems to offer an exception when the houses are in character with their setting. There should be no exception to the 1200 m rule, we wish to keep Eynsham compact only allowing infill and diverting new large developments to the north</p>	<p>It's true the Visions were set out before the 'separate settlement' idea was floated but when it was, the visions seemed adequate to cover both the existing and new settlements on the basis of the first paragraph that new and existing residents shall enjoy the same benefits as now which must mean an increase of the facilities to match the population.</p> <p>ENV 8 to stress the importance of implementing the ideals set out in the DCLG prospectus for a Garden Village has been added.</p> <p>There is a typo in ENP1D – it will say 'Exceptions shall only be made for properties where being further away from the centre is justified and that they are in character with their location can be demonstrated. Two examples are given in ENP1.8 and 9. It has been made clear to us that 1200m (or any other non-negotiable distance) would not be acceptable in planning policy terms and our clearly argued case is there as a strong guide to anyone making future planning decisions.</p>

CF no. 10.	Date: 12/10/2016 - ENP v1.0, ENP10, ENP16, SA3
<p><i>These items are taken from a wide-ranging review of the NP and its context:</i></p> <p>Vision should add a reference to affordable housing for local people and remove reference to the Knowledge Spine, just referring to 'reflecting Eynsham's location near Oxford'</p> <p>ENP10 – given the extent of unsold/unlet employment land, why can't it be considered for science use. Why can't a small proportion (< 20%) be used for residential purposes, e.g. teachers, hotel/conference staff.</p>	<p>Issues of 'affordability' and housing specifically for local people are both constrained by national legislation. We do note the need for both and offer possibilities such as rural exception sites in ENP1.10 and ENP1.4 offers the possibility of waiving the normal 'affordable housing' rules, which have emphasised social housing, to ensure housing is available for workers in local businesses or institutions. The Knowledge Spine is a well-known concept – we will have to change the wording as Eynsham (or any of West Oxfordshire) is not included in this area on maps that show it.</p> <p>'Science use' would be included in employment use anyway.</p> <p>There is an option to use some employment land for residential where it directly supports employment operations in both ENP18.2 and ENP10.1</p> <p>Teachers and other 'key workers' have some provision made within national policy which applies anyway; hotel staff accommodation would be an example of</p>

<p>ENP16.3 I do not understand how an improved section of lower road can reduce congestion for all concerned.</p> <p>SA3.6 Realigning the A40 north of the Millennium Wood will negate the purpose of the Wood as natural habitat and a dual carriageway will not resolve the traffic problems.</p>	<p>something in direct support of employment activity.</p> <p>It could be expressed better! Access to a northern development is proposed via an improved Lower Road to the Eynsham Roundabout rather than direct to the A40 to try and minimise the disruption to through traffic flow on the A40 while increasing the capacity of this part of Lower Road.</p> <p>Perhaps best to say nothing as this ought to be something for professional road-planner to decide but this doesn't seem to happen in many cases where no attempt is made to upgrade local roads for better access.</p> <p>The ideal situation for habitat to have continuity between 'green' areas is noted in ENP4.3. It is possible to minimise the impact by road-side planting but ultimately a trade-off between ideal wild-life habitat and keeping four or six lanes of A40 next to the rear of houses of Spareacre Lane will have to be made. The ENP asks that the opportunity to dual the A40 be retained on the basis that both modal transfer (to P&R buses) and the use of cars for longer-distance commuting will be required to resolve the A40's congestion problems.</p>
---	--

<p>CF no. 11.</p>	<p>Date: 25/09/2016 - ENP v1.0 (ENP17)</p>
<p>For the western extension, please ensure that all existing trees and hedgerows are retained to screen the existing residencies from the new developments.</p>	<p>The need for planting to screen properties by retaining or adding extra planting is included in ENP4</p>

<p>CF no. 12.</p>	<p>Date: 21/11/2016 - ENP v1.0 (ENP16)</p>
<p>The latest version of the NP as presented at the public exhibition last Saturday seeks to consider the implications of the WODC proposal for the promotion of a Garden Village to the north of Eynsham. Whilst I agree that it is appropriate for the NP to take this proposal into account it needs to do so in a way that reflects the opportunity and issues that it presents.</p> <p>In terms of opportunities, it represents an opportunity to take pressure off the further expansion of the existing village to the west, by limiting it to the northern section shown on your plan and delete the area to the south which is sensitive in terms of its impact on the wider countryside and loss of access to the countryside. This also has problems in the need to complete a western bypass as well as being more distant from facilities.</p>	<p>Extensive redrafting of ENP16 has been done and these issues have largely been addressed.</p>

Therefore, if there is an overall need being identified in the local plan to provide in aggregate c. 3200 dwelling units in and around Eynsham, then it should be split between the northern part of area to the west (as shown at your exhibition) and the rest allocated to the area to the north of the A40. In my suggested reworking of the policy I have included a figure of 2750 (on the basis of 450 being in the western extension) but this will need to be double checked.

However it is important that this done in a way that does not prejudice the proper planning in detail of the areas. This is particularly important given that the WODC have not done (or presented the results) of the technical analysis that is required, include traffic impact assessment, EIA, design coding. It is important that the indicative layouts submitted by WODC to CLG are not given undue status., for example the layout of roads and development areas.

At this stage the NP, if it going to do anything , should only give conditional support to the principle of development which should then be subject to a full consultative master planning exercise based on a brief which has been itself subject to consultation and approval by the WODC and NPF . The NP should also set the parameters which would form the context for the brief in terms of how the area would be served in principle in terms of transport and other hard infrastructure, social and community facilities and the development of the green network within which it should be developed, as well as the design principles. These principles are reflected in my suggested rewording of the policy ENP 16

REVISED DRAFT POLICY ENP 16 : EYNSHAM NORTHERN EXTENSION AREA

The Eynsham Northern Extension Area shall be protected so that it remains available for residential development in the future for up to 2750 residential units and associated educational, cultural and social facilities New homes in this area would need to be fully integrated with the existing village to ensure new residents share the full benefit of living in Eynsham and have no adverse impact on the functioning of the A40 as the primary link between West Oxfordshire as a whole and the city of Oxford and beyond.

The Eynsham Northern Extension area shall be developed in accordance with master plan approved by WODC and in consultation with the NPF. Requirements for supporting infrastructure and services shall be established through the master plan and, where necessary, through legally binding agreements. These

<p>requirements include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Integration with the existing communities, in particular Eynsham village • Vehicular access to any development north of the A40 shall only be made using existing junctions on the A40. • Planning decisions for one side of the A40 shall not be made without due consideration of the impact on residents on the other side. • linkage to the existing and planned extensions to the fixed public transport network or Park and Ride facilities; • Make provision for the re-alignment of the A40 as indicated on Diagram X • Creation and management of interconnected green-spaces and where necessary the enhancement of the adjacent Green Belt; • The long-term quality and stability of any new urban boundary; • Associated infrastructure improvements and flood management requirements; • Green transport. links (including walking, cycling and public transport) to employment areas and village centres; • In particular, safe and direct crossing places of the A40 shall be provided for students required to attend Bartholomew School before development begins. • A wide range of mixed uses and housing types, tenures and choice; • Delivering high design standards in the built environment and urban form; • Provision of adequate social and community facilities, including educational, religious and cultural, and, if necessary a neighbourhood centre 	
---	--

<p>CF no. 13.</p>	<p>Date: 04/12/2016 - ENP v1.0 (ENP17)</p>
<p>Vision adequate NO</p> <p>Protect our strong community spirit and identity through retaining our rural, village character (also proposed by a resident at the October 5th 2016 meeting and getting affirmative responses from many of the 200+ attendees)</p> <p>Richard, community spirit is the largest theme in the Launch data but the term does not appear anywhere in this document. I have my 'referendum' hat on</p>	<p>The word community appears in both of the opening paragraphs and the text describes what that community is – but the word 'spirit' does not appear. 'Identity' and 'rural character' have been a feature of 01 and 02 but it is possible to reword the second part of the second introductory para and the reference to the school has looked a bit unnecessary for a while.</p>

<p>here!</p> <p>Substantial countryside and trees to separate GV and Eynsham (residents Nov 19th Drop in /Dec 5th WODC etc meeting)</p> <p>Emphasise protection of green spaces (residents – throughout engagement)</p> <p>Highlight reduction of traffic in village (ditto)</p> <p>Advise restrictive parking in village centre (ditto)</p> <p>No big supermarkets (ditto)</p> <p>Vision – covers general issues – NO</p> <p>New ENPV8 should stress spatial as well as infrastructure separation from Eynsham</p> <p>Section 2 – Eynsham as a community</p> <p>Add to first paragraph that Eynsham residents value the ‘rural feel’ and ‘community spirit’</p> <p>ENP1 Include</p> <p>Policy C –1 bed as well as 2 bed accommodation + sheltered accommodation</p> <p>1.7 – homes for older people built on inner edge of new development in Eynsham so near services</p> <p>1.8 – community farm</p> <p>ENP3 Policy A – healthcare facilities need to be cognisant of secret (until leaked</p>	<p>ENV8 specifies a 'separate community'. Anything more in the 'Vision' seems inappropriate. Substantial would not add anything quantitative</p> <p>ENV4 points out the lack of green spaces within the village which is compensated for by quick access to countryside rather than have an unqualified comment about protecting undefined green spaces.</p> <p>It is hard to know how the neighbourhood plan can bring about a reduction of traffic in the village (apart from the western bypass!)</p> <p>This has been offered to local residents before and was rejected. ENP9 recommendation A and B is far more appropriate location for this level of detail than a Vision section</p> <p>ENV6 says much the same thing in a positive and reasoned way which will be far more effective than an unexplained 'thou shalt not...'</p> <p>ENV8 is quite explicit about a 'separate community'. How this might be achieved is left to ENP16 which does specify 'heavy planting of trees'</p> <p>The paragraph talks about location and structure of the village and its sense of community. If it is preferred, the less well defined phrases could be substituted in quotes as that is what people have often said whereas the text has tried to unpack that a little to be more precise.</p> <p>Policy A says that the mix 'shall meet the identified local needs' which would include 1 bed (and which may change over the life of the plan). Policy C highlights the need for two types of 2 bed housing as the distinction is not normally made in standard documents</p> <p>ENP 1.7 says 'as close as practical' which is pretty explicit. Actually there is no land left that is close to the village centre – instead we can emphasise the benefits of putting this housing north of the A40, close to the new centre e.g. ENP16.17.</p> <p>A community farm would be a form of small-holding but the words can be added to be sure.</p> <p>Not sure if this refers to ENP3 or ENP3a but it is in any case not a relevant planning consideration</p>
---	---

<p>recently) BOB/44 Sustainable Transformation Plans.</p> <p>ENP4 Include Policy A – importance of open countryside south of GV and north of Eynsham</p> <p>ENP5 Include Policy C – community energy generation Policy E – new technology rain water collection 5.5- solar tiles and new energy generation technologies 5.7 – Paris Agreement now signed by UK Government</p> <p>ENP6 Include Policy box intro - Necessary new school facilities will be built before or in parallel with houses are built</p> <p>ENP7 Include Policy box footnote - ‘motorised wheelchair/buggy users’. I note that they are included in ENP8 but needs to be here too for equity purpose. 7.7 ‘motorised wheelchair/buggy users’</p> <p>Recommendation – A40 has to be improved before any new large developments take place to prevent traffic gridlock and increase in air pollution</p> <p>ENP8 include 8.1 Replace ‘segregated’ with ‘separated’</p> <p>ENP9 Include A recommendation box - restricted day-time parking in village centre should be considered by OCC to alleviate this very serious problem. 9.1 Residents and retailers feel that P&R will make no difference to this problem and they strongly support restricted parking in centre. In fact retailers believe park and ride will exacerbate parking as people will park in village to avoid fee and still use transport</p>	<p>This is just duplication of details in ENP16 – note new para in pre-ambule text of ENP16 and ENP16.2 & 3 which attempt to resolve the REAL issue of the separation strip which is NOT just about physical distance and may actually be counter-productive</p> <p>Community Energy generation supported in ENP5.6 Rain-water harvesting will be added to ENP5.7</p> <p>The technology chosen for PV can be left to individual choice – there is no need to specify a more expensive technology for general PV. Have updated the reference to Paris agreement</p> <p>Change ENP6A and B to require a plan to be put in place when new homes are given consent to ensure school places are available. Don't think it is right to forbid people to occupy new homes as they may not need school places or may be willing to look outside village for school – that should be their choice.</p> <p>Changed to 'non-vehicular access' to cover all other options. Also add a definition of a 'path' earlier in the ENP so we don't have to keep repeating the long list. (After ENP1)</p> <p>We simply can't do that – we do not have the authority. We can recommend that LPA seeks developer funding for A40 improvements as ENP16 Recommendation A</p> <p>'segregation' is the term used in this context See SUSTRANS article.</p> <p>Imposing restricted or resident parking is not a matter for the NP It is fully covered in ENP9 recommendations A and B.</p>
--	---

<p>ENP10 include Any new Science Park, wherever located, should have the explicit backing and sponsorship of University of Oxford and Oxford Brookes. Also, It seems it is an assumption that it is an Oxford thing as it is in the unmet need for Oxford area. I haven't heard anyone say it would be a national/international enterprise, but I imagine it would be welcome if it linked with the Oxford universities. It needs to be discussed in the EFSG.</p> <p>ENP11 Include 11.2 Eynsham residents are consistently against the development of super-markets and large retail sheds as they value and want to protect their unique independent shops. Satisfied with easy access to supermarkets in Witney.</p> <p>ENP14 include Policy A – village character ‘and community spirit’ Policy D – with large developments, new infrastructure and road are built before or in parallel with the housing (worth repeating as it is vital)</p> <p>Policy E – subject to thorough social, environmental, ecological, biodiversity and archaeological examination</p> <p>Policy G – replace ‘green’ with ‘countryside and trees’ separation zone</p>	<p>This is way outside the remit of a NP.</p> <p>This is fully covered by ENP11.4-6 and ENP16.21</p> <p>'Community spirit' is not an recognised planning term; it has already been used in ENV1 to link the general concept with specific planning considerations</p> <p>ENP3A and ENP3.1 cover this</p> <p>This is standard practice on any development but see ENP4b</p> <p>Not sure how 'countryside' applies when it is only 50m wide. See the new bit in right-hand column of ENP16 preamble. Trees covered in ENP16.8(a)</p>
---	--

<p>CF no. 14.</p> <p>ENV5 add 'should not exacerbate conditions, but contribute to improvement of local access and reduction in pollution from transport.'</p> <p>ENV3 safe, easy (pedestrian/cycle access to excellent schools. In ENP6 but should it feature on Vision Page?</p> <p>ENP1 Include self-build in smaller developments too. Would they be single or group self-build? Both are needed</p> <p>ENP7 add 'should not exacerbate conditions, but contribute to improvement of local access and reduction in pollution from transport.'</p> <p>ENP7 All new development should contribute to wider plan to improve public</p>	<p>Date: Dec 2016 - ENP v1.1 .</p> <p>Visions should remain compact – details are best put in the relevant sections. The idea that residents will look no further than the Visions and therefore everything should be in them is not practical.</p> <p>I think we have to set realistic and achievable goals – if the site is small then why not a group develop it all themselves.</p> <p>Not sure how development could contribute to the reduction of pollution.</p> <p>Developers can't be forced to improve pre-existing situations. Added note to</p>
---	--

<p>transport and reduce congestion</p> <p>Crossing points needed on other roads too, eg B4449.</p> <p>Improvements to access A40 eg re-instate right turn at Witney Road</p> <p>ENP4.7 Require street trees on new roads ENP6/8 Safe, easy (pedestrian/cycle access to excellent schools.</p> <p>ENP16 Better longer term visionary strategic infrastructure planning, prioritising effective public transport which connects Witney to Oxford centre/stations/hospitals</p> <p>ENP17 Land south of Chilbrook should stay open for walking</p> <p>ENP17 Land south of Chilbrook should stay open for walking but can also see advantage of western link road as would keep lot of traffic out of village and link to underused industrial site. Would need sensible speed limit and would be noisy</p> <p>Has air quality been considered and do we know current pollution levels and predictions with extra traffic?</p> <p>ENP5B - Prepare site energy strategies in consultation with the community and work with local partners to develop innovative integrated and de-centralised renewable energy (heat and power) schemes and facilitate community renewable installations wherever possible</p> <p>ENP5C - All homes on a development site shall have an average of 3kWPV generation capability or equivalent more efficient renewable energy</p> <p>ENP5 Add to Reasons, Eynsham's Transition Town Group, GreenTEA, have a track record of collaborating in community energy generation in the village. The group has ambitions for innovation and there is a wealth of local expertise, eg, Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford and Low Carbon Hub, Oxford.</p>	<p>recommendations of ENP7.</p> <p>Where? there is no new development on B4449. A40 is special case due to Bartholomew School being for both communities.</p> <p>This is outside the ENP remit.</p> <p>This would be a very hard policy to write 'requiring' street trees but encouraging street trees is practical - ENP4.5</p> <p>Have extended the idea of a 'designated path' to include schools – ENP8.1</p> <p>See 'Transport Hub' in ENP 16.24</p> <p>And there lies the conundrum – it all depends what is more important – a country walk from Acre End Street along the old railway line and back without crossing the road twice and most of the 'country walk' being alongside houses or a few less cars down Acre End Street! Eynsham Parish Council are currently taking the view that the harm of the Link Road outweigh the benefits.</p> <p>There isn't an Air Quality Action zone in Eynsham – WODC have checked but not sure when it was last done.</p> <p>This will be too prescriptive – we are already pushing the boundaries by included anything in ENP5. There will be opportunities during master-planning stages of developments for community involvement. See ENP5.6</p> <p>PV is 'photo-voltaic' e.g. any direct conversion from sunlight to electricity and doesn't specify technology beyond that. Not sure this would add anything.</p> <p>Reference to these local initiatives and organisation has been added as a reference</p> <p>ENP5.6</p>
---	---

<p>CF no. 15.</p>	<p>Date 06/12/2016 v1.0?</p>
<p>Is the 'Vision for Eynsham 2031' adequate in your view?</p> <p>No - It has been so affected by the GV proposal - needs to strongly propose that development is concentrated north of the A40 and come to an agreement on</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has to be subservient to the WODC Local Plan. That means our plan would not be found to be 'sound' if it flew in the face of WODC plans with which we have had to keep up.</p>

S106s. One of the main reasons for being 'open' to development appeared to be the need for a better primary school but this could be achieved in the new GV (and the existing school improved via s106 agreements)

Do you think the above Vision covers all the general issues that you think it should? No – see point above

– also would also like to see a vision to entice some buses to come into the village that go to Oxford along the A40 as many people work in the hospitals and Brookes but won't walk all the way to the A40. Also if park and ride is built we would need short stay parking to prevent people using Eynsham as a car park

What should we add? What should we change / leave out?
As mentioned the strategy still seems too development friendly for Eynsham – if we are to accept a GV then development should be targeted here.

Building on the flood plain would seem a non-starter

Only a small thing but there are quite a few typo's e.g. recommendation and spatial often misspelt

The latest version of the plan has been changed to make it clear that building new homes north of the A40 first is the best option.

We have added an eighth 'vision' relating to the GV but a 'vision' which is directly opposed to WODC won't have any positive result.

This is too detailed for the 'visions' which need to concentrate on a few overarching goals rather than summarise everything.
The new Version 1.2 includes the need for the P&R to be a transport hub with buses going through the village to the east Oxford sites (ENP16.23)

The first page of the new ENP16 makes our position clear in as positive a way as we can; it is considered bad form to be too negative in a NP.

Building on a flood-plain is a non-starter! A flood-plain is what the Environment Agency lists as such which is not the same as any piece of ground that has standing water at times of heavy rain fall. Often local people will insist that this or that land 'floods' and think they are being ignored but, even though they have seen water on the ground, it isn't an insuperable problem as was the case for Hazeldene Close itself. WODC learned a very harsh lesson in the summer 2007 floods and won't forget it.

All the 'spacials' have been changed and other typos have been corrected

CF no. 16.

04/10/2016 – v1.0 or earlier

(Editted from a longer e-mail)

I like the idea of basing expansion arrangements around a reasonable walking norm. I'm sure 1200m is reasonable for many people, especially if there are safe pathways. Where your limit becomes difficult is walking young children to school. As one of several dozen grandparents who frequently make the trek to the primary school, I feel that Back Lane to the present location is not far off the limit I would feel committed to. There is a pragmatic case for seeking a second primary school in the west so that parents have some choice in how far they have to walk. You perhaps should apply the same walking criterion to primary

Good point - the distance for primary and secondary are different; I do see parents walking from Merton Court (with a push-chair) but **there is no reason to make the distance so far for new schools - there will be one in the west and in OCGV.** (respondent's house to primary school is about 600m, so 800m is reasonable to generous while including most of the likely development without encouraging unwarranted sprawl.)

ENP6.9 added. Note A modified for 800m.

school as for access to a convenience store, 700m	
---	--

<p>CF no. 17.</p> <p>We note that Biodiversity has not been addressed at all in the Plan. Under section 40 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006 Local Planning Authorities are required to conserve biodiversity. Also, paragraph 109 of the National Planning Policy Framework requires that biodiversity net gains should be provided by the planning system. We would like to see a new policy added on Biodiversity net gain. Under that policy it would require that any new development results in a biodiversity net gain for the parish and that any development resulting in a loss of biodiversity will not be supported. Suitable methods for calculating biodiversity impacts can include the Defra biodiversity offsetting metric¹ and the environment bank biodiversity impact calculator².</p> <p>There is also no mention of Best and Most Versatile (BMV) agricultural land in the Plan. We would like to see a policy or at least a paragraph somewhere that ensures future development will avoid BMV land wherever possible. Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services for society. It is a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, a store for carbon and water, a reservoir of biodiversity and a buffer against pollution. Development should seek to use areas of poorer quality agricultural land in preference to that of a higher quality in line with National Planning Policy Framework para 112. For more information, see our publication Agricultural Land Classification: protecting the best and most versatile agricultural land.</p> <p>Policy ENP4 Green Infrastructure – creating a setting for new developments.</p> <p>Development of the size and scale that is likely to happen in and around Eynsham will have significant impacts on biodiversity if they are not mitigated. It is essential that any new development results in biodiversity ‘net gain’ for the parish. Green infrastructure can be used to help mitigate the impacts of development. In this policy we would like to see an additional requirement for the use of green infrastructure as mitigation to provide a ‘biodiversity net gain’ for development.</p> <p>Policy ENP5 Sustainability: Climate Change</p> <p>The effect of climate change can also be mitigated by using vegetation to provide shade and insulation to buildings. Green roofs and wall gardens provide</p>	<p>ENP4a added to address bio-diversity specifically. ENP4aA requires bio-diversity gain.</p> <p>ENP4aC requires the protection of BMV land and cross-refers with ENP14 I which requires land classification to be used as part of any sequential testing of sites when choosing which to develop. The ENP does not attempt to allocate land for development – the West Oxfordshire Local Plan process currently being restarted after a 1 year suspension makes the situation too complicated – so policies relating to the choice of sites is used instead.</p> <p>ENP4a added.</p> <p>ENP4.4 amended to reflect importance of Green Infrastructure in creating connected bio-diversity conduits.</p> <p>ENP4.5 added to point out potential contradiction between public access to green space and the need not to disturb eco-systems.</p> <p>Reluctant to include 'shading by trees' as we have had serious issues with</p>
--	--

<p>excellent insulation. Large trees can provide shade. Green infrastructure can be an effective way to help people adapt to climate change but it also applies to plants and animals. Open green space, wild green space and Green Infrastructure can all be used to create connected green space suitable for the movement of species and their adaptation to climate change. It is essential that connected green space to be a high priority in your policy on climate change.</p> <p>Policy ENP9 Parking</p> <p>Parking is not something we normally comment on. However as public transport is a good way to tackle climate change we like to suggest options that would help increase its use. Given the Park and Ride facility that is planned we would like to suggest that housing proposed within a 5 minute walk of the Park and Ride is built without provision of parking spaces (or street parking permits). This will reduce traffic in the village and encourage commuters to live without a car.</p> <p>ENP17 Development of a western extension to the village.</p> <p>While we appreciate that no development has been specifically allocated as part of this Plan we would like to express our concern over some of the potential development site discussed in Appendix A. Sites 411, 347, 435, and 411b are adjacent to or contain a length of Thames tributary. Any development on these sites would be expected to protect and enhance this watercourse and focus any connected green space provision along the stream. Biodiversity along this water course is likely to be particularly sensitive and a biodiversity net gain would be expected from any development proposed.</p> <p>Where Neighbourhood Plans could have significant environmental effects, they may require a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) under the Environment Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.</p> <p>If you are setting out policies on new development or proposing sites for development, you may wish to consider identifying what environmental features you want to be retained, connected, enhanced or new features you would like to see created as part of any new development. Examples might include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Providing a new footpath with landscaping through the new development to link into existing rights of way or other green spaces. · Restoring a neglected hedgerow or create new ones. · Creating a new pond as an attractive feature on the site. Planting trees characteristic to the local area to make a positive contribution to the local landscape. 	<p>poorly-maintained trees causing too much shade – hence ENP4.7 ENP5.10 added to encourage green roofs.</p> <p>ENP5.12 cross-referenced with ENP4.4 note the importance of connected green space.</p> <p>Eynsham parish Council were unable to support this idea as it is contrary to WODC policy and the centre of the village – which is on the main bus route – has real problems due to lack of residents parking</p> <p>ENP4F / 4.16 specifically mentions the sensitivity but also the value of (continuous) water courses. This is also emphasised in ENP17.9 which is specific to the Chil Brook which is an important feature of a western development with considerable benefit as a wildlife conduit and public open space but presents a proven flood-risk needing proper attenuation measures.</p> <p>As the ENP does not allocate land for development, an SEA is not considered necessary. NE has been consulted previously (Oct 2016) on this particular matter and concurred with this opinion.</p> <p>As we are not proposing specific sites we are not offering specific examples but we do have policies and supporting rationale for the following:</p> <p>ENP4.4, 4.9 and ENP8</p> <p>ENP17.7, 10</p> <p>ENP4.7</p>
---	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds. · Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings. · Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife. · Adding a green roof to new buildings. <p>You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · Setting out in your plan how you would like to implement elements of a wider Green Infrastructure Strategy (if one exists for the Aylesbury Vale District) in your community. · Assessing needs for accessible green space and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision. · Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see Planning Practice Guidance on this). · Managing existing (and new) public spaces to be more wildlife friendly (e.g. by sowing wild flower strips in less used parts of parks, changing hedge cutting timings and frequency). · Planting additional street trees. · Identifying any improvements to the existing public right of way network, e.g. cutting back hedges, improving the surface, clearing litter or installing kissing gates) or extending the network to create missing links. · Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition or clearing away an eyesore). 	<p>ENP4.11</p> <p>ENP4.17 added ENP5.10 added</p> <p>Not aware of any wider strategy for West Oxfordshire – do mention our own local linear green space (ENP17.8) which actually runs through the Fishponds area (other side of Station Road) to the Oxford Green Belt at the eastern edge of the village.</p> <p>ENP12 addresses LGS</p> <p>Parish Council is starting to do this – maintenance plans for green space ENP4.13 are required to ensure this continues.</p> <p>ENP4.6 Parish Council has maintained existing network – ENP8 and ENP16.9 mention need to preserve and enhance through areas being developed.</p> <p>Parish Council will use CIL for this.</p>
---	--

<p>CF no. 18.</p>	
<p>ENV1 - is no longer adequate because housing is so affected by GV proposal.</p> <p>Action: Add New development (<i>of any size</i>) shall ensure Eynsham ...self-sustaining.</p> <p>ENV2 - Eynsham as a community - important to stress quality of life and avoid urban sprawl.</p> <p>Action: Add New development shall avoid urban sprawl and be visually attractive and in harmony ... shall provide quality of life and a pleasant, and safe place for all residents to live.</p>	<p>This makes a good point – the Vision is for the NP Area which is the Parish of Eynsham which does include the potential OCGV Site.</p> <p>Current wording is correct – by not specifying any range of sizes it applies to all development; anything else will limit, not add to, the vision.</p> <p>Preamble has already been amended to include 'strong community spirit' and 'rural village character'. Terms such as 'quality of life' which mean different things to different people have limited value in a planning policy context where it is better to focus on those things which actually make for a strong community, for a rural feel and that which contributes to quality of life. ENV3 is a case in</p>

<p>ENV3 – Resident suggests safe, easy (pedestrian/cycle access to excellent schools. In ENP6 but should it feature on Vision Page? Action: Add “compact and people can access these facilities (includes schools) easily by foot, bicycle and motorised buggy”.</p> <p>ENV5 – Residents suggest including significant improvement to public transport and 'should not exacerbate conditions, but contribute to improvement of local access and reduction in pollution from transport.' Action: Add these suggestions to ENV5 + motorised buggy to the networks within the community.</p> <p>Gravel extraction and its threat -</p> <p>Eynsham as a community – important to stress quality of life and avoid urban sprawl - Put in Eynsham's Critique at beginning.</p> <p>ENV2 This suggestion for a master plan and competition could go in the Recommendations Box. The competition should include a team of consultants, as well as an architect. Concern over sewage, water, road infrastructure, flood areas, flood risk suggests that we need to make these aspects of design stronger in 2.13.</p> <p>ENV3: Have we made enough provision for spaces for teenage activities? Development of an Arts Centre is inspirational, but could we put it in the ENP 14 Recommendations box as an aspiration? New idea of shared gardens for self-sufficiency and play spaces could be added to allotments where mentioned (see above). There is a call for infrastructure before development in all new development.</p> <p>ENV4. Add Street trees to ENP2D. There is an overlap between ENP3 and this policy in that green community facilities, such as allotments and burial grounds, also constitute a contribution to green infrastructure and biodiversity. Suggest to include include green community facilities here.</p> <p>ENV5: For flood risk cross-reference (2.13, ENP14B, SA4.7, SA4.8). Traffic pollution (as well as air quality and noise as both are affected by traffic</p>	<p>point – addressing the 'compact and well connected nature of the village'</p> <p>amend to “access <i>schools, employment and other</i> facilities <i>without the use of a private car.</i>” see ENV5 for reference to foot, bicycle and motorised buggy vehicle</p> <p>Not sure what “contribute to improvement of local access” means so will not add this statement in this important section of ENP. It is not clear how “reduction in pollution from transport” can be achieved by a NP so we should not add an unachievable aim in the vision section. Mobility Vehicle added to the list on non-car transportation</p> <p>Gravel and minerals are an area of development which a NP is specifically forbidden from addressing – see the Basic Conditions document. Although the need to express things in 'layman's terms' is understandable, we should not assume residents cannot understand the document without vague catch-phrases if they read the document. It is not clear that people who have actually read the document are commenting on the lack of these <i>phrases</i> but they do want to see the <i>issue</i> addressed – which it is.</p> <p>A masterplan is required (ENP2F) for any site allocated over 100 units where it is quite likely that the build will be undertaken by multiple contractors; smaller sites will be developed as one site anyway. Technical issues such as these should not need to be duplicated but ENP4b includes them to be sure.</p> <p>Good idea – use for CIL and community buildings Play areas are done by Parish Council using CIL/S106 funds and ENP3.6. Allotments are covered by ENP3.5. Shared gardens would be a complex legal issue and are often restrictive in practice so would be an unwarranted complication</p> <p>ENP3.1 is already specific in this regard.</p> <p>While we do cross-refer policies where helpful, ENP4.5 covers this. Allotments and play areas are already mentioned as a way of providing open green space (ENP4.7)</p>
--	---

<p>pollution), should be added to this Policy with the recommendation that surveys be carried out to measure these aspects at peak times of day on A40 opposite the Spare Acre Lane houses that back onto the A40 and the findings acted upon, ie, measures taken to reduce traffic and noise pollution and improve air quality when the A40 development takes place.</p> <p>Add the following to ENP5B and integrate into 5.6 Reasons - Prepare site energy strategies in consultation with the community and work with local partners to develop innovative integrated and de-centralised renewable energy (heat and power) schemes and facilitate community renewable installations wherever possible.</p> <p>Also add to Reasons - Eynsham's Transition Town Group, GreenTEA, have a track record of collaborating in community energy generation in the village. The group has ambitions for innovation and there is a wealth of local expertise, eg, Environmental Change Institute, University of Oxford and Low Carbon Hub, Oxford.</p> <p>ENP6: Add points about interim plans to ENP6A & B. Can we recommend that the Childrens Centre could be used to expand Primary school? There is no mention in this policy about adult learning and education for an increasingly ageing population, so add this provision + vocational skills and apprenticeships geared to support local businesses/enterprises to the policy box.</p> <p>ENP7: Could it also be stressed that Traffic Assessments need to take account of all developments approved (and not yet built), assessing the cumulative effect of all developments, rather than proposed developments in isolation, which happens as developments come forward at different times.</p> <p>Also, ENP7 should suggest noise pollution measures along a western link road.</p> <p>ENP8: cross referencing to ENP7 and ENP12.</p> <p>ENP9: People are not seeing the NP addressing what is an important problem for them, so make an ENP9 Recommendations box and Include Parking restrictions in village centre (now done). Suggest adding that the restrictions should be introduced before development to deal with the existing park and riding situation, as well as preventing their exacerbation when development goes ahead.</p>	<p>This would be duplication and in the wrong policy.</p> <p>A40 noise is referenced in ENP16.22. Pollution from traffic noted in recommendation C</p> <p>ENP5.3 will require a plan to demonstrate why they can't do it – or they will implement anyway</p> <p>ENP5.6 says this but without specifying who should be involved and it isn't clear that the NP should be advocating specific organisations in policy.</p> <p>A reference to Green TEA and Low Carbon hub as the people involved in the existing project is added in a reference so we are not 'advocating'.</p> <p>OCC has a statutory duty to provide education. It is not for the NP to tell them how to do it!</p> <p>NP can't require these things – extra-curricular education will probably use the schools – add to ENP16.20 which deals with additional premises for Bartholomew School. Apprenticeships require specialist premises – can't demand but can 'encourage' in ENP10 recommendations.</p> <p>Will add to ENP14.7 which already addresses the general issue of transport plans</p> <p>Add to ENP7.4</p> <p>ENP4 (not 12) already referenced – move to main text. Add ref to ENP7.7</p> <p>See cross reference to ENP15 in ENP9.1.</p> <p>ENP9 recommendations added.</p>
--	--

ENP13 - Trees along the A40, as well as a woodland belt to separate the GV from Eynsham is suggested. With regards to new development, street trees are a required feature.

Actions: Add to ENP16, 17, 18

ENP14: Given that preservation and infrastructure first are both given so much weight by residents, we think they should be referenced in ENP14 Reasons. However, preservation of wildlife has not been given prominence in the NP and is only mentioned in ENP17 Reasons in relation to hedgerows. We consider that there is now a need for a new policy called Biodiversity and Ecology to pull together the hedgerows, swifts and the old railway line wildlife identified by SC. Also, we are recently aware of the City Farm field studies by experienced botanists using a rigorous scientific protocol and recognised by Plantlife, a national and international organisation that works to protect the world's flora.

City Farm has European recognition for arable wildflowers, so this land is very special and residents who are becoming aware of it are urging us to protect it in our NP.

There is no policy for alternative sites and these are not discussed within current NP.

ENP15: There is one view that the walking distances that older people can manage is over-estimated because it doesn't take into account having to carry heavy shopping items. School children will have friends at each end of village and that is too long for them to walk.

Action: Estimated walking distances for older people should be shortened. The policy should state that homes specifically for this group should be within this shortened distance from the shops.

ENP16: Adhering to genuine GV principles needs to be included in the Policy Box and clarified in the Reasons.

(Also include here ENP18: If there is evidence of need for a Science Park at Eynsham, it is suggested that the brownfield site in the underused existing industrial site to the south of the village is more suitable.)

Add to Strategic Context critique and ENP16 Recommendations Box that

Street trees are covered by ENP4.6. Only purpose of adding to ENP16-18, apart from simple duplication, would be to place more technical details which is unlikely to be accepted.

'Infrastructure first' covered by ENP3.1 – added new ENP3A to specify 'essential infrastructure' such as schools and health-care to strengthen policy.

Natural England agree! Added ENP4a and significant extra bio-diversity related elements to various policies – see CF no. 17. in this document.

NE have been asked about weight of IAPA score in planning but no response

This is definitely outside the remit of NP policies but also definitely part of any 'strategic context'

'one opinion' does not trump the limited but accepted published evidence!

The need for specific elder housing to be close to the village centre is included in ENP16.17 and ENP1.8. We should remember that many older people will have a mobility vehicle as they are unable to walk even half the 'standard' walking distance so not necessary to add an extra, short, walking distance.

See ENP16F. See also ENP14 recommendations for a stronger push for all housing in north but does require the western site to be planned in conjunction with the north. There will be a push to develop here at some time and it would be best to have it planned as an integrated whole when this does happen.

<p>residents wish to see the evidence of need and support for the Science Park and they recommend it to be built on the Southern Industrial Estate for ecological reasons. They also recommend that the land allocated to the Science Park on the north of the A40 should be left as natural countryside. Note also that there are concerns that Science Park could push up the price of so-called affordable housing in the GV.</p> <p>ENP17: State in Policy Box that W1 (Development North of Chibrook only is preferred over W2 (Development of western link road). Highlight in the reasons, the tension between residents wanting to keep the fields south of the Chilbrook free for walking and recreational use, at the same time as seeing the value of a western link road to the Industrial Estate to keep traffic out of the village.</p>	<p>Look at the map and see how small the available space in SIA is compared to the Science Park! I think the evidence is the 3200 new homes to be built nearby. There is a simple choice – every single one of those 3200 commutes out -or- give some of them the opportunity not to have to – which is best? “Make it an unattractive place to keep the prices low” is an interesting concept but may not have huge merit!</p> <p>EPC has make it clear that they support employment sites as did 75% of questionnaire respondents</p> <p>ENP17 recommendations added</p>
---	--

<p>CF no. 19.</p> <p><i>Response lists the relevant NPPF references for Local Plans, then continues</i></p> <p>It is therefore important that the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan considers the net increase in water and waste water demand to serve proposed developments and also any impact the development may have off site further down the network, if no/low water pressure and internal/external sewage flooding of property is to be avoided.</p> <p>Thames Water therefore recommend that developers engage with them at the earliest opportunity to establish the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The developments demand for water supply and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met • The developments demand for Sewage Treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met • The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met <p>Thames Water consider that as this issue is so important that there should be a section on ‘Infrastructure and Utilities’ in the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan which should make reference to the following:</p> <p>“Water Supply & Sewerage Infrastructure</p> <p><i>It is essential that developers demonstrate that adequate water supply and sewerage infrastructure capacity exists both on and off the site to serve the development and that it would not lead to problems for existing users. In some</i></p>	<p>Removal/replacement of ENP14.8 is requested - to be replaced with new wording</p> <p><i>Noted that pre-amble to ENP14 policies has now been updated to reflect the possibility of a new settlement as well as an expansion of Eynsham – wording changed to cover new eventualities.</i></p> <p>Rather than add to ENP14, add new section ENP3b specifically for Infrastructure and Utilities to include mention of other utilities such as electricity, gas and phone/ broadband which may also have network capacity problems.</p> <p>Also include a note against ENP10.8 to require same for business premises, especially 'fibre to premises' broadband.</p>
---	--

<p><i>circumstances this may make it necessary for developers to carry out appropriate studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water & sewerage infrastructure. Where there is a capacity problem and no improvements are programmed by the water company, then the developer needs to contact the water company to agree what improvements are required and how they will be funded prior to any occupation of the development.</i></p>	
---	--

<p>CF no. 20.</p> <p>Points mentioned as 'not having been included' in the ENP</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> substantial flood risk, not mentioned in the EOI (see Environment Agency online flood risk map, which is reinforced by local knowledge); destruction of existing business and employment (notably a David Einig Contracting site, in which substantial amounts of money have been invested); destruction of nationally and internationally important habitat and wildlife (“Site of European Importance” for rare plants, for example); prevention of extraction of gravel between the southern end of Lower Road and the westward A40; interference with the setting of Grade II listed buildings <p>Page 5: ". . . emphasis has shifted to placing development to the north of the A40 where rapid development would ensure funding for the infrastructure of what is intended to be an entirely new free-standing settlement . . ."</p> <p>Comment: This claim needs to be substantiated. How rapid is it going to be, or must it be, to "ensure funding" for infrastructure? I thought the funding that might become available if this Garden Village was chosen was just for technical planning support (£1.5m?). The DCLG press release of 2 January mentions £6m for the Garden Villages. Is that £6m each or £6m between all 14? If the latter, it's not really very much.</p> <p>Page 6 ENV4: "Quick and easy access to countryside."</p> <p>Comment: But according to the WODC Local Plan, Eynsham will be entirely surrounded by main (and ring) roads. Not exactly conducive to countryside</p>	<p>The ENP doesn't duplicate every requirement of the planning process of which a flood risk assessment is one. A note has been added to the Site Options document mentioning all these matters in relation to the GV site. Page 38 recommendation and ENP16.17a, 18a</p> <p>This is addressed by new section ENP4a</p> <p>Neighbourhood Plans are expressly forbidden from making policies on minerals but a note in the Site Options won't go amiss.</p> <p>Now included reference to listed assets at City Farm</p> <p>The infrastructure will be funded by the developer or their backers – most likely a pension or life assurance company working on long-term but secure returns. None of the DCLG money is for infrastructure!</p> <p>As the infrastructure will need to be in place almost immediately – for everyone's benefit – there will be a substantial up front cost and the backers will want to get some money coming in as soon as they reasonably can. WODC is proposing to build 'west Eynsham' to the fullest extent to fill in the gap in delivery on the GV site – we think this is not in the interest of residents of Eynsham or OCGV who want all their infrastructure – shops, schools, public buildings as soon as possible.</p> <p>We agree entirely – hence our comments in ENP17 and opposition to the western bypass. We have now amended ENP17 to make this stronger. We agree</p>
--	--

<p>access.</p> <p>ENV5: "New developments should not exacerbate existing parking problems within the village centre."</p> <p>Comment: How can this possibly be avoided? All we can hope for is containment of the extent of exacerbation.</p> <p>ENV8: ". . . built according to Garden Village principles."</p> <p>Comment: You have covered this well. Obviously, the Garden Village is too close to Eynsham to satisfy some of these principles.</p> <p>Page 7 1.4: ". . the WODC target of 50% affordable housing shall be adhered to." Comment. Wishful thinking? Developers will undoubtedly put pressure on the council to reduce the allocation.</p> <p>Page 10 ENP2 Design A: Please add a reference here to the Grade II listed buildings, and their setting, at City Farm. (I have sent Richard the details from the Historic England website.)</p> <p>3.1: "Planning consent should include an agreement as to how residents who are not provided with facilities at the time of occupation will be compensated by the developer." Comment: Is this a realistic demand, and does it also apply to existing inhabitants?</p> <p>3.5 "Allotments shall have a water supply on-site . . ." Comment: More water stress?</p> <p>3.7 "A new village burial ground is urgently required." Comment: North of the A40 is a good option for this, although it will reduce the area for Garden Village housing (note how this phrase will recur several times: are you in fact subtly arguing that there will not be enough room for the Garden Village?).</p> <p>4.1 Re: a 'green' setting for the Village: "It should also be recognised that increasing biodiversity is a good thing . . ." Comment: This could be the point at which to stress that the existing City Farm site has enormously rich biodiversity, for the rare combination of reasons that Dr Larkman has described, and there is no way that a Garden Village is going to "enhance" it. On the contrary, it will reverse years, if not decades, of wildlife progress. Furthermore, connectivity with adjacent open country is almost as important.</p> <p>5.7 "Electric vehicles . . ." Comment: Will existing residents also get a 32Amp</p>	<p>with your comments to WOLP which are similar to those from Eynsham PC.</p> <p>This is what we aspire to. The policy on not allowing access to new developments through village streets and recommendations for revisiting 'residents parking' in the village centre are in response to this but it is not an area where we are confident of 100% success.</p> <p>You are right – and the ease with which this principle was 'reinterpreted' is a worry. I think 'separate settlement' is not interpreted as 'physically separated' although that was almost certainly what was originally meant</p> <p>This is one area where WODC does have quite a good record. Of course the next question is 'how affordable will they really be'.</p> <p>Agreed – the wording did assume all listed buildings were in conservation area – wording amended.</p> <p>We will see if it is realistic. We want to see some penalty for ignoring the needs of new residents (it would be nice to compensate the community too – maybe I can try that as well!). We will see if this is allowed to stay in the plan or thrown out by WODC/Independent Examiner!</p> <p>ENP3b has been added to ensure water and infrastructure is adequate.</p> <p>I think WODC would like to keep the GV in Eynsham Parish so they don't get opposition from three directions!</p> <p>Natural England agree with the general point – ENP4a has been added to address the need for 'bio-diversity gain' and the need to protect species. I have asked them for more specific details in relation to the IATA scores, S41 listing of endangered species and others rated vulnerable in the survey. I haven't got a complete answer so have left it up to the developers to get NE agreement. Connectivity is addressed in ENP4.4 which has been strengthened.</p> <p>No, any more than old houses had to have upgraded cavity wall insulation when</p>
--	---

<p>charging point ("considered necessary" for the new residents)</p> <p>6.8 "New schools shall have provision for safe drop-off and collection of pupils including appropriate space for parents to wait without causing nuisance or hazard to other road users."</p> <p>Comment 1: I thought the pupils were all supposed to be walking to school.</p> <p>Comment 2: Where will the school be in relation to the proposed strategic link road and bus route through due to run through the middle of the Village?</p> <p>Comment 3: This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing.</p> <p>7.3 "Heavy construction traffic causes more distress to residents than private cars." Comment: So they won't want to live right next to David Einig Contracting (at New Wintles Farm), which has just applied for planning permission to increase the throughput of material from 120,000 tonnes per annum to 170,000 tonnes. This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing.</p> <p>7.4 "Any new Link Roads between main routes . . . should . . . be provided with a combined cycleway and pedestrian path along its full length." Comment: This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing. Will it be dual carriageway as well, or have a bus lane?</p> <p>"Due to their use for through and HGV traffic . . ." Comment: The new residents will love this (as will the existing ones). Alzheimer's here we come.</p> <p>10.2 "Some employment land has remained unsold or unlet for a considerable period, often because an unreasonable price has been placed on it."</p> <p>Comment 1: So there's quite a lot left still? Does this weaken the case for a 40ha Science Park next to the Garden Village (in any case, I think the Science Park could be located near Carterton/Brize Norton, not least because engineering jobs have just been safeguarded at Brize).</p> <p>Comment 2: Why would prices go down if demand is going to go up?</p> <p>ENP 11 C Retail: "Redevelopment of the Spar site to improve both retail and housing provision will be supported." Comment: This is a good idea, but how will the retail compete with the Garden Village? Or will Garden Village residents use the Spar, thus blurring the distinction between the two settlements? And what will happen to the Tesco Express (11.3)?</p>	<p>this became mandatory for new ones!</p> <p>If you go to the junction of Witney Rd and Thornbury Rd at school finishing time you will see why this is included! Same for Beech Rd near Primary School.</p> <p>Yes, that's why we want schools within 800m of homes – but some parents drop children off on the way to work and it would be foolish to ignore reality. The ENP doesn't offer a detailed plan – the policies set out the requirements which need to be worked up into the masterplan which is required. Yes, but with a bit of imagination the same space may be usable for shoppers to park in if the school is close to the centre</p> <p>No, they won't. This is a complication of the proposed GV site which the ENP does not offer any solution to but will need to be addressed before the site becomes viable as a GV.</p> <p>Eynsham PC response to WOLP consultation noted that a 'northern link road' was an absurd idea.</p> <p>Note that the ENP does not want any homes built on Link Roads as they carry through traffic and are not suitable within residential areas. Buses should go through residential 20mph areas where cycles routes would be nice but not essential given the low speeds.</p> <p>Rather less than people believe! Map 2 has been updated to show what is still unused and it is a tiny amount compared to the Science Park site. <i>(The Chartered Engineer writing this could get a bit hot under the collar at this point as there is a clear assumption that science and engineering is to do with men in overalls repairing things!)</i> The sort of work envisaged for a Science Park is designing (and making) innovative new products and services where people with PhD's and degrees in physical/ life sciences, software engineering, etc , work together with all the ancillary admin, finance, marketing and manufacturing staff to make viable businesses from what will often be University spin-outs.</p> <p>No, the GV must have its own shops – at least its own convenience store and whatever others the developers consider commercially viable. It isn't clear what would happen to Tesco express, particularly if the road is relocated. The ENP expects pressure to build a supermarket in the GV which could impact existing shops – hence ENP11B and 11.6 which have been strengthened.</p>
---	---

11.6 The convenience store in the Garden Village "shall be only of a suitable size to serve OCGV". **Comment:** Can Eynsham parish dictate the size of Garden Village shops? I don't think so. Once it is under way any control or influence Eynsham might have (in itself debatable) will seep away.

ENP 12 Local Green Space LGS1

Comment: Please insert a note to say that, under current plans, Eynsham Millennium Wood will lose all the rest of its connectivity, and that The Woodland Trust should be consulted on this.

ENP 14 A Comment: A reference to designated heritage assets at City Farm would not go amiss here.

ENP 14 B "Protect the wider village setting including its relationship to . . . the wider countryside." **Comment:** The Garden Village (+ A40, new link road, etc) will make access to the countryside to the north more difficult and unattractive, as will the western link road (access to the west).

ENP 14 G "A green buffer zone". **Comment:** So we widen the A40, add a buffer zone, put in crossing points . . . This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing.

14.7 I suggest you add Oxford Brookes University.

14.10-14.11 "Any further expansion south of the Chilbridge Road would have an adverse impact on the setting of the village and the adjoining countryside and should not be accepted." **Comment:** Quite right. But what about us? We are parishioners too, and there will be a very adverse impact on the rural setting of the Grade II listed buildings at City Farm and on the surrounding countryside.

" . . . all 3200 new homes should be met through the creation of a Garden Village as proposed by WODC. Concentrating on building up the population quickly will fund the necessary infrastructure and ensure that a sustainable community is rapidly established."

Comment: Thank you very much for offloading all your problems onto us. This proposal is also counter-productive in terms of protecting Eynsham. According to the 2011 Census, average household size in Oxford and Oxfordshire is 2.4 per household. The population of Eynsham then was 4,648. If you multiply 3,200 by 2.4, you get 7,680 people, about 65% more than in Eynsham. If it is going to be a

The ENP applies to the whole Parish. The ENP regards the principle of two mutually beneficial communities as an essential element. The idea of a beggar-my-neighbour situation between the villages is abhorrent and a good reason why close proximity may be a bad idea!

Your comment is well made – the long term relationship between two such closely located communities needs careful consideration and a recommendation about this long term relationship will be added to ENP16.

This is a drawback of almost any development north of the A40.

Para A is referring specifically to the village centre and the impact of heritage assets on it rather than the importance of heritage assets *per-se*.

That's why the paragraph is necessary!

Yes.

You are correct to observe that the impact on City Farm residents has not been taken into account in the ENP. Our plans never envisaged development so far from the existing built-up village and we have been playing catch-up ever since the GV came to light. A comment about considering the impact on those already occupying the GV site needs to be added to ENP16 but does not detract from the merit of ENP14.10-11

You make a good point about the potential ongoing relationship between the two communities.

There will be just as much impact on Eynsham Village and City Farm residents whether the GV is initially envisioned as 2200 or 3200 homes.

Eynsham currently has about 2200 homes built or consented with another 600

<p>proper Garden Village, it will have to have bigger and better facilities than Eynsham, which will undermine the viability of the retail and other businesses in the original village. Moreover, the WODC expression of interest hints at further expansion of the Garden Village in the future. All these homes and associated shops, roads and infrastructure will create more displaced flooding risk, to the detriment of Eynsham. The greater water stress will affect Eynsham residents. You should drop this damaging argument.</p> <p>14.13 “Science Park . . . would be in full accord with Eynsham’s aspiration to become part of the Oxford Knowledge Spine”. Comment: If successful, this runs the risk of creating the need for more residential development, and the “village” character of both Eynsham and the Garden Village will be lost. It will also keep house prices high, to the detriment of those on lower incomes.</p> <p>15.3 “Parking is a problem in Eynsham.” Comment: Yes. Better parking facilities in the Garden Village (which they would be mad not to create) will draw more business away from Eynsham.</p> <p>ENP16 North of the A40 A “Appropriate connectivity with the neighbouring communities, including the provision of safe crossing places of the A40 for students and other residents accessing services in Eynsham village.”</p> <p>Comment: So not so separate after all.</p> <p>ENP16 B “. . . provision of landscape separation”. Comment: This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing.</p> <p>Page 30 “It is therefore appropriate for the [ENP] to apply to a new settlement within the Neighbourhood Plan Area to safeguard the interests of both existing residents and residents of the new settlement.” (But not apparently us.)</p> <p>Comment: If it is agreed that all the 3,200 homes will go into the Garden Village, then you will lose any right of influence over what happens there. You will be in the same position as Freeland or the Hanboroughs, or Cassington. Application of the ENP north of the A40 vanishes once it is no longer part of the parish, which it won’t be.</p> <p>16.3 “The A40 . . . should not have extra junctions, roundabouts or traffic lights to slow down this arterial route . . .” Comment: This is exactly what is going to happen.</p>	<p>proposed for the west at some point so both communities will come out roughly 3000 homes.</p> <p>Balancing the two communities is probably a very good idea and goes well with the idea of two mutually supporting communities.</p> <p>The consequent problems of so much new housing needs to be addressed wherever it is located</p> <p>Local employment offers the opportunity for people not to commute. Some will commute in and some will commute out but without local employment everyone will need to commute in the same direction.</p> <p>Eynsham Parish Council does not accept that making this a less attractive place to live to reduce housing costs is a valid argument. If you don't have a job the cost of any housing is unaffordable!</p> <p>This is true – see the argument in ENP 11.4-5 which addresses the situation.</p> <p>No, not in the sense of physical location. As the ENP cannot say 'no' to the GV we are trying to make the most of the closeness of the two communities as a way of compensating for the potential drawbacks already noted</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>We are trying to address our lack of attention to City Farm!</p> <p>This is an excellent point – recommendation has been added to ENP16 recommendations (page 36) to address the unusual situation of two communities (parishes) with their centres so close together.</p> <p>OCC does seem intent on this but it is a daft idea and the ENP says it should not happen!</p>
--	--

16.5 “Ideally a dual-carriageway re-alignment should be built on the northern edge of the buffer zone, providing an unobstructed route for through traffic.”

Comment 1: This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing.

Comment 2: It won't be unobstructed, because it will still need crossings for pedestrians and others.

Comment 3: What happens to the existing commercial premises and Millennium Wood?

16.11 “Sites north of a new line of the A40 may be suitable for employment use . . .” **Comment 1:** This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing.

16.12 “non-residential developments north of the A40 shall be . . . set out at low density . . .” **Comment:** This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing. Many of the suggestions you have made imply even greater density of housing and non-residential development. Not very Garden Village-like.

16.23 I am baffled by the importance people are attaching to this bus route from the Park & Ride to Hanborough Station. Why would people travelling from the west and using the Park & Ride choose, instead of a single bus to various Oxford locations including the hospitals, to get a bus at the Park & Ride to go to Hanborough and wait for a train to Oxford Station only (or London), thus involving three modes of transport instead of two and incurring greater travelling expenses? Also, how many people wanting to travel north-west on the Hanborough line would choose to drive to the Park & Ride and take a bus to Hanborough to catch the train when they could board the train at Oxford or park at an expanded Hanborough car park?

Page 33 ENP 16 Recommendations “WODC should continue to work with Eynsham Parish Council as the local representatives of the new settlement until such time as [it becomes independent].” **Comment:** Actually, I think the people who live here should be the local representatives.

Page 37 SA3.5 “Option N3 [the Garden Village] has local support if such a large development accommodates all new housing for Eynsham, taking pressure off the western edge and village resources.” **Comment:** You mean it won't be supported if it doesn't accommodate all new housing for Eynsham?

Yes, it will, but the A40 is essential for the whole of West Oxfordshire.

The ENP asks for under- or over- crossings to minimise this.

The millennium wood will remain and will still have significant bio-diversity and amenity value despite poor connectivity for mammal species.

No reason why some businesses should not remain – others will clearly need compensating.

ENP16 has had to be significantly re-written due to possibility of a GV on a site west of Eynsham. This makes the prospect of an integrated northern extension a possibility again with the 'new' line of the A40 north of the new houses but south of City Farm and the DEC site. These paragraphs were aimed at the north side of the 'new' A40 where there will be pressure to develop something and we didn't want any more new homes. More recently the ecological value of this same area has become more apparent; the recommendation now will be to use the GV 'science park' area west of Cuckoo Lane for a (smaller more appropriately sized) employment area.

The P&R, if it happens, presents an opportunity to create a transport hub. The P&R isn't something the NP 'wants' but if it there then let's make use of it.

A link to the railway station will help Eynsham residents and others who want to get to Reading or London.

See the ENP16 recommendations which replaces this paragraph.

A lot of village residents say just that but, from a planning reality, the area west of the village will be developed so the NP addresses both areas and many people accept this reality. Ultimately what 'residents support' may not be the deciding factor if WODC have their way!

<p>SA3.6 “Landowners . . . would have to sell at well below free-market rates (as actually envisaged for Garden Villages) . . . any separate development would have to be significantly bigger than Eynsham to fund facilities that have grown naturally over decades. Comment: As mentioned above, a larger Garden Village could damage Eynsham economically.</p>	<p>The statement is true enough but the consequential but undesirable outcome is a very helpful observation – mention of the size has been removed.</p>
--	---

<p>CF no. 21.</p> <p>A Vision for Eynsham 2031 Eight visions for the village by 2031 are outlined in the draft Plan. The consortium broadly supports the thrust of these visions. Notwithstanding, the specific wording of ENV2 – Design should be amended. In its current form this vision is arguably too prescriptive, with explicit reference to achieving BfL12 accreditation. This vision should be revised accordingly. In respect of vision ENV6 – Economy; industry, commerce, and retail, the consortium (and incoming development partner) would welcome the opportunity to discuss the provision of commercial and retail facilities in an appropriate and complementary manner to those already existing in Eynsham. The consortium agrees with vision ENV8 – a new Garden Village style settlement that any new settlement north of the A40 should not be wholly dependent on Eynsham, and that any shared facilities shall be for mutual benefit.</p> <p>Draft Neighbourhood Plan policies Commentary on the draft policies of the pre-submission are made in addition to those submitted in October 2016. Reference should, where relevant, be made to these earlier submissions. Policy ENP1 – Housing Please see correspondence dated 28th October 2016. Policy ENP2 – Design Please see correspondence dated 28th October 2016. Policy ENP3 – Community Facilities In respect of land north of the A40 and a proposed Garden Village, this policy appears contradictory to the aims of creating a separate and distinct settlement which provides for its residents</p>	<p>EFSG's approach to being 'too prescriptive' is already explained in FAQ Appendix</p> <p>Q. Why have so many policies which are prescriptive; what about market-forces? A Eynsham is well placed between Oxford City and the countryside of West Oxfordshire and as a result house prices are high and in no way limited by the cost of building which is typically less than 50% of the price of each dwelling. Under these circumstances developers are able to sell anything they put up. Homes built in Eynsham should possess an excellent standard of design, energy efficiency and landscaping but there isn't any market pressure to 'build better' as anything will sell. We believe it is necessary to establish high but realistic standards to ensure that responsible developers are not undercut by those who are less concerned with building long-term, sustainable homes. But we also include:</p> <p>Q. Why do you include 'get-outs' like the 'except where...' comments? A. The policies are implemented by elected (WODC) representatives who need to have some discretion when deciding what is the best option for the community they represent as it isn't possible to write rules which cover every circumstance. ENV2 will be reworded to include 'or equivalent' as there may be an alternative from CABE or other body during the life of the ENP. It should be noted that the Feb 2017 White Paper actually recommends the use of BfL12 as a design standard.</p> <p>ENP3 unfortunately the comment isn't specific about which elements are contradictory. There is a real problem with ensuring that a GV is a separate community, even though it is not physically very separated, and making the best of</p>
--	---

<p>locally. Whilst the consortium supports the principle of a mutually beneficial range of services and facilities between Eynsham and the proposed Garden Village where appropriate, further attention to the exact wording of this policy is required in ensuring a consistent policy basis for the plan.</p> <p>In consideration of Criterion E and the provision of 1 allotment for every new home, it is noted that public open space will be provided on site to be agreed through any future masterplan. It is requested that greater flexibility is built into this policy.</p> <p>Policy ENP3a – Health Care Facilities Criterion B of this Policy relates specifically to a new settlement north of the A40, and sets out the primary health care facilities should be provided both there and in Eynsham. The consortium agrees with the need to provide local community health facilities through partnership with such providers, although this should avoid an overly onerous and prescriptive approach to the delivery of local service provision. It is recommended that this policy be re-written to a less prescriptive standard to allow the necessary flexibility.</p> <p>It is again noted that the consortium supports the principle of a mutually beneficial range of services and facilities between Eynsham and the proposed Garden Village where appropriate, but further attention to the exact wording of this policy is required.</p> <p>Policy ENP6 – Education The consortium agrees with the principle of contributing to the expansion or new building of educational facilities. Nevertheless criterion A & B are too rigid and arguably unnecessary in respect of the delivery of a new settlement at land north of the A40. Education provision will be discussed with the relevant authorities in due course and will take account of such matters in the natural course of any subsequent planning application. Policies to this effect are not required to ensure sufficient education capacity. Paragraph 6.2. should be amended. Reference to Eynsham Partnership Academy should proportionately reflect a consultation role rather than one of statutory requirement, for which responsibilities lie solely with Oxfordshire County Council in respect of education provision.</p> <p>Policy EN14 - Sustainable Growth The consortium welcomes the Plan’s acceptance of the provision of a new settlement in the Neighbourhood Plan Area during the plan period. This includes the provision of at least 3200 new homes in the plan area allocated as per the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031.</p> <p>Policy EN16 – North of the A40 The consortium supports Policy ENP16 in its</p>	<p>this unusual situation of co-location by sharing some facilities where this is mutually beneficial. The preamble of ENP16 (after blue policy frame) tries to resolve the apparent contradiction.</p> <p>This policy is based on the current situation where Eynsham is short of allotments at the current rate of 1 per 24 homes, therefore a minimum of 1 per 20 homes is suggested for new developments.</p> <p>This section (ENP2.12) has been amended in the light of recent conversations with Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group. No obvious solution exists at present so, to avoid unsustainable prescription, the involvement of the CCG in the master-planning process and as a consultee in all planning decisions is recommended (green frame).</p> <p>The potential loss of the Eynsham Medical Centre would be seen as unacceptable to Eynsham hence the strongly prescriptive ENP3.13 is still considered necessary and appropriate in representing local opinion.</p> <p>ENP6A and B are worded to respect the fact that the primary school will be new and may be in the separate settlement whereas the senior school will be Bartholomew School in Eynsham as it still has some capacity to expand.</p> <p>Demonstrating how places will be provided is not an onerous burden on those preparing a masterplan or the subsequent more detailed plans and should be seen as a minor strengthening of the standard practice to answer strong local criticism of poor education planning in recent planning decisions.</p> <p>EPA are referenced as the 'providers' – have made it clearer that is as consultee not final decision maker.</p>
--	---

safeguarding of the area north of the A40 for at least 2200 residential units and associated educational, cultural and social facilities.

The consortium accepts that development shall be in accordance with a Masterplan approved by West Oxfordshire District Council, which will be prepared in consultation with the Parish Council as appropriate. It is also accepted that the requirements for supporting infrastructure and services will be established through the Masterplan process. It is noted that other draft plan policies should be wholly consistent with this aim. It is supported that criteria A-G will be appropriately considered through the Masterplan process.

The consortium also supports the principle of flexibility in the development of a new settlement north of the A40. As such, the specific wording of paragraphs 16.3, 16.4, 16.5 and 16.6 should be amended to reflect the role of robust technical inputs in determining the most appropriate access to any such development in due course.

The phasing of development will be informed by the Masterplan process, and through the course of the planning application process. Paragraph 16.15 outlining a proposed prioritisation of development types on site should be amended to reflect this.

Paragraph 16.19 should be revised to reflect that financial contributions required by the Local Planning Authority will be discussed in due course as part of any subsequent planning application.

As elsewhere in this correspondence, the consortium supports a mutually beneficial role for any new settlement north of the A40. This principle is consistent with the provisions of Paragraph 16.20.

Paragraphs 16.21 – 16.24 outline additional policies relating to potential improvements to the A40 involving bus lanes, dualling, and/or re-siting of the road. At present, these policies are too prescriptive. It is emphasised that detailed design matters and other such matters (including any required mitigation) will be considered during the Masterplan process and any subsequent planning application, as informed by robust technical inputs.

Paragraphs 16.25 – 16.29 relate to potential improvements to the A40 in its current location and course. As above, these draft policies are at present too prescriptive. Such matters will be considered in the course of the Masterplan process and any subsequent planning application.

Conclusions

The above comments are set out in a constructive manner to help support the preparation of the Plan, prior to its submission to West Oxfordshire District

This section has had to be re-written now there is an alternative GV which might then result in the area north of the A40 coming forward as a smaller integrated extension to Eynsham. Policies need to reflect these two possibilities.

A note has been added before ENP 16.1 to indicate that there will be technical reasons for amendments and these should be done in conjunction with local consultation.

<p>Council.</p> <p>Our key concern is that Plan preparation needs to reflect the emerging Local Plan policies that directly affect Eynsham and better integrate these within the document. Proceeding with the Plan without such integration risks the plan failing at examination or only having a short lifespan, effectively becoming out of date soon after adoption</p>	
--	--

<p>CF no. 22.</p>	
<p>P4 You might want to change or remove ‘probably’</p>	<p>True, done</p>
<p>P5 and others ‘Tilgarsley’ is now officially dead subject to some sort of competition/consultation on a new name to replace Tilgarsley or the DCLG ‘Oxford Cotswolds’</p>	<p>Agreed – OCGV is used instead</p>
<p>P8 A community path to connect to the Toll Bridge/Botley Path would be pretty short would it not?</p>	<p>Better than nothing.</p>
<p>P9-P10 Difficult to comment on some of this but the paragraph on Assets of Community Value looks fairly pointless.</p>	<p>Doesn't do any harm</p>
<p>P17 3.14 I found the ‘chatty’ style a bit incongruous, “on a positive note” could be simply lost without affecting the content or context.</p>	<p>OK, done</p>
<p>P18 3.15/3.16 As the LPA demand a consultation/approval from statutory consultees, Thames water etc. I found it difficult to see the point of this. Similarly, I thought that 3.17/3.18 might be outside of the NP remit?</p>	<p>Put in at Thames Water's request and the others added to match. Broadband bit as a reminder given the poor coverage by BT particularly to Southern Ind Est.</p>
<p>P21 5.12 This is in direct opposition to the LPA ELP which specifies a MINIMUM for car parking spaces and it would be dangerous to allow ANY development without parking provision. AND P25 9.7 Once again this runs against the LPA ELP and I think that it would be dangerous to change planning policy when you don't have control of the public transport and cannot predict or ensure a sufficient service in the future. ENP5.11</p>	<p>This was requested by Natural England; EPC on Tuesday Feb7th agreed that this should not be included</p>
<p>P29 12.3 at the end of the paragraph suggests “any other development” I would suggest that you lose “except in very special circumstances” and simply state “will not normally be allowed”.</p>	<p>OK</p>
<p>P34 14.15 This needs an edit as the green box has split the text so a line of text</p>	

appears AFTER the box finishes

P35 ENP14, J “until the y are in a position to review it” ????????

P37 refers to Tilgarsley again...

P38 I found this confusing, consider re-write?

P43 ENP17 for the record I completely but COMPLETELY disagree with this. Some sort of western link road is needed to ease the strain on the East/West transit of traffic via Acre End Street and Spareacre. By all means use traffic calming to make it unattractive as a North/South rat run but a link is needed. I did however love the idea of the Chilbrook Linear park and I don't think that the link road and linear park are mutually exclusive.

Formatting will have to be checked after edit is finished

Which bit?

Link road – so not a rat run ever – or a continuous 20mph residential road when traffic calming would be required.

Cannot see how road could be afforded without extra houses and crossing of Chil will wipe out most of the route of the Park. For debate at EPC

CF no. 23.

Education

Policy ENP 6 Education

Bullet D is vague – This would work for the current “larger” sites but another site may come forward whereby a school may not be needed. The text currently says “where appropriate” but it should reference Oxfordshire County Council (OCC), e.g. “where the authority with responsibility for ensuring sufficiency of school places confirms that a new school will be necessary” (phrased to take into account whether sufficiency duties are taken away).

As the growth in Eynsham is likely to need secondary school sites, bullet D could also say secondary, e.g. “land for new primary and/or secondary education provision” – this phrasing is also more helpful for any instances where a second site or expansion land for an existing school rather than a standalone new school is needed.

Paragraph 6.2 states “Developers shall work closely with OCC and EPA to ensure that land, access and financial contribution is available from development sites to allow them to meet their responsibility to educate the village's children. OCC and EPA (as education provider) shall sign off any Masterplan before implementation.” This is despite the “Contextual Note: education in Eynsham is currently provided by the Eynsham Partnership Academy(EPA) who are

Agreed, section amended

<p>represented on the ENP team but the responsibility for ensuring education provision rests with OCC and future schools will not necessarily be provided by EPA". Paragraph 6.2 should therefore not solely state EPA – it could be “EPA (or other approved provider)”.</p> <p>Para 6.3 “The Primary School is already at capacity and the prospect of 'bussing' of primary-age children to schools outside the village is particularly undesirable. Therefore development should only be permitted when it can be shown that there are (or will be at the time of completion) enough school places available to meet the demand predicted for the number and type of homes to be built according to OCC's schedule. This shall apply to Eynsham and OCGV separately for primary schooling and in combination for secondary schooling.”</p> <p>Depending on the scales and timing of the 2 large sites, efficient delivery of primary school provision may require some flow between OCGV and Eynsham, at least in the short term. Indeed, parents may choose the “other” school. It is not considered that the two settlements are far enough apart to isolate the primary school provisions in this way.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.5 names the EPA – it could say “(or other approved provider)” rather than “(as provider)”. It should not specify “Increasing the school capacity from 2 to 3 form entry” – This considers only the existing school, but the policy still needs to apply when there are more schools, i.e. it also needs to apply to West Eynsham where the school might not be 2fe to start with – OCC would advise removing the highlighted text.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.7 “If a new settlement close to Eynsham is created whose students will attend Bartholomew School, a suitable expansion of the school shall be funded from an S106 agreement for this new settlement so no Eynsham or Tilgarsley students are required to attend another senior school.”</p> <p>It cannot be guaranteed that Bartholomew will expand, as that is subject to the Regional Schools Commissioner approval. This text could be changed to “suitable expansion of secondary school capacity in a manner approved by the Regional Schools Commissioner and/or other authority as required by the relevant legislation”.</p> <p>Paragraph 6.8 - “New schools shall have provision for safe drop-off and collection of pupils including appropriate space for parents to wait without causing nuisance or hazard to other road users.” Any schemes will need county</p>	<p>Agreed</p> <p>This is contrary to GV concepts although OCC will no doubt use whatever flexibility is available. The ENP is concerned that provision will be made in the community where it is needed and the two communities will be 'separate' as required by GV principles.</p> <p>These were intended to be options, e.g. 'either or both'. These words added as obviously not clear enough</p> <p>Wording is a bit clunky but if that's what it takes.....</p> <p>.. and so far there is no evidence of OCC Highways doing anything about in Eynsham which is why this statement is necessary. Wording changed slightly so responsibility is on the overall masterplan design, not specifically on the school</p>
---	--

input as Highway Authority.

SA 4.7 "Option W1 only has housing north of Chilbridge Road.... The most sensitive area at the south of the site is ideal for a new Primary School".

Currently there has been no work undertaken which has looked into where the location for a new primary school should be located so this is misleading.

Archaeology

Eynsham is an important medieval town with significant buildings and surviving archaeological features. The latter includes two Scheduled Ancient Monuments; SM118, the site of Eynsham Abbey and SM 119 an extensive prehistoric settlement at Foxley Fields. There are also numerous listed buildings. There are other non-designated archaeological sites that are also potentially important and form an integral part of the development of the town and the wider parish. Should development be proposed that may result in material damage to them then appropriate mitigation will be required in line with the NPPF and Local Plan policy. The plan however includes no acknowledgement of the historic environment or any indication that it should be a material consideration when assessing the impact of future development.

The plan also includes a series of proposals for various developments within or around the village. ENP17 B includes designated and non-designated heritage assets but this is only for development west of the village and ignores the rest of the parish.

We would recommend therefore that the importance of the historic environment is included in the plan along with the following policy.

Historic Environment

The parish's designated historic heritage assets and their settings, both above and below ground including listed buildings, scheduled monuments and conservation areas will be conserved and enhanced for their historic significance and their important contribution to local distinctiveness, character and sense of place.

Proposals for development that affect non-designated historic assets will be considered taking account of the scale of any harm or loss and the significance of the heritage asset as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF 2012) .

No, but this is only an indicative map which notes that the low profile buildings of a school would be appropriate in this location.

ENP14A policy extended to require protection of these assets.
The suggested text added as ENP14.15 and 16 under the heading 'Protecting the historic environment'

CF no. 24.

1.7 Development should be within reasonable walking distance of the Village Centre (see Note B), to ensure the village feel is retained.

This approach could inhibit WODC from delivering the scale of homes as proposed for the West Eynsham SDA in the draft LP, this could mean that the NP is not in general conformity with the strategic policies set out in the LP and therefore unacceptable as per the NPPF.

Additionally - a larger development could provide self-supporting infrastructure and not be solely reliant on existing services.

Definition of 'Paths' box following ENP1 - Paths should have continuity of status along their length where possible – so if a footpath is upgraded to a bridleway that should apply along its length. This is so that people following maps or unfamiliar with the area re not confused.

ENP5D Policy may be inadvertently restrictive, suggest rewording to read “New homes shall have the capability of adding a charging point suitable for different types of electric vehicles.”

ENP7A: This policy is regarded by OCC as overly prescriptive. There may be benefit from retaining the ability for vehicular access directly into the village from the west Eynsham SDA. For example, there could be a cul-de-sac development within the SDA, i.e. not one that connects with vehicular access to the rest of the strategic site area. Additionally, there could be good reason to retain the possibility of creating a vehicular link that enables emergency vehicles and/ or buses (school or service) to access the SDA directly from the village.

Furthermore, it may be useful or necessary to allow some construction traffic to access development sites via the existing village roads in the absence of suitable alternatives. LTP4 states: “We [OCC] will also seek to minimise environmental damage from HGVs through the use of Routing Agreements, Construction Logistics Plans and Delivery and Servicing Plans, as part of the development control process.”

ENP 7B: Homes Zones carry with them specific legislation, suggest this is either changed to 'Home Zone Principles' or to Manual for Streets which provides greater flexibility in designing residential spaces.

ENP7.4: Need to carefully consider the function of new roads which helps

ENP1.9, 10 and 11 provide flexibility in this policy. 1.7 added 'normally' to qualify 'within reasonable walking distance' as it is always intended that some flexibility is allowed; at least 600 extra homes can be delivered to the west.

Note B makes it clear that a new 'centre' creates a new set of rules but with similar dimensions to achieve 'village' proportions

removed upgraded “to bridleway” to prevent this anomaly.

Change policy wording; ENP5.7 now says 'of at least 7kW (=32A @ 230V) capacity' and reference NPPF 35.

ENP7.2 provides the necessary exceptions to this requirement which is primarily included for the benefit of A40 users but also to reduce traffic in narrow village street.

Emergency access is definitely required (and would be provided through Chilbridge Road for any western development).
Allowing local traffic and particularly buses would be beneficial for access through Thornbury Road although this exit is very sensitive at Bartholomew start and finish times and preventing through traffic will be critical at least until improvement of the A40 makes 'rat-running' unnecessary.

Note will be made of OCC LTP4 as the mechanism for ensuring implementation of the policy

Helpful suggestion to improve wording, Manual for Streets was in ENP7.5 but now added to policy ENP7B

<p>determine their width, speed and frontage etc. The OCC Residential Road Design Guidance stipulates the dimensions and footway/cycleway provision for various road types and the Eynsham NP should be consistent with this guidance.</p> <p>In some instances off-carriageway cycling provision may not always be the most desirable or practical solution. Draft cycling design guidance from OCC outlines appropriate provision for cyclists and is due to be adopted in spring 2017.</p> <p>ENP9.7: This policy appears to be inconsistent with policy ENP5 (D), which requires that there should be the capability for a charging point to be added, whereas this policy seems to imply that the charging point itself should be provided. It would be helpful to clarify this ambiguity.</p> <p>ENP14D: Does a masterplan have any formal planning status, such as an adopted SPD? If not, this may not be a suitable mechanism to achieve the overall goals of this policy.</p> <p>ENP14.7: OCC has its own requirements for transport assessments and transport statements, which are in line with national policy. OCC as Highway Authority has guidance on how Transport Assessments for developments are conducted.</p> <p>ENP14C: OCC has its own requirements for Transport Statements and Assessments, which cover this topic. These are in line with national policy. OCC as Highway Authority has guidance on how Transport Assessments for developments are conducted.</p> <p>ENP15F: A positive aim in principle, there may be constraints to implementing this policy particularly as there is probably insufficient space in the village centre to provide bus shelters (see reference in 15.5).</p> <p>ENP16: WODC is planning to deliver 2,200 dwellings in the garden village, not 3,200. However the policy should not be specific as this may change over time.</p> <p>ENP16B: It may be helpful to be more specific about what specific types of impacts this policy is aiming to address.</p> <p>ENP16.4 : Extensive traffic modelling will be required to establish the highway measures to serve new developments, including access arrangements that are appropriate.</p> <p>ENP16.6: During the master planning the local authorities will need to consider the merits of safeguarding land for upgrading the A40 to a dual-carriageway,</p>	<p>ENP7.4 has been amended to include reference to OCC guidelines as suggested</p> <p>This policy is to ensure a suitable <i>parking location</i> is provided. Wording amended to include ref to NPPF35 as well.</p> <p>It is expected that WODC will give due regard to masterplans which are a requirement under the ENP</p> <p>Paragraph was poorly worded. Now references Travel Plans (NPPF 36), OCC guidance but include the need for audit and need to consider worst-case conditions. This is appropriate in the local context s the road is so badly congested at peak times affecting the whole District.</p> <p>(Now ENP14 recommendation H) Reference has been made to OCC guidance – wording now begins “Given the serious economic impact of A40 congestion” to make clear why we think the extra requirement is necessary in our local case.</p> <p>This is understood but sometimes imaginative solutions do come forward to resolve previously insoluble problems.</p> <p>We are encouraging flexibility rather than limit to a particular number.</p> <p>Wording changes to require an impact assessment as it would be unwise to create a list now which may be incomplete and therefore restrictive.</p> <p>Agreed, but minimising junctions will help traffic flow better.</p> <p>There is no agreed strategy but there is long-standing aspiration and plenty of previous plans, some quite recent, which could be utilised to create a perfectly</p>
---	---

noting that there is no present strategy to deliver this.

ENP16.13 Mandatory national road signage will follow DfT standards.

ENP16.16a : It is unclear what is meant by a 'traffic-free' area. Does this mean a pedestrianised area? Some elaboration would be helpful here.

ENP16.24: The range of destinations served by bus services from the park and ride is not yet known and will depend on levels of demand that would sustain long-term commercial bus provision.

ENP16.26 & 27: The OCC feasibility study for the proposed Eynsham Park & Ride and A40 bus lanes proposes at grade crossings.

ENP17A: OCC policy requires that developments over 400 dwellings are served by more than one access. Therefore, this development will require more than a single access.

ENP17.2: It may not be technically possible or desirable in terms of capacity, safety, or other reasons, to incorporate existing nearby accesses into a junction serving the SDA.

reasonable plan rather than risk cutting off all options.

This should have referred to advertising hoardings, not statutory signage.

Yes, the word 'pedestrianised' has been added.

This paragraph aims to promote the wider use of the P&R as a transport hub to benefit Eynsham / OCGV including the benefits of routing some buses through the villages. WODC is currently promoting Hanborough Station which seems less valuable district-wide than the P&R for this purpose.

We are not convinced by the 'at grade' crossings and make our observations, which are as much aimed at future situations, accordingly.

ENP17A and 7.2 have been amended to ensure access for emergency vehicles and encourage some local traffic and buses through to the village but with tight control to minimise through traffic into the village. Of the 600 homes we recommend, 160 already have permitted access through Thornbury Road.

The intent to minimise traffic delays by multiple junctions is clearly set out. This will allow technical changes that bring the same end result. Wording altered to allow 'other means' to achieve the required result.

<p>CF no. 25.</p> <p>Policy ENP2 Design: We strongly support the use of Neighbourhood Plans by communities to ensure that new development responds positively to those features of character that they value. At present the policy leaves a considerable element of subjectivity to the decision maker as to what might be considered 'visually attractive'. This does not add clarity to the decision-making process or secure consideration of elements the community consider to be important. It is likely to be removed at examination.</p> <p>Whilst buildings are an important element of a conservation area, the area is designated to preserve and enhance the totality of its character and appearance (or at least those part that contribute positively to it), including trees, spaces, green areas street materials, etc.. We would recommend changing the bullet point to "Proposals for development within the conservation area or in its setting that do not sustain or, where practicable, enhance its character or appearance will not be supported."</p> <p>Nevertheless the policy could be augmented to identify particular features of the conservation area, such as the use of particular materials, scale or spacing of buildings that should be protected in new development and that should be referenced in their design. The design guide may provide a source of detail and should be referred to in the policy itself to secure this as a document that will be given weight in planning decisions. However, it is the policy itself that receives the greatest weight and the more specific it is the greater the degree of control that can be exerted. It might also help to consider forms of development or design that the community feel would be inappropriate in Eynsham or a particular part of it.</p> <p>We are please to support the allocation of sites as Local Green Space through the plan, which also provides recognition of the contribution of these spaces to the conservation area or its setting and the setting of listed buildings and that has historic interest in its own right, notably LGS7, LGS8, LGS 9, LGS 11, LGS 12 and LGS 13.</p>	<p>Oddly, design and the 'look' of the village has not been a very strong element of local concern perhaps because Eynsham is an eclectic mix of styles and in some cases, the antithesis of style! The latter point is taken – wording is now “New development shall be well related to and in keeping with its immediate setting and character and to the wider village and landscape context.”</p> <p>The conservation area is addressed in more detail in ENP15</p> <p>ENP2A has been amended to “Proposals for development within the conservation area or in its setting that do not sustain or, where practicable, enhance its character or appearance and do not conform to the WODC design guide will not be supported” with a link to ENP15</p> <p>The design guide features in ENP2A.</p> <p>This is valuable advice – ENP2C is now “A mix of different styles, particularly pastiche renditions of local styles, in close proximity should not be used. The height of buildings shall suit their location” to bring policy emphasis to ENP2 4 and 5 as these are the main issues raised on design.</p>
--	--

<p>Support recognition of heritage assets as factors that contribute to the village character that should be sustained in policy ENP14.</p> <p>ENP 15 Measures E and G cannot form part of the policy. Measure A could be amended to provide recognition of key aspects of the conservation area that contribute to its role as a village centre that should be highlighted for conservation or enhancement through planning decisions. This might, for example, include evidence of historic use of buildings for retail or service functions. It isn't clear what aspects of the village square need to be preserved. Is it the uncluttered feel, use of timber street furniture and coloured road surfacing that contribute to its village character?</p> <p>ENP 15 Recommendations. It would be possible for the community to prepare a conservation area appraisal with the District Council. Whilst this may require negotiation to ensure a document is acceptable to both the community and Council, this in itself, would be a valuable process of consensus building.</p> <p>Policy ENP 17 We would like to suggest replacing bullet point B with the following:</p> <p>“Development should be designed to sustain or better reveal the significance of the village’s heritage assets and to avoid harm to them, including indirectly through harmful change in their settings. Where developments could affect heritage assets either directly or indirectly a heritage statement clearly describing the development site’s contribution to the significance of these heritage assets will be expected to accompany any application for development, including a description of the measures taken to avoid or minimise harm and any measures that have specifically been included to enhance heritage assets. Where proposals would nevertheless result in unavoidable harm, this should be clearly identified along with and any public benefit that could not otherwise be delivered and is considered to justify that harm.”</p> <p>We would also like to suggest the Parish Council consult with the District and County Council’s archaeological advisors to ascertain whether any of the land west of Eynsham referred to is known to have particular potential for the</p>	<p>Parking can be moved but the conversion of buildings – often listed ones – into HMOs will have a significant impact on the physical and community aspects of the CA</p> <p>Some strengthening of the details in the policy has been made but there isn't much we can add apart from the need to keep the space open and usable while setting the context for historic buildings round it</p> <p>This requirement also applies to development near the listed buildings of City Farm and the suggested paragraph is much longer than most policy point. To achieve the same ends ENP17B will be changed to</p> <p>“B Development should sustain or better reveal the significance of designated and non-designated heritage assets and avoid harm to them and their settings, and safeguard existing trees and hedgerows.”</p> <p>The paragraph has been added to ENP14.16-18 which deals with historic assets while ENP17.4 and ENP16.18 reference the full paragraph. ENP14A has already been amended to include 'protecting these (heritage) assets and their settings so this paragraph fits nicely into ENP14.</p> <p>We have had a response from OCC Archaeology which prompted the amendments to ENP14 mentioned above.</p> <p>There are sites to the west which are scheduled ancient monument which are</p>
---	--

<p>presence of regionally or nationally important archaeological remains that might need to be given particular consideration in planning applications.</p> <p>We particularly support the identification of the key views from the bridleway at Chilbridge Road towards the village and church in particular. However, the policy doesn't clearly identify what should be given priority for protection in the view. Is it a green foreground, verdant setting to the village, or purely the visibility of village buildings and church tower that are valued? Although Wytham Hill is identified as an important landmark in views in the supporting text this isn't clearly referred to in the policy text. As such, views to it would be afforded little protection. A useful starting point might be to analyse one or more photographs of the view using the methodology set out in the recent 'Oxford View Cones Assessment' prepared to support policy protection of some other locally valued views and which can be downloaded at: https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20064/conservation/876/oxford_views_study</p>	<p>well known to WODC and the proposed development does not encroach on them.</p> <p>Rewording will be :</p> <p>D The form of any development alongside Chilbridge Road should have particular regard to its impact on the view from the bridleway over open fields towards the historic village centre and Wytham Hill beyond and from the south & western road approaches.</p>
---	--

<p>CF no. 26.</p> <p>Although several criteria with direct relevance to public health are included in Section 3, such as the desire to “protect and enhance” community spirit, ensure new homes meet the ‘Built for Life’ accreditation, the need for community facilities and the provision of “excellent pedestrian and cycle paths”, neither the Vision nor the Objectives make overt reference to improving the health and wellbeing of residents. Key general points to consider including in this section and link in with the Planning Policies that follow might include encouraging the development of an environment which:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provides opportunities for people to be more active (this could be used to support aspirations for ‘reasonable walking distances’ within the village together with active travel infrastructure to and from other settlements including Oxford and the provision of adequate sports/leisure facilities) • provides opportunities to make healthier food choices (this could be linked to the aspiration for local shops which allow all residents to shop for day-to-day needs within the village without the need for a vehicle, the provision of additional allotments and retention of orchards within local green spaces) 	<p>Explicit references are few although this was part of the original supporting evidence in the SA scoping report</p> <p>The ENP has skipped the rationale and gone straight for the policy; the benefits are considered self-evident and the planning policy is the most important element which is present already.</p>
--	--

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • fosters good mental health and wellbeing by increasing opportunities for social interaction/reducing social isolation and loneliness (this could be linked to the design and use of community facilities, public realm and green spaces/infrastructure) • enables people to maintain their independence for longer (this could be linked to the aspiration for 'lifetime homes' standards within new builds, locally accessible amenities and services, and public realm that considers the needs of older people, such as bus stops with suitable seating) <p>The above are supported by National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) paragraphs 7, 35, 50, 69, 156 and the Planning Policy Guidance 'Health and Wellbeing' chapter and would also help to make the case for CIL funding.</p> <p>Although Policy ENP3 sets out aspirations for a range of different types of community facility the case for multi-functional facilities has not been stated. In addition to increasing the long term sustainability of community facilities multiple functions are more likely to increase opportunities for social interaction/reduce social isolation and loneliness. Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) strongly recommends that the development of multi-functional community facilities is included within the criteria for policy ENP3. The above is supported by NPPF paragraphs 38, 69 and 58.</p> <p>Policy ENP6 does not set out the health and wellbeing benefits of active travel to school whilst Section 6.8 states that "new schools shall have provision for safe drop-off and collection of pupils including appropriate space for parents to wait without causing nuisance or hazard to other road users". To help improve pupil wellbeing and academic attainment whilst also reducing inactivity, obesity, air pollution and congestion OCC strongly recommends that the health and wellbeing benefits of active travel to school are included within the criteria for policy ENP6 and clearly stated within Section 6.8. The above is supported by NPPF paragraphs 35 and 38.</p> <p>Section 7.7 within 'Sustainable Travel' states that "developments shall encourage the use of alternatives to the private car particularly by providing pedestrian and cycle paths that provide the shortest practical routes to bus stops, long-distance cycle paths and the like". To maximise the behavioural change potential of new active travel infrastructure, OCC strongly recommends that this section highlights the importance of appropriately phased development i.e. people moving into new developments are more likely to</p>	<p>This has been explicitly mentioned in the justification for walkability of new developments</p> <p>Lifetime homes are included in ENP1 although without the explicit reasoning suggested here</p> <p>ENP3C already lists multiple functions that a building should be used for – the phrase 'multi-functional' has been added to strengthen the policy along with ref to the NPPF paras suggested.</p> <p>The need for safe drop-off is clearly shown in Eynsham on every school day but the importance of being able to walk to school can be emphasised here , as it is elsewhere in the plan</p>
---	--

<p>adopt healthier day-to-day lifestyle habits when health promoting infrastructure, such as walkways and cycle paths, is already in place. The above is supported by NPPF paragraph 177.</p>	<p>Useful guidance – ENP7.7 has been upgraded to include this requirement.</p>
---	--

<p>CF no. 27. OxLEP</p> <p>We support the Eynsham NP in the context of:</p> <p>ENV6 – Economy – industry, commerce and retail, and ENP10 – Building a strong, sustainable economy, as being in alignment with the SEP’s priorities for People, Place and Enterprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • People – delivering and attracting specialist and flexible skills at all levels, across all sectors, as required by our businesses, filling skills gaps, and seeking to ensure full, inclusive, employment and fulfilling jobs; • Place – ensuring a strong link between jobs and housing growth, and providing a quality environment that supports and sustains growth; and offering the choice of business premises and homes (including more homes that are genuinely affordable) needed to support sustainable growth whilst capitalising on and valuing our exceptional quality of life, vibrant economy and urban and rural communities; • Enterprise – emphasising innovation-led growth, underpinned by the strength of Oxfordshire’s research, business collaboration and supply chain potential; recognising and reinforcing the significant contribution made by all sectors, in all parts of Oxfordshire and all types of business; 	
---	--

<p>CF no. 28. Environment Agency</p> <p>Flood Zones 2 & 3</p> <p>Your plan includes site proposals which are located in areas of Flood Zone 2 and 3. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) para 100-102, we recommend the Sequential Test is undertaken when allocating sites to ensure development is directed to the areas of lowest flood risk.</p> <p>The Sequential Test should be informed by the Local Planning Authorities Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA).</p>	<p>This is a statutory requirement but as an added reminder is now included in ENP15.14.</p>
--	--

<p>We would have concerns if development is allocated in this high risk flood zone without the Sequential Test being undertaken.</p> <p>It is important that your Plan also considers whether the flood risk issues associated with these sites can be safely managed to ensure development can come forward. Without this understanding we are unsure how your Plan can demonstrate compliance with the NPPF.</p> <p>The Local Authority will be able to advise if there are areas at risk from surface water flood risk (including groundwater and sewerage flood risk) in your neighbourhood plan area. The Surface Water Management Plan will contain recommendations and actions about how such sites can help reduce the risk of flooding. This may be useful when developing policies or guidance for particular sites.</p> <p>Main Rivers Both the Chil Brook and Eynsham Mead Ditch run adjacent to Eynsham and are located on sites proposed in Appendix A: WODC SHELAA Site proposals. As they are designated Main Rivers we would expect an 8 metre undeveloped buffer zone to protect ecology associated with the rivers.</p> <p>Eynsham Garden Village We would welcome opportunities for early engagement with regards to the Eynsham Garden Village proposals.</p> <p>Neighbourhood Planning Advice Together with Natural England, English Heritage and the Forestry Commission we have published joint advice on neighbourhood planning. This sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into neighbourhood plans. This is available at:</p> <p>http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</p>	<p>We are relying on them to enforce this requirement.</p> <p>Enhancing the protection and ecology of the Chil has become more prominent as comments have been received – ENP17.9 and 10 have been added along with the suggestion of a Linear Park all along the Chil to ensure 'bio-diversity' gain that NPPF also requires of large developments.</p> <p>Main river status has been noted where relevant</p>
---	---

<p>CF no. 29.</p> <p>2.1 Map 1 – ‘Village Context’ on page 3 of the draft Plan shows a ‘Proposed Western Extension Boundary’ outlined in red. This boundary is different to the boundary of the proposed West Eynsham SDA as set out in the District Council’s Submission Draft Local Plan 2031.</p> <p>Policies ENP1 and ENP8, an ideal and maximum distance threshold for new</p>	<p>This error has been corrected. We only note the western boundary of the site on our map.</p> <p>These policies do not suggest that a greater distance than 1000m will be in any</p>
---	--

development from the village centre is an arbitrary way of managing the future form of development and sustainability. Decisions about the location of development should be based on a wider ranging assessment of the form of development proposed, its accessibility to existing and new facilities and its physical relationship to the village. It is too simplistic to suggest that any development located more than 1,000 metres from local services will by definition be unsustainable.

Berkeley notes that Policy ENP12 identifies an area on the West Eynsham SDA to be preserved for 'Local Green Space'. Berkeley would suggest that the provision of public open spaces within the SDA would best be considered through the comprehensive master plan process for the whole site (Policy ENP17 – 'Development of a western extension to the village' in the draft Plan states that development of the area should be accordance with an approved Masterplan)

Para 14.10 of the draft Plan states that:

"On the basis of the criteria set out in ENP17 it is considered that a future expansion to the west of Eynsham for 600 homes could be acceptable."

As indicated above, following capacity work carried out by the District Council, the West Eynsham SDA is allocated for 1,000 new homes in the Submission Draft Local Plan 2031. Berkeley agrees with and supports this approach and is confident that the site can successfully deliver 1,000 new homes in a way that is sympathetic to the village.

Para 14.12 of the draft Plan states that:

"Land to the west of Eynsham should remain as a reserve site, something that the WODC LP noticeably lacks at present." 2.7 As indicated above, the West of Eynsham SDA is identified by the District Council as a housing allocation to help meet its housing target or "Objectively Assessed Need" (OAN) as set out in its emerging Local Plan 2031 and as part of the District Council's contribution to Oxford's unmet need. Without this allocation, the District Council would fall short of providing for its OAN as required in Government guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework. Furthermore, this allocation will help deliver much needed new infrastructure, such as new primary school in Eynsham. It cannot and should not therefore be considered a reserve site, not least because this would result in a material inconsistency between the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan.

way unsustainable. It will be out of character with the village and detract from a village form, tending instead towards a town with separated neighbourhoods. The policy is written to allow exceptions and already accepts that houses to the west of Eynsham will be as much as 1400m from the centre. There are also clear health and social benefits from walkability which have been highlighted by other respondents which will be included in the final ENP version.

We are surprised that Berkeley would object to such a small piece of land over which they have no ownership or control and which is of exceptional local bio-diversity surrounding a public footpath should not be designated LGS. Hopefully they will support the use of this land as LGS within the masterplan

Our position is that 1000 houses will require building of far too many houses and result in poor design, failure to achieve the bio-diversity gain as required by NPPF 109, loss of local amenity and may fail sequential testing on matters such as flood risk, landscape, loss of grade 2 agricultural land and struggle to fund the access road. We consider that WODC is unwise to allocate so many houses at this stage and should maintain – as we will – that the final decisions should be made when a masterplan takes shape. We can see 600 homes as being feasible at this stage; to deliver more will require further detailed work.

We are aware that WODC has no reserve allocation in its plan and is at risk of failing to meet its OAN.

We have suggested that the garden Village can take many more than its 2200 allocation – the EOI indicates that it can expand – and that the combination of even 600 to the west and between 2200 and 3200 in the GV will meet the OAN with some in reserve.

There needs to be joined up thinking in the draft Plan regarding design of the access to the West of Eynsham SDA and the West Oxfordshire Garden Village SDA proposal (allocated for 2,200 new homes in the District Council's emerging Local Plan 2031). The will help ensure that growth at Eynsham is delivered in a timely manner, that the two developments complement each other and that the correct level of infrastructure is provided (see below).

Berkeley does not agree with comments made in the draft Plan at paragraph 17.9 and Appendix A, paragraphs SA4.5 and SA4.6 concerning the difficulty in developing land south of the Chilbrook due to its raised topography. There is no reason why this area could not be developed if it was sensitively designed and subject to appropriate landscape mitigation.

As indicated above, Berkeley has control over the majority of the proposed West of Eynsham SDA. Berkeley has a proven track record in promoting and delivering large, complex strategic sites.

Berkeley's approach in dealing with large strategic sites is to take the lead on but to work constructively with Parish Councils, Local Planning Authorities and other stakeholders in developing comprehensive masterplan/Development Briefs for its sites. Berkeley therefore welcomes the reference in Policy ENP17 of the draft Plan to development west of Eynsham being in accordance with an agreed masterplan.

Berkeley will be looking at the site comprehensively and, while it will want to take the lead in preparing the masterplan, it would want to work closely with the EFSG.

In short, the West of Eynsham SDA will:

- Assist in meeting the Council's increased requirement for housing;
- Be ideally placed to assist in meeting Oxford's unmet need;
- Deliver a site for a new primary school;
- Contribute by way of direct provision and financial contributions to -
 - improved community infrastructure (health, library provision, community buildings, sport and recreation provision, public open space, etc.);
 - secondary and special needs education provision
- Provide further support for the existing village centre and assist in the delivery

We make an economic and practical case for focussing on the GV first but agree with your comment about 'joined up' thinking at least to masterplan stage for the reasons you list.

At this stage we are raising the very real issues for south of Chilbridge Road of which topography is just one. There is still some question over this matter and no solid proposals. Currently Eynsham Parish Council wants to protect the area south of the Chil but there is always the possibility that a new design will be acceptable and would be possible to put this to the locally led consultation mechanism that has formed the ENP to make a judgement when plans start to emerge from the masterplan process.

This seems to fit well with your comments which follow here.

There is no doubt that many of these aims and aspirations can be achieved and the ENP is intended to ensure that that *is* the case to everyone's benefit.

It will become clearer as the masterplan starts to take shape what can be achieved. We hope that EFSG / Eynsham Parish Council will continue to work with developers to put the Neighbourhood Plan into practice which is far harder than just writing it.

of additional services and facilities within the strategic allocation;

- Assist in the delivery of a new road linking the A40 with the B4449 thereby reducing congestion in the village centre; and
- Open up opportunities for additional employment-generating development at and adjacent to the Oasis Business Park on the south side of the village.

Berkeley notes from Policy ENP17 that the EFSG wants the vehicular access to new development to the west to be “from the A40 and at only one point.” Berkeley agrees that there should be only one access off the A40 (see below). It would make the point however that the emerging Local Plan requires a “a new western link road funded by and provided as an integral part of the development and taking the opportunity to link effectively with the existing road network on the western edge of the village”

(Submission Draft Local Plan Policy EW1b c)). The Local Plan Proposals Map shows that link road having junctions on the A40 and the B4449. This requirement should be reflected in draft Plan Policy Enp17.

It states at paragraph 9.5.40y in the supporting text to Submission Draft Local Plan Policy EW1b that “appropriate consideration will also need to be given to the relationship between [the] proposed access arrangements onto the A40 from this site [the West of Eynsham SDA] and from the proposed Garden Village to the north.” In its submissions made in response to the Submission Draft Local Plan Berkeley went further: its view is that it is essential there is a coordinated approach to both sites which, based on the work carried out to date by Berkeley, points to a new roundabout on the A40 as close as possible to the western-most point of the proposed West of Eynsham SDA. This should be reflected in both the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan.

In this regard, account also needs to be taken of Oxfordshire County Council’s (“OCC”) plans for a new park and ride facility north of the A40, access to which should also be integrated with the proposed SDAs north and south of the A40. This should also be reflected in the Local Plan and the Neighbourhood Plan. Based on the work done to date by Berkeley, the best solution would be for cars to access the park and ride from the new roundabout and for buses to use a restricted/dedicated access further east along the A40. Berkeley has made detailed representations to OCC in this regard in response to the recent consultation on the Park & Ride proposals.

The ENP has enough flexibility to cope with the inevitable changes of detail that will result from more detailed work on the ground and during planning.

The ENP recognises the potential value of the Link Road but also its potential costs and disbenefits.

We have strongly disagreed with WODC's approach of including the road as a 'done-deal' in the plan as we are not even sure if it can be delivered let alone whether it should be delivered.

We note the possibility of the road but are not including it as a 'done deal' because the WOLP is not a 'done deal' yet either. We want to keep options open where we can.

We are in full agreement with you – we will look at strengthening our wording on the matter.

We agree that the roundabout should be shared. Our plans are only indicative and we currently show one route for both cars and buses but this is an interesting alternative. We hope that OCC are willing to consider other ideas and move the roundabout back to where it was on the original plans where it will give better access the western SDA site.

<p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>4.1 Berkeley welcomes the EFSG’s recognition that the land west of Eynsham is suitable for a strategic allocation.</p> <p>4.2 Berkeley is concerned however by the suggestion in the draft Plan that the site is only suitable for around 600 homes and by the proposal to hold the site in reserve for future development. These suggestions put the draft Plan at odds with the emerging Local Plan and would affect adversely the District’s Council’s ability to meet its identified housing need and to contribute towards the unmet needs of Oxford.</p> <p>4.2 Berkeley would welcome discussions with the EFSG on these matters and looks forward to working with the Parish Council and local stakeholders to ensure that it delivers a well-designed, integrated and appropriate development in respect of which everyone in the local community can be proud</p>	<p>While we clearly disagree about numbers, we are putting forward what we are sure can be delivered.</p> <p>We look forward to working with Berkeley to make these fine words, with which we agree, a reality!</p>
---	---

<p>CF no. 30.</p> <p>Policy ENP1 - Housing</p> <p>4.2.1 In principle, Gladman support the general thrust of this policy. However, housing mix will inevitably change over a period of time and this policy should seek to secure a greater degree of flexibility going forward so that it can positively respond to changing market conditions. The policy should therefore make reference to the ‘latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment’ available, rather than the 2014 Strategic Housing Market Assessment which will eventually become out-of-date and replaced by a future assessment of housing needs.</p> <p>4.2.2 Further, Gladman welcome the inclusion of criteria (b) which applies exceptions to the affordable housing requirement of 50% where alternative benefits to the wider local community can be provided or where the scale of affordable housing is not viable. Notwithstanding this, it is considered that the Plan should not contain a specific reference to the 50% affordable housing target, similar to the above, affordable housing needs will likely change depending on market conditions. The removal of a specific affordable housing requirement will ensure that the policy remains up-to-date over the plan period.</p> <p>4.2.3 This policy also states that residential development should normally be located within 1000m of the village centre. The supporting text identifies that</p>	<p>This is a valid point which will improve the flexibility but not dilute the ENP.</p> <p>The point may be valid but the need for affordable' housing remains acute. Now that 'affordable' includes discounted market housing as well we see no reason to reduce this figure and prefer to risk going out of date rather than dilute our policy.</p>
--	---

the Parish Council have considered the most up-to-date guidance on walking distances 'Providing Journeys on Foot' published by the Institution of Highways & Transportation (2000). The supporting text indicates that walking distances of 1,200m would also be acceptable but not for the new village where 1,000m distance is to be applied. Gladman consider that it is more appropriate for the 1,200m distance to be applied in both instances.

Policy ENP3: Community facilities

4.2.4 Gladman is concerned with criteria (f) which states that 'for larger developments...developers shall provide a community building and pre-school where appropriate.'

4.2.5 Whilst recognising the community's aspirations to ensure future development is served by appropriate community facilities not all development proposals will be capable of delivering such provision. The ENP defines 'larger developments' as 100 dwellings or more, whilst a new Garden Village, such as Barnard Gate, will be capable of delivering such community facilities, it is important, especially in the wording of policy statements, that there should be no ambiguity of the meaning.

Once 'made', the ENP will form part of the statutory development plan and will be used for decisions on planning applications made by WODC. Gladman recommend that the Steering Group revisit this policy to ensure that it is consistent with paragraph 154 of the Framework which makes clear that 'only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.'

Policy ENP4: Green Infrastructure – creating a setting for new developments

4.2.6 Gladman submit that new development offers the opportunity, where necessary, to integrate existing Green Infrastructure assets into development proposals through appropriate design, helping to maintain their role as part of the wider Green Infrastructure network. It is also often necessary to provide public open space and areas of landscaping as part of a development proposal, adding to existing Green Infrastructure assets ensuring that the local community will benefit from any potential ecological enhancements.

4.2.7 Whilst recognising the importance of the Green Infrastructure to the local community, criteria (c) states that existing green infrastructure will be 'protected'. This aspect of the policy is considered rather onerous and may lead

Eynsham has developed so that the 'village centre' is far from the geographical centre of the village.

We consider 1000m as the ideal (that's typically 1200m actual walking) but accept that Eynsham Village has to accept a compromise for historical reasons.

This is a timely reminder of the need for clarity. ENP3G will be changed to "Developers shall contribute to a community building and pre-school as appropriate to the scale of the development to ensure it is within 1000m of new homes in accordance with Note A."

This is more proportionate and better explains the intent. ENP3.8 explains more.

The text will be amended to:

"Existing Green Infrastructure shall be protected, particularly where it is prominent in the public realm, particularly the specific locations set out in

to inconsistencies through the decision making process. Instead this policy should ensure that development proposals 'recognise' the setting of an area rather than a blanket 'protection' policy. Quite often the loss of some natural assets may be needed to ensure the wider delivery of a development proposal i.e. for access. The loss of some natural assets will often be replaced as part of a development proposal, indeed this is highlighted in Policy ENP14.

Accordingly, greater flexibility is needed to ensure that this policy does not preclude the delivery of sustainable development proposals and consistent with the remaining policies contained in the Plan

Policy ENP5 Sustainability: Climate Change

4.2.8 This policy requires new development to be designed and built in accordance with the goals set by the Climate Change Act 2008. Several references to Building for Life 12 standards are also included in the Plan.

4.2.9 As the Parish Council is aware, the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) to parliament dated 25th March 2015 introduced significant changes to national planning policy with regard to building sustainability and design. In particular the WMS set out the Government's new national policy on setting technical standards for new dwellings. In effect, this statement makes clear that qualifying bodies preparing neighbourhood plans should not seek to apply any additional local technical standards or requirements relating to the construction, internal layout or performance of new dwellings.

4.2.10 Further, with regards to Objective 2, the nature of many development proposals means that they could not achieve 12 out of 12 greens as many of the Building for Life criteria will simply not be relevant or applicable.

ENP12 – Local Green Spaces

4.2.11 Policy ENP12 seeks to designate parcels of land as Local Green Space (LGS). In order to designate land as LGS the Parish Council must ensure that it is able to demonstrate robust evidence to meet national policy requirements as set out in the Framework.

4.2.12 Paragraph 77 of the Framework makes clear that 'The Local Green Space designation will not be appropriate for most green areas or open space. The designation should only be used:

- Where the green space is in reasonably close proximity to the

ENP12, 13. Exceptions should only be made where public amenity benefit or bio-diversity gain can be clearly demonstrated."

This retains the original intention of protecting relatively scarce features (ENP4.4) while allowing some flexibility where alternative benefit can be shown and linking in with the need for bio-diversity gain raised by another respondent and emphasised by addition of ENP4a

Indeed we are aware of the current situation.

We do not seek to impose additional local technical standards at this time but, as you have highlighted earlier, things do change and a NP should be flexible enough to cope with changes in circumstances and regulation.

We hope that developers will see the merits of including the more basic and cost-effective measures at the time of construction. This would be particularly appropriate for a Garden Village.

This is a good point we had not considered. We have now amended our recommendation of BfL12 to include 'or equivalent' and we are confident that BfL12 will be updated or superseded in the event of such significant change. We note that Feb. 2017 White paper recommends the use of BfL12.

community it serves;

- Where the green area is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local

significance, for example because of its beauty, historic significance, recreation value (including as

a playing field), tranquillity or richness of its wildlife; and

- Where the green area concerned is local in character and is not an extensive tract of land.' (our emphasis)

4.2.13 The designation of land as LGS is a restrictive and significant policy designation. The Framework requires the managing of development within LGS to be consistent with policy for development in Green Belt, effectively once designated, LGS provide protection comparable to that for Green Belt land. In order to designate land as LGS, the Steering Group must be able to demonstrate all three requirements listed above are met in full.

4.2.14 Whilst the evidence supporting this policy has gone some way to test whether the site meet the requirements listed above, we consider that the evidence base needs further work to support the proposed choices. In this regard, Gladman highlight the recent Examiner's Report to the Wantage Neighbourhood Plan¹ which stated:

'The evidence base for the policy is the Wantage Neighbourhood plan – Open Green Spaces, June 2015. Each of the proposed designations is listed in Table 1 of the document, with a column giving reasons for protection. However, the table's reasons are no more than a summary of certain features, many of which are not related to the criteria in the Framework. There is no appropriate appraisal of each site in relation to the criteria... Overall, there is simply insufficient, proportionate, robust evidence to support the proposed designations in the plan promoted by this policy. Given this I am not in a position to determine which green spaces should be retained in the plan. I would recommend that the policy be deleted.

4.2.15 Further, whilst neither the Framework or the PPG provides any guidance over what is considered to be an extensive tract of land, this issue has been explored in a number of Examiner's Reports across the country and we highlight the following decisions for the Steering Group's consideration:

♣ The Seldlescombe Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report² recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately 4.5ha as it was found to be an extensive tract of land.

♣ The Oakley and Deane Neighbourhood Plan Examiners Report³ recommended the deletion of a LGS measuring approximately 5ha and also found this area to be not local in character. Thereby failing to meet 2 of the 3 tests for LGS designation.

♣ The Alrewas Neighbourhood Plan Examiner's Report⁴ identifies that both sites proposed as LGS in the neighbourhood plan 'in relation to the overall size of the Alrewas Village' to be extensive tracts of land. The Examiner in this instance recommended the deletion of the proposed LGSs which measured approximately 2.4ha and 3.7ha.

4.2.16 Gladman recommend that the Steering Group revisit this piece of evidence and test individual sites against each of the criteria listed in paragraph 77 of the Framework to ensure that the proposed designations are in accordance with the requirements of national policy.

Policy ENP14 – Sustainable Growth

4.2.17 This policy is seeking to influence a variety of issues ranging on landscape, heritage and infrastructure requirements. Policy ENP14 states that the 'expansion of Eynsham village beyond its existing boundaries shall protect the character and community of the village' and 'protect the wider village setting including its relationship to the Oxford Green Belt, Thames floodplain and the wider countryside.'

4.2.18 New development can often be located on the edge of settlements without resulting in the loss of openness, character or views considered to be important by the local community. Quite often the delivery of sustainable development proposals can enhance an existing landscape setting and provide new vistas and views to the surrounding area.

4.2.19 This policy must allow a decision maker to come to a view as to whether particular location contains physical attributes that would 'take it out of the ordinary' rather than a blanket approach surrounding the settlement which may not have any landscape significance. An area's pleasant sense of openness to open countryside cannot on their own amount to a landscape which should be

We are aware of the high threshold set by the LGS standard set out in NPPF 77.

The document referenced by ENP12 provides only an outline summary of each site, including many that were rejected as not meeting the criteria.

Each of the proposed site will have a full assessment using WODC's LGS toolkit, including more precise site maps, which has been used successfully to designate LGS.

Historic England among others have highlighted the need to be more specific about what exactly we want to 'preserve'; some points have been amended as a result.

<p>protected.</p> <p>4.2.20 Whilst Gladman commend the Parish Council for the positive stance taken to the delivery of a new Garden Village in the neighbourhood area, we are concerned that the emphasis of this policy is very much on 'protection' rather than seeking to integrate sustainable development opportunities within the existing landscape.</p> <p>Garden Village Proposals</p> <p>4.3.1 Gladman note that the Plan seeks to shape the development of the proposed expansion west of Eynsham and land north of the A40. Gladman has an interest in 228 hectares of land to the south of the A40 at Barnard Gate, some of which is located within the neighbourhood plan area. The site is of a sufficient scale to accommodate sustainable development of a new community rather than an expansion of Eynsham, further details can be found in section 6 of this submission.</p> <p>4.3.2 Whilst acknowledging that the majority of the site lies outside of the ENP boundary it would be beneficial if this could be added to the ENP as an alternative to the North Eynsham site. This would ensure that if Barnard Gate is chosen by the LPA then similar matters that may affect Eynsham, would also apply for the Barnard Gate proposals</p>	<p>We will carefully review the wording of the policy as we recognise that development will not always contribute negatively to the area. However, there are many aspects of the local countryside, including the ability to access it quickly and easily, which are considered to constitute very important aspects of the 'village feel' which should be preserved to the greatest extent possible for the benefit of future residents as much as for existing ones.</p> <p>The ENP now acknowledges the possibility of the alternative Barnard Gate GV proposal and has therefore made a major revision to ENP16 to allow for the possibility that the 'new settlement' could be elsewhere. This would leave the area north of the A40 as a potential location for an integrated extension of Eynsham which was in our original drafts of the ENP. We have therefore included this in the new ENP16 which now addresses both a GV and a smaller but integrated alternative.</p> <p>As we point out in the introduction, the ENP applies to all developments within the Parish of Eynsham so would include the small, and as far as we can see, largely open space part of the proposed Barnard Gate GV site within this Parish.</p>
--	--

<p>CF no. 31.</p> <p>Policy ENP1 - Criterion D introduces distances from the village centre, beyond which new residential development will not normally be supported. This is potentially too restrictive and whilst founded upon good accessibility principles, may render otherwise suitable areas to the west of the village inappropriate for development. It also does not take into consideration the guidance contained in the former PPG13 Transport which suggested that cycling has the potential to substitute for short car trips for distances under 5km (paragraph 78) and that walking has the potential to substitute for short car trips for distances under 2km (paragraph 75). There is a risk that this restriction will be in conflict with the strategic policies in the development plan and with the general approach set out in the NPPF. Criterion D should therefore be deleted from the policy or modified to ensure conformity with the strategic policies of the development plan.</p>	<p>The requirement is not intended as a hard cut-off and the wording has been amended to allow some flexibility where other benefits can be shown.</p> <p>The 2000m distance is recognised for walking to senior school and for commuting.</p> <p>We do not consider that the general presumption of walkable development will be in conflict with the WOLP given the flexibility included to allow exceptions to the general presumption.</p>
---	--

Page 8 Note B Last Paragraph – This again introduces distances from the village centre, beyond which new residential development will not normally be supported. This reference is also objected to for the same reasons as set out in relation to policy ENP1 above.

Policy ENP2 and Paragraph 2.2 – Whilst the principle of a master planned approach is supported (policy ENP2), the requirement, as part of the master planning exercise, to demonstrate how infrastructure will be funded before revenue comes in from the sale of houses is unlikely to be deliverable in a meaningful way, given that this requirement precedes the planning application stage. The programming of provision of infrastructure and cash-flow will only be able to be understood once the overall viability of the specific development sites has been agreed, and the detailed section 106 negotiations have commenced, which will take place after submission of the initial outline planning application(s) on the larger sites. The latter part of paragraph 2.2 should therefore be deleted.

Policy ENP3 and Paragraph 3.1 – The provision of land and monies to support the delivery of community infrastructure is not unusual, but it is governed by the strict tests for requiring such provision as set out in regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations (as amended). The policy and/or supporting text should acknowledge this relationship and the requirements of the three tests in Regulation 122.

It is unclear what the requirement in paragraph 3.1 (to demonstrate how residents will be 'compensated' by developers for inadequate provision of community facilities at the time of occupation) is intended to refer to. Generally, if temporary measures are required to be put in place whilst permanent infrastructure comes on-line, then those temporary measures would be covered in the section 106 agreement associated with the delivery of a particular development site and would therefore appear to address the same point as is raised in paragraph 3.1.

Policy ENP5 – This policy appears to duplicate Building Regulation requirements and is unlikely to be appropriate for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan as a result. Where the requirements exceed Building Regulation requirements it is unlikely that they would be valid reasons for refusing planning permission for proposed development and the matter may be better expressed aspirationally, in lower case text rather than in a policy.

A viability assessment is included with the supporting documents for the West Oxfordshire Local Plan so, even at this level, it is possible to build a picture of what is and is not affordable to test the viability and sustainability of any development at each stage of the planning process. To make this clear the term 'a viability assessment of appropriate detail showing how' is added and reference to WOLP viability assessment section 10 is made as an example.

This is now referenced in ENP3.1

Compensation may be interpreted as 'money in lieu' which is not the primary intention. Your point about the temporary measures in a S106 agreement is well made and the policy will be changed to :
"Planning agreements should include appropriate temporary or compensatory measures both for residents and the community in general to be implemented if adequate facilities are not available at the time of occupation."

We are aware that no additional technical requirements are permitted at the present time but the ENP will have validity up to 2031 so these policies are included against such time as the regulations change.

Paragraphs 14.10, 17.9 and Appendix A SA4.6-4.9 – It is not considered to be appropriate to seek to determine the precise layout of development to the west of Eynsham ahead of more detailed landscape and visual analysis of the capacity of the area to accommodate development, and the proposed master planning approach that would precede any outline planning application for the site. To introduce restrictions on the proposed layout at this stage could be considered not to be in accordance with the strategic policies in the development plan, and certainly there is a significant risk of prematurity in relation to such matters without substantive evidence to support such an approach – evidence which will only emerge prior to or during the master planning and planning application processes. Statements seeking to prevent development south of the Chil Brook should be deleted from relevant paragraphs in the draft Plan.

Paragraph 14.2 – Land to the west of Eynsham should not be treated as a reserve site since it forms an integral part of the District Council's supply of housing land during the Local Plan period. Reserve sites are sites that are generally identified in addition to the normal housing land supply, to be called upon if required during the Plan period.

Policy ENP14 – It is already the case that the planning obligations associated with major developments will contain mechanisms to ensure that triggers for the provision of infrastructure are not only observed by developers but are also enforceable, so the requirement of criterion A of the policy is unnecessary and should be deleted.

Policy ENP17 – It is unlikely that a development of approximately 600 dwellings west of Eynsham will be able to be served off one access only (criterion A). This part of the policy will need to be modified to address this concern.

This is now our conclusion given the uncertainty of the situation and the lack of full details.

We do not consider the WOLP to be wise in pre-determining that a Link Road should be built and question the viability of 1000 houses in the area. We now make known our concerns about the difficulty of developing parts of the larger western site and propose that locally-led consultation should be undertaken as masterplans make the options more tangible.

In our view the WOLP is deficient in that it has no reserve sites for use if required. We would expect criticism if we were allocating sites and did not include a reserve. It is made clear that a masterplan should include the reserve site as it is expected that development will occur at some point although the focus should initially be to deliver primary sites in the first instance.

This refers to Recommendation A (now E in updated version). The observation is quite correct but our emphasis is on 'provision' not agreement and the second half of the recommendation about enforcement and preventing occupation if the conditions are not met which has not always happened as it should in West Oxfordshire.

The need for emergency access and the possibility that local traffic (notably buses) should be able to filter through from the west while restricting through traffic is recognised and ENP17A and ENP7.2 amended.

CF no. 32.	
<p>Oxford City Council welcomes Eynsham Futures' 'Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan Draft for Pre-submission Consultation' and in particular the following three policies:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENP16 'North of the A40'; • ENP17 'Development of a western extension to the village'; and 	No changes are requested.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENP14 'Sustainable Growth'. <p>It is considered that these policies will not only assist greatly in delivering the 2,750 dwellings that West Oxfordshire District Council is committed to providing in order to facilitate its agreed allocation of Oxford's unmet housing need but also because ENP14 will ensure that the development will be sustainable.</p> <p>Oxford's housing need is urgent and therefore pressing such that the statement made in the draft plan that "It has become clear from consultation events and surveys that residents are willing to contemplate significant expansion of the village provided that it ensures that the benefits of living in Eynsham are preserved or enhanced for the continued benefit of existing residents and for the benefit of new residents also." is to be welcomed. This also applies to the view that "Eynsham has signalled a willingness to see the village expand as long as all residents, new and existing, can enjoy the current level of amenity." The city council is particularly anxious to ensure that any development which is delivered facilitates a high quality of life for residents and workers which includes ready access to local facilities and to sustainable, affordable, efficient, effective, safe and reliable means of transport to places for work, study, recreation and shopping.</p> <p>In furtherance of the last point, the city council will continue to lobby Oxfordshire County Council, in its capacity as the highway authority, to do its utmost to ensure that this comes to fruition. This will include ensuring that the main routes to Oxford from Eynsham – including both the A40 and the B4044 – incorporate facilities such as bus only lanes wherever possible and that safe, direct cycleways are provided between the city and surrounding settlements such as Eynsham. The city council will seek to liaise with West Oxfordshire, Cherwell and Vale of White Horse District Councils with a view to ensuring that its emerging local plan, and particularly the Infrastructure Delivery Plan that will support it, addresses all relevant cross-boundary planning issues relating to the successful implementation of the relevant Neighbourhood Plan policies.</p>	
--	--

CF no. 33.	
The submission was scanned and therefore would need retyping. A brief summary of the comment is made instead.	Some amendment to wording has been made to ensure a measure of flexibility

<p>ENP1D and Note A: overly prescriptive on distance</p> <p>ENP14: comment is supportive of the ENP.</p> <p>ENP17: supportive of development proposal W1. Comment on our map being 'ahead of Fig 9.15b of WOLP Proposed modifications' is, I think, a complement as our map is closer to their concept than WODCs!</p>	<p>but in addition to the need to retain the compact nature of the village, the value of walkability in meeting the goals of NPPF 36 has been pointed out by other respondents and has been included.</p>
--	---

<p>CF no. 34.</p> <p>I support a “garden village”, as long as it is WELL PLANNED.</p> <p>I think all the development plans, and the A40 should be integrated, and planned at the same time.</p> <p>I do not think the architecture should be required to reflect the area. I live next to Millers Cottages, and whilst they are sympathetic to the surrounding dwellings, it put the price beyond the reach of new buyers. I think newer building methods would help the housing shortage more than creating similar architecture to Eynsham, but am NOT advocating cheap and nasty! I would also like to see some opportunity for self-build.</p>	
---	--

<p>CF no. 35.</p> <p>I would support Map 1B and Map 2B.</p>	
---	--

<p>CF no. 36.</p> <p>Thank you for championing the campaign to combat the proposed developments around Eynsham. We moved to Old Witney Rd last October with our 2 boys (3 and 5). We chose the house as we like the quiet road which offers safety for the boys and a quiet environment. We moved from a busy road in Cowley so you can imagine our reaction when we learned recently that Old Witney Rd is to be used as a link to the new estate to the west. We feel strongly that the new development will severely deteriorate our environment if a new road is not built. Old Witney Rd is not very wide and</p>	<p>The road to 77 houses has been given consent. There is a possibility it might get an alternative route to the A40 but it is not clear who would pay for that as the developers have no obligation to do so.</p>
--	--

increased traffic will cause noise and increased danger to our boys.	
CF no. 37.	
<p>I agree with two of your "important points"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • not building south of Chilbridge Road (plenty of people walk there regularly and building on it is likely to increase flood risk) • planning for Eynsham, Tilgarsly, Barnard Gate and the A40 should be considered together (isn't that the point of having a plan?) <p>but not the third: if the Garden Village goes ahead, 2500 houses is going to encroach on valuable wildlife habitat and, again, increase flood risk. Adding a further 1000 makes this inevitable. The 850-house suggestion for west Eynsham seems a better compromise giving at least a little flexibility.</p>	<p>The total must add up to 3200. The ENP does have flexibility built in</p>
CF no. 38.	
<p>Given the severely adverse impact of a major western extension of Eynsham, notwithstanding the benefit of western distributor road/ bypass, the proposed 1200 dwellings should be part of the Garden Village not a village extension. Any major village extension will, inter alia, significantly reduce village amenity and congest existing roads. The village centre would be difficult to upgrade and extend with more facilities without major damage to the Conservation Area and village character. A western development would be too far from the existing village facilities.</p> <p>I am critical of the Balkanisation of planning policy in the County. There should be a county wide strategy to plan for growth and infrastructure. The primary aim should be sustainable development, most particularly, low carbon development. Building a ring of satellite mini villages outside the Green Belt is not sustainable because it is predicated on commuting to Oxford, the engine of most job growth in central Oxon. There should be a strategic review of the inner boundary of the Green Belt to identify sites that can be served by an extension of existing public transport without damage to the key landscape areas that provide Oxford's much valued setting.</p>	

<p>CF no. 39.</p>	
<p>I observe and regret the need to address so many separate yet contingent proposals creates an immense challenge to the Eynsham Futures team as it seeks to construct an integrated and holistic plan for the village.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I observe and regret the need to address so many separate yet contingent proposals creates an immense challenge to local residents as they seek to understand the proposals before them and to express any concerns that they might have about the various proposals. • Notwithstanding the separate and discreet nature of the proposed Garden Village it seems obvious that housing development and infrastructural issues in Eynsham Village and the Garden Village are interrelated and have to be considered as one project. • Even at this late stage I have grave concerns about the A40 proposals which are an inadequate response to the current transport problems faced by Eynsham and its hinterland and certainly do not provide a transport infrastructure sufficient to support the residential and commercial developments proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan and the Garden Village proposal. • My full support for any development of Eynsham and a new Garden Village would depend on a much more radical and far reaching solution to the problem of the A40 and the problem of access to Oxford City and the south of the County. • Recognizing that the issues of the A40 and the B4044 Cycle and Community Path fall outside the immediate scope of the draft Neighbourhood Plan I would have liked the Neighbourhood Plan to voice stronger concern about the inadequacy of the current proposals for A40 and stronger support for the B4044 Cycle and Community Path as constituting part of a transport infrastructure necessary for the proposed developments. • Given the parameters described by OCC and WODC I am in broad agreement with the content and direction of the draft Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan. • I support the proposals for the 15 Local Green Spaces indicated in the draft Neighbourhood Plan • In respect of the alternatives being discussed for the western extension and in particular in respect of a western bypass, I note that bypasses can often constitute a significant ‘moat’ or ‘redline’ indicating the limit of development to 	<p>I think most people think likewise but that isn't the way things work with one council duty bound to build houses and the other unable to find money for the road.</p> <p>We have put in as much as we reasonably can.</p> <p>Planners will argue that a bypass is just waiting to have something built off it on</p>

<p>future generations. I see this as a good thing and would hope that if a western bypass is constructed it follows a route which would contain all proposed Eynsham Village developments to its east and constitute an effective barrier to any further westward creep.</p>	<p>both sides. We are protected in Eynsham by flood zones and green belt outside the eastern bypass and would be protected to a limited degree by the Chil to the west but there is nothing to stop houses being built of a western Link Road that a modest bridge across the brook won't provide.</p>
--	--

<p>CF no. 40.</p>	
<p>We have two young children and work in both Witney and Oxford. It would be difficult for us to over emphasise how much we appreciate Eynsham in its current form. We came to Eynsham because we want to raise our children in a small, protective and above all green environment. Key to our quality of life are two things - Eynsham's sense of community and the green spaces around the village that we can enjoy As a family. We are a diverse yet close-knit village and village is the operative word. It would be a terrible loss to overwhelm the village with extensive further development on the edges of our current boundary not least because we do not currently have the infrastructure to cope with it. But losing our green spaces would be a tragedy, changing beyond all recognition both the character of the village and our experience of living within it.</p> <p>For these reasons we appeal to the council to protect our green boundary and support the development of a garden village on the other side of the A40. That is with the proviso that adequate infrastructure is put in place to service a new settlement and that a residents parking scheme is put in place within Eynsham. The village becomes a car park for commuters during the week and shoppers on Saturday because of a lack of provision for other towns and villages. This must be part of any planning for new housing.</p>	

<p>CF no. 41.</p>	
<p>Section 1 – Introduction</p> <p>It would be useful perhaps in the introduction to briefly explain the stage reached by the West Oxfordshire Local Plan and that whilst the ENP is closely related to the Local Plan (including proposed main modifications) that has not yet been tested through independent examination and is subject to potential change.</p>	<p>This is mentioned in the context section added as a response to the consultation</p>

<p>The introduction also states that the ENP has a particular emphasis on the areas where development ‘will take place’. It may be better to refer to areas where development is ‘proposed to take place’ through the Local Plan as the draft allocations are yet to be confirmed through the examination process.</p> <p>The introduction could also usefully make mention of the recent award of garden village status to WODC which is highly relevant to the ENP.</p> <p>Section 2 – The Village</p> <p>Map 1 provides a useful context but it may be better to present two separate maps, one of existing Eynsham including relevant constraints such as areas of floodplain and the scheduled monument etc. followed by a second map of proposed development including the garden village and west Eynsham SDA. The second map should make it explicit that these are draft proposals only at present and that the site boundaries are indicative.</p> <p>Map 2 – village development. This is a useful map showing the historic development of Eynsham. The Council does however have concerns about the concentric rings shown (1km and 1.2km) as explained in more detail below. It would be preferable for this map to simply show the historic development of Eynsham and no more.</p> <p>Section 3 – Vision and Objectives</p> <p>The proposed vision is very short and concise. We have no specific concerns about this but note that some neighbourhood plans and indeed local plans, seek to use the vision as an opportunity to explain how a place is expected to change over the plan period.</p> <p>Consideration should therefore be given as to whether it would be appropriate and beneficial to expand the vision in order to give a clearer steer on the spatial development of Eynsham i.e. how it will look and function as a place by 2031.</p> <p>The 8 supporting objectives (ENV1 – ENV8) appear generally appropriate but are likely to require some re-wording and/or further evidence to support them.</p> <p>For example ENV3 refers to developments contributing to local facilities ‘where reasonably practicable’. In reality this is likely to be a matter of viability as well as any contributions having to comply with the statutory tests for seeking planning obligations.</p> <p>Objective ENV7 – refers to homes of a standard compatible with climate change</p>	<p>Good point</p> <p>I have highlighted the point better</p> <p>Map 1 now does that although we do not go into details of the two SDA'a as we think they should be one SDA!</p> <p>The rings have a specific purpose – we could add another map but this seems unnecessary.</p> <p>We would like to but WODC proposals are basically to build on every scrap of spare land round the village. There doesn't seem to be very much positive to say so we have said nothing!</p> <p>We consider viability and legality to be some of the elements in deciding practicability</p>
---	---

<p>act intentions being 'commercially viable in Eynsham'. What evidence is this statement based on? Is the ENP underpinned by a viability assessment? Care is needed to avoid broad statements such as this unless there is clear evidence to support them.</p> <p>ENP1 – Housing It is not clear what is meant by a 'self-sustaining' community. ENP1A refers to 'market and social housing'. Social housing is just one form of affordable housing and the term affordable housing should therefore be used instead to be consistent with the NPPF.</p> <p>ENP1A. Reference is made to 'each site'. Does this also relate to small sites that come forward during the plan period? Reword to be more generic i.e. 'the range of house types/sizes on development sites should...'</p> <p>ENP1C. It is not clear why a particular emphasis is being placed on 2-bed units. The SHMA suggests a mix of house types is needed including 2-bed. Also care is needed in relation to the use of the term 'starter home' to avoid confusion with the Government's official definition.</p> <p>ENP1D. The ENP addresses the issue of connectivity. This is an important aspect of new development and we support the need to emphasise this, especially for the western expansion in order to integrate the new area into the village.</p> <p>Within the ENP a fundamental factor on the spatial extent of new development, particularly in relation to connectivity, is the use of concentric rings to represent reasonable walking distance from the village centre so as to maintain a compact, walk-able village. While such a concept can provide a useful guide, the use of such distances within the policies (e.g. Policies ENP1 and 11) could be seen as somewhat arbitrary and unduly restrictive. Not all the village services and facilities lie within the centre; the primary and secondary schools and the main employment areas are all on the edges of the existing village. In addition, SDAs would be expected to provide additional services and facilities, some of which will be on-site.</p> <p>While the use of concentric rings may be a useful tool for a nucleated village, they are less appropriate for settlements of a different character and structure, for example, such as Long Hanborough or Minster Lovell which are linear in nature or Hailey which is poly-focal or Enstone which is dispersed. The overall pattern and structure of the Garden Village has yet to be determined and imposing the concentric rings to set the village form (as set out in para 16.20)</p>	<p>True - will change that to 'are likely to be'</p> <p>Not depending on elsewhere to sustain itself – provide jobs, services locally rather than a dormitory.</p> <p>Actually the intent is to distinguish between market – open and affordable – and social housing so this is correct.</p> <p>No, we had also spotted this inconsistency – changed to 'each village'</p> <p>Simply because the distinction between something suitable for downsizing and for 'first home' is not normally made in planning docs. And we have identified the needs as different. Hopefully the use of starter home without capitals will be taken as the generic meaning although Starter Homes are included as well.</p> <p>This isn't a simple yes/no policy and we have been careful to word it as such. There may have been changes in response to other comments that will have answered your concerns.</p> <p>The provision of new services, particularly convenience store and school, is covered in the text.</p> <p>Our conclusion is that the best form is a nucleated one as this maximises the benefits of walkability which, as another respondent pointed out, is enshrined in NPPF69 which we now reference.</p> <p>We cannot see how it would be rational to have a village which requires people</p>
---	---

<p>may not be appropriate.</p> <p>Supporting Text</p> <p>Para 1.1 and 1.4 refer to the need for smaller homes for skilled junior staff. Other less skilled workers also require housing locally. For example, bus drivers – Oxford City and the Oxford Bus Company are working together to develop affordable housing for bus staff.</p> <p>Para 1.2 says that the building of larger homes to release smaller homes by residents up-grading, is not justified. Is there evidence for this statement?</p> <p>Para 1.6. - For information Barratt Homes already have a house-type with larger rooms for 'down-sizers'</p> <p>Para 1.6. Strong evidence needed for justifying the 'Homes for Life' standard. Other standards exist such as Housing our Ageing Population Panel for Innovation (HAPPI) principles which are increasingly advocated. Potential issue with regard to re-sale of bespoke properties.</p> <p>ENP2 – Design</p> <p>With the exception of criteria F the policy appears acceptable although the examiner may question what it adds over and above the local plan and WODC design guide. Could it be made more locally specific to Eynsham in any way?</p> <p>Criteria F is also perhaps a matter for the Local Plan rather than the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>2.2. The local plan including proposed main modifications has allocated a range of different sites including less than 100 dwellings (albeit the sites at and near Eynsham are much larger). May be advisable to refer to allocated sites in general. The wording relating to infrastructure funding/timing is beyond the control of the neighbourhood plan and will depend on viability and other development considerations.</p> <p>2.7. Three storey buildings are said to be inappropriate on the edge of the village. Does this just relate to housing development? Does it also apply to north of the A40?</p> <p>Policy ENP3 – Community Facilities</p> <p>Whilst the general intent of the policy is admirable and logical some of the requirements may be considered unreasonable/unenforceable or too loosely</p>	<p>to get in their cars given the thrust of sustainability policy. Historic villages are another matter. The possibility of more than one focus is not excluded, in fact it is encouraged for local shops.</p> <p>Our consultation has not identified bus drivers as a key person locally but local businesses have identifies skilled staff, earning too much to qualify for social housing but unable to afford a house locally. This is Eynsham's NP and hence our local issues, not Oxford city's unless you take that on under the duty to co-operate!</p> <p>No, good point – can be reworded so that developers provide justification if they want to do this.</p> <p>Great – that's what we need! 15% isn't a very high proportion and I think the reference should be 'Lifetime Homes' anyway! Will add 'or equivalent' and make reference to standard. HAPPI is more for houses specifically for downsizers so I have referenced that as well.</p> <p>Encouraging modern styles, not mixing styles together. We have strengthened the policies after other comments. We have added E recommending Building for Life (now with White Paper backing - thank you Janice) to raise it to policy rather than supporting text. Agreed, you should make it district policy, but we want it for Eynsham anyway</p> <p>Does refer to sites allocated through WOLP. We have upgraded the text to include 'locally-led consultation' and asking that a viability assessment be presented showing how infrastructure is to be delivered – putting emphasis on developers to show it will be done before consent.</p> <p>Generally applicable. Clear purpose is to 'blend' into countryside but no reason why they should not be used in the centre.</p>
---	---

<p>worded by the neighbourhood plan examiner. For example it may not be possible to provide new allotments at the rate specified. Also does this apply to all new housing development or only those of a certain scale? Also for primary healthcare what is an appropriate distance?</p> <p>Does 'easy access' mean facilities with ramps and no steps or is it a measure of distance and capacity or both? Does it relate to new provision or existing?</p> <p>Supporting Text</p> <p>3.1 Reference is made to the need for developers to compensate residents if adequate facilities are not made available at the time of their occupation. How would this be managed/enforced?</p> <p>3.12. CCG – Clinical Commissioning Group</p> <p>Policy ENP3a – Health Care Facilities</p> <p>Criteria A is more of a statement than a policy requirement. Is it suggesting that new development will be refused if not within 1km of a primary health care facility?</p> <p>Criteria B is a matter for the Local Plan / Area Action Plan process.</p> <p>Criteria C is unclear and not adequately justified. The supporting text refers to protection of the existing medical centre as part of the rationale but this requires further clarification and justification.</p> <p>Policy ENP4 – Green Infrastructure</p> <p>No comments</p> <p>Policy ENP5 – Sustainability: Climate Change</p> <p>The second paragraph of this policy is not clear and should be reworded with clear justification provided in the supporting text.</p> <p>Under current Government guidance additional housing standards, over and above Building Regulations, have to be very well justified. Why Passive House and where is the evidential justification for this requirement?</p> <p>Policy ENP6 - Education</p> <p>ENP6D. There is likely to be a need for secondary school provision too, not just primary school. It is also perhaps a matter for the local plan to prescribe the</p>	<p>Agreed the allotment wording needs to explain the reasoning better and be less overtly prescriptive.</p> <p>It really meant distance – I hope the other features would be a requirement to be DDA compatible – we don't have to say that explicitly do we?</p> <p>Poor wording – has been changed to put onus on developers to explain what they will do if things go wrong – a plan B</p> <p>No, it now says 'ideally 1000m'</p> <p>That's how it will be implemented – this is the policy.</p> <p>No reduction of the services locally in Eynsham – i.e. you can't close EMC and make us all get in cars to go to OCGV as explained in 3.13</p> <p>Agreed – in progress</p> <p>Wording changed to be less prescriptive but to point out that with CABE Level 6 gone and not replaced, passivhaus is one remaining zero-carbon standard</p> <p>Agreed, wording changed in response to OCC reply. Agreed that WODC should</p>
---	--

<p>infrastructure requirements associated with strategic development areas rather than the neighbourhood plan.</p> <p>Policy ENP7 – Sustainable Transport</p> <p>Criteria A is considered to be too restrictive and not appropriate. Further explanation is given below in relation to the proposed spatial policies with particular regard to access from the A40.</p> <p>Policy ENP8 – Connected Place</p> <p>See earlier comments in relation to the 1km walking distance threshold.</p> <p>Policy ENP9 – Parking</p> <p>No comments.</p> <p>Policy ENP10 – Sustainable Economy</p> <p>ENP10A. There is no land currently allocated for employment purposes. Does this relate to land in employment use and/or with unimplemented planning approval for employment? Or is it intended to refer to the proposed science park north of the A40? This should be clarified. If it is intended to apply to existing employment sites with permission etc. to simply retain this for employment use is contrary to the NPPF which seeks to avoid the long-term safeguarding of such land where there is no reasonable prospect of it being implemented.</p> <p>There is also potential conflict/confusion here with the local plan policy on protecting employment land. Care is needed to add value/local dimension to the policy rather than duplicate or contradict the local plan.</p> <p>Policy ENP11 – Retail</p> <p>Criteria A is not very positively worded. Should instead perhaps say will be permitted where....</p> <p>Criteria B – see previous comments about walking distance thresholds.</p> <p>Criteria D – what period does this apply to? Up to 2031? Is it suggesting that no loss of pubs or restaurants will be permitted? This is likely to be considered unreasonably inflexible by the examiner.</p> <p>Policy ENP12 – Local Green Space</p>	<p>do this – hopefully the LP will reflect this in which case we are backing you up</p> <p>There is adequate get-out for small developments within the village (7.2) but the basic principle should remain. Multiple access points onto the A40 seems to fly in the face of reality given the state of the road and the extra demands to be placed on it.</p> <p>And our previous replies</p> <p>The reference in 10.4 is to south of the A40 so excludes the proposed science park which is supported in ENP16. Don't think we are in conflict here – we are pointing out the local situation which has left commercial premises empty for reasons given and explaining that this situation is changing</p> <p>We agree on protecting employment land generally (A) but do allow its use for housing under very specific and employment-related situation (which Polar have already said they want to do with part of their site as they redevelop it)</p> <p>Agreed – we had this marked down to reword as you describe</p> <p>Obviously it covers the life of the Plan to 2031 and building will probably be going on up to that date. It does say 'normally' and 'while the village is expanding so there is both limited time scope and flexibility with a strong steer away from hasty conversion to other uses.</p>
--	--

<p>This policy provides a list of areas that are intended to be designated as Local Green Spaces. There is a process to be followed to designate such spaces. If this consultation has been completed, this should be made clear and the outcome of it (support/objections) provided to give weight to these sites being designated as Local Greenspaces.</p> <p>Policy ENP13 – Trees</p> <p>No comments.</p> <p>Section 5 – Spatial Policies</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>The ENP does not allocate land for development. Instead it provides guidance for the proposed allocations in the draft West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031. Eynsham Futures do not, however, fully accept the Main Modifications to the Local Plan; there are discrepancies between the ENP and the Mods allocations, in particular in relation to:</p> <p>West Eynsham where the Local Plan proposes 1,000 homes and the ENP says it should be 600 homes. In addition, the ENP advocates that the site should be a 'reserve site'.</p> <p>Garden Village where the Local Plan proposes 2,200 homes and the ENP says it should be 3,200 homes.</p> <p>In order to bring ENP in line with the draft Local Plan in relation to the SDAs, the wording of Policies ENP16 (North of the A40) and ENP17 (Development of a western extension to the village) would not require substantial change: while Policy ENP16 refers to 3,200 units, Policy ENP17 does not include a number. Policy ENP17 (and Policy ENP7) does, however, propose that vehicular access shall be from the A40, with no vehicular access from existing village roads. Officers have questioned this approach on a number of occasions, suggesting that having a variety of vehicular accesses to the village (albeit heavily managed to reduce through-traffic and vehicle speeds) will help to integrate the new development, as well as being more convenient.</p> <p>A further discrepancy relates to the A40 in the supporting text of Policy ENP16. The ENP suggests that the A40 should be dualled and the carriageway re-aligned to the north. Neither the County Council nor the District Council has plans for a re-alignment.</p>	<p>We have used WODC/Cotswold LGS 'pack' which this summarises. There are clear references to these supporting documents though they are not yet on our website.</p> <p>No, but then your plan is not made yet either. We are very closely aligned with the WODC eLP (on the total number for example where we will accept your lead as per NPPF 184, but we disagree about the best place to allocate them – something not unreasonable for a NP to do – and think you should have some reserve.</p> <p>We are modifying our words slightly to 'up to 3200' for OCGV to retain the flexibility we are advocating and have advocated as part of our response to the WOLP consultation.</p> <p>ENP17 does suggest that 600 new homes to the west are deliverable without any reservation but we don't think it wise to go beyond that number without a bit more detail.</p> <p>We agree that there is a case for vehicular access into the village – for buses and emergency vehicles without restriction – and it would be beneficial for residents to have limited access while avoiding any 'through traffic' (though we are not sure how this will be done).</p> <p>We do call for improvement to the A40 and recommend that at the very least some land is protected to allow for this to happen. We are aware that there are no plans but WODC have aspired to dual the A40 for some time and we are</p>
--	---

The consultation on the Proposed Modifications to the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 ended on 23 December 2016. The Local Plan and the representations will soon be submitted to the Inspectorate, with the Examination likely to resume in the Spring. A number of the key issues in relation to development within the Eynsham area will be debated at the Examination; this will give Eynsham Parish Council the opportunity to put their views forward to an independent Inspector.

In terms of the Strategic Development Areas (SDA), a substantial amount of work will need to be undertaken on masterplanning the areas. Eynsham Futures have already begun this process. Getting detailed landscape advice will be an important component of this work, especially in identifying those areas that should form part of the Green Infrastructure network and where built-form should be limited. WODC will commission independent landscape architects to undertake this assessment.

Policy ENP14 – Sustainable Growth

This is a wide ranging policy that perhaps lacks a little focus and clarity. Consideration should be given to the main purpose of the policy with a view to making it more succinct and focused. What is it trying to achieve?

Criteria E for example is a statement rather than a policy requirement and could be included in the supporting text. A number of the issues covered by this policy are also addressed in other policies e.g. infrastructure provision, requirement for masterplan etc.

Perhaps strip this back to avoid overlap with other policies including ENP16.

Policy ENP15 – Village Centre

No comments.

Policy ENP16 – North of the A40

See general comments above.

Also perhaps re-title the policy to 'Garden Village'?

Is there a link between affordable housing construction and speed of delivery overall? Not advantageous to concentrate mono tenure at the beginning of the Garden Village, rather than allowing the community, with all its diversity, to evolve organically over time. Will most of those with disabilities and in need of

supporting this aspiration.

We will take the opportunity. A ready-to-go NP is part of our preparation for this

We can see that things may change as this process goes ahead so we hope we have set out our objectives and principles in the policy but left enough flexibility. In fact we have added a note just in front of ENP16.1 stating that this is our intention

it is a bit of a 'catch-all' policy which sets the principles for the more 'located' policies which follow.

This section has changed as comments have been incorporated and hopefully a bit more focused than the original version.

There is a bit of overlap and cross-referencing to bring some of the previous policies together as an introduction to the more located spatial policies.

You will see that we had to change ENP16 significantly after the Barnard gate 'GV' came to light as, if that happened, an integrated northern extension for Eynsham might be back on the table and we wanted to address this possibility as well.

We are trying to encourage the construction of the new village centre without being prescriptive in doing so but aware that it is always difficult to fund

<p>extra elderly care be in social housing?</p> <p>Supporting Text</p> <p>16.25-16.29. This discussion of crossing the A40 differs from OCC's proposals.</p> <p>Policy ENP17 – Western Extension</p> <p>See earlier comments about having one vehicular access from the A40.</p> <p>Policy ENP18 – Southern Industrial Area</p> <p>The intention of this policy is good but the examiner may seek further clarification/justification to ensure consistency with the local plan and NPPF in relation to the protection of employment land.</p> <p>Appendices</p> <p>Appendix A – WODC SHELAA site proposals</p> <p>It may be appropriate to have this commentary as a separate background paper rather than part of the ENP itself particularly as it is likely to become out of date when the next SHELAA is published or as and when applications are determined etc.</p> <p>Appendix B – Public Realm Projects</p> <p>Eynsham Parish Council will be responsible for allocating their proportion of the CIL funds.</p> <p>General Comments</p> <p>A number of the policies are worded rather negatively i.e. permission will not be granted if...The NPPF encourages a more positive approach to planning and some policies could usefully be reworded to suggest that permission will be granted if/where etc..</p> <p>As explained in Appendix C a number of the policies include the words 'shall' or 'must' and that failure to meet any one requirement will result in planning permission being refused. The NDP examiner is likely to conclude that such policy requirements are inflexible and contrary to the NPPF presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Reference to Tilgarsley Garden Village should be removed and referred to instead as simply 'garden village' or similar.</p>	<p>infrastructure without houses but houses without infrastructure is a bad thing for new residents.</p> <p>Disagree with the 'evolve organically' – if you are creating a new community you do not have that luxury. That is the whole point of 'community building'</p> <p>A little – but we think their plans have limitations and flaws – we have told them so in response to their consultation and do not wish to withdraw our recommendation.</p> <p>Comments on ENP10 apply. If there are specifics we would consider them because we are in close agreement with WODC policy here.</p> <p>Arguable – it does present an analysis of the situation at one point but there isn't much land that could be added in the future.</p> <p>Agreed – that's why it is all recommendation.</p> <p>We have done a trawl though to reword anything negative</p>
---	--

Many of the ENP policies focus on the SDA or larger scale development, with much less guidance on smaller scale development that will come forward in the plan period. This is more an observation than suggesting a need for significant amendment to the Plan but some tweaking to the wording of policies may allow more widespread use.

Many of the policies also tend to focus on housing development, rather than other forms of development. For example, Policy ENP5 on climate change could be extended to cover non-residential uses.

A further observation on the Plan is that there appears to be an emphasis on the influence of Oxford, especially in relation to traffic flows and employment. While 30% of workers in the sub-area do work in Oxford, 70% do not. The village's relationship with, for example, Witney receives little recognition.

Chipping Norton Neighbourhood Plan (CNNP) is now 'made' and provides Eynsham NP with a useful resource for understanding how particular policy areas are dealt with by an Examiner. The links for your reference are provided below.

There are similarities between the policies in the submission version of CNNP and ENP where particular moderations were required for policies which ENP should have particular regard to. The policies most relevant to ENP in the CNNP are:

Policy M4: Greenspace : Policy M9: Green Infrastructure : M10: Trees

M11: Urban Fringe Development : Transport and Movement Policies: TM1, TM8

TC4 – Town Centre Parking : B9: Sustainable Drainage Systems

B10: Water Supply and Sewerage

<http://www.westoxon.gov.uk/residents/communities/community-planning/neighbourhood-planning/chipping-norton-neighbourhood-plan/>

<http://www.westoxon.gov.uk/media/1301060/Chipping-Norton-WODC-Examiner-Report-Final.pdf>

There is a need to ensure that there is consistency between ENP content and representations sent from the Qualifying Body (Eynsham Parish Council) to consultations on the Local Plan. Should any legal challenge arise any discrepancies may be picked up on which would need to be justified.

This has been done – we use OCGV to identify with explanation on p3.

I suppose that's the natural focus for Eynsham. We have tried to avoid ignoring the needs of small developments.

Good point. ENP5 has mention of commercial building for community energy but I didn't have a standard to recommend for insulation etc. I think a cross reference from ENP10 may be a useful addition.

Oxford features strongly because of the unmet need and the traffic problems mainly relate to Oxford-bound traffic. I don't think we are particularly blinkered in this regard. I am surprised that 70% don't work in Oxford – it doesn't look like that on the A40 – but the Parish Council are all for local employment.

Thank you for this suggestion.

We have been consistent although there may be minor changes of emphasis in

<p>It would be wise once the responses to this consultation have been considered and changes to this draft version of the ENP made to consider submitting the ENP for a 'Health Check' – a practice examination undertaken by an approved Examiner. Further details of this process can be found here: http://www.rics.org/uk/join/member-accreditations-list/dispute-resolution-service/drs-products/neighbourhood-planning-independent-examiner-referral-service-npiers/</p>	<p>such a fast-moving situation. Things are different now to what they were in December 2016!</p> <p>This is probably a good idea in normal circumstances though it may be seen as an unwarranted delay in our situation.</p>
---	---

<p>CF no. 42.</p>	
<p>Stanton Harcourt PC expressed concern over the building of a Link Road which is likely to add extra heavy traffic though Sutton on B4449 and other roads in the Stanton Area</p>	<p>The Western Link Road is not currently supported by the ENP which regards it as an unjustified project bringing as many harms as potential benefits.</p>

<p>CF no. 43. HE – response to SA Scoping report</p>	
<p>the scoping report should be amended to identifying the Oxfordshire Historic Environment Record as a source of baseline evidence that should be consulted in assessing the suitability of land for development</p>	<p>SA Section 4.1.D updated to note OHER as source and presence of Foxley Fields / Abbey Precinct scheduled monuments and Tilgarsley (unscheduled) deserted medieval village site. ENP14 contains a section on preserving the historic environment (based on policy ENP14 A) which has been modified to include the need to consult the Record Centre to check for suitability for development.</p>

<p>CF no. 44. NE – response to SA Scoping report</p>	
<p>we suggest that other habitats are also considered, for example ponds and species rich grasslands, and that a strategic approach to planning new developments is taken to ensure habitat connectivity as well as people's access to nature. areas near to Eynsham that have been identified as having importance for rare arable weeds. SA11,13 and 14 are noted as being significant.</p>	<p>SA Section 4.1.B and SA13 updated to include reference to meadows (particularly those recognised as having European importance for arable plants) ENP4a has policies relating to bio-diversity and ENP4 G requires bio-diversity gain for all new developments. ENP4.18 has been amended to add ponds and grassland in addition to ENP4.4 which highlights hedgerows, trees and stresses the need for continuous green spaces. These SA sections are reflected in ENP4 (B, E and G particularly)</p>

<p>CF no. 45. EA – response to SA Scoping report</p>	
<p>Unless such evidence has been produced for these sites through the Local Plan process, we would expect that any site allocations (or safeguarded sites) in</p>	<p>Sequential testing of sites for Flood Risk and (landscape impact, bio-diversity gain, agricultural land quality) is included in ENP14.14, 15. ENP14 B is the</p>

<p>Flood Zones 2 and 3 will be accompanied by appropriate flood risk evidence</p> <p>assessment of rivers under WFD is required</p>	<p>relevant policy which has been amended to emphasise the need for sequential testing generally.</p> <p>In practice, the Local Plan will allocate these sites and the adequacy of its SA will be assessed at its Examination. The significance of the Chil and Mead Ditch was noted in the ENP4.16 but is emphasised by separating out into ENP17 which now includes a reference to the WFD/Thames RBMP.</p>
<p>CF no. 46. Dovehouse Close residents petition</p> <p>A petition of Dovehouse Close residents resulting in about 75 individually signed household responses indicated that in the event that there were to be housing on the Primary School site during the period to 2031 the ENP should</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) preserve the Play Area and Green Space 2) protect the Trees along the whole of the northern boundary of the School site 3) there should be no traffic to the former School site through Dovehouse Close. 	<p>Policy ENP7A already says that access should be from the main roads. The supporting text of ENP7.1-2 does require a minimum number of junctions so as to not impede traffic but only allows access from village roads if 'no reasonable alternative exists'.</p> <p>The green space and trees are addressed in ENP12 and 13 respectively with the site mentioned specifically in both those policies (ref. LGS 4).</p> <p>The petition is used to support the application for LGS designation of the area of concern and full details are given in the LGS 4 supporting document (p26) at https://admin.eynsham.org.uk/variable/organisation/173/attachments/LGS-4-checklist.pdf.</p>

Feedback from Reg14 Consultation (30/09 – 16/11/2018) on the redrafted Neighbourhood Plan, version 3.09.

CF no. 47.

ENV 4 - After "retaining tress, hedgerows and footpaths", please add "and best and most versatile agricultural land (Grade 3a and above)".

ENV 5 - After "New developments should not exacerbate existing parking problems within the village centre", please add "or make access to routes out of Eynsham parish or commuter journeys more difficult than they are already".

ENV 8 - I'm sorry, but this sentence just doesn't add up: "Neither settlement should be dependent on the other [could add "either during construction of the garden village or after its completion"?]; any shared facilities shall be for mutual benefit and without harm to either." There will inevitably be dependencies of one settlement on the other, for example for medical facilities or schools. It simply reflects the fact that the two settlements are too close to be independent, and not separately large enough to be self-sufficient once the additional population has arrived.

ENV 4 should add that agricultural land is also part of green infrastructure, and should therefore be retained wherever possible. This is what the UK Green Building Council has to say about GI in its document *Demystifying Green Infrastructure* of February 2015 (my emboldened emphases):

There is no single established definition of Green Infrastructure (GI) but the following quote provides a concise description; "Natural or semi-natural networks of green (soil covered or vegetated) and blue (water covered) spaces and corridors that maintain and enhance ecosystem services." Green infrastructure, therefore, can be described as the network of natural and semi-natural features **within and between our villages**, towns and cities – reaching out into the wider countryside. These features range in scale, from individual street trees, green roofs and private gardens through to parks, rivers and

The Vision section of the ENP was deliberately intended to summarise on one page the over-arching vision of the plan. To that end there will be limited detail included, only enough to set the overall direction of the plan. Inevitably some details will be omitted, particularly where they are part of national or local policy or set out in the relevant part of the plan.

The reference to "best and most versatile agricultural land" is a quote from national policy and is referenced within the body of the plan so there is no need to duplicate it here.

While we would sympathise with the sentiments you want added to ENV5, we also have to be aware of achieve-ability and this probably isn't achievable if *any* development occurs.

In the legally-binding policies we have to very careful with our use of words, but normal English usage is acceptable in supporting text. The term 'dependent' normally implies that the dependent party can do very little apart from the one on whom they depend and that is the way the word is used here. We agree that the two settlements will not be totally independent either, indeed there will be some facilities where sharing is positively beneficial and that is encouraged.

The wording was carefully crafted to point to the complex relationship between the two settlements due to their close proximity. We cannot see how a straight 'all or nothing' approach to this relationship will benefit either community.

A reference to this definition of Green Infrastructure will be a useful addition.

woodlands, transport corridors, verges and, **at the larger scale**, wetlands, forests and **agricultural land**.

PARA 4.15 - Re "Loss of locally significant species should be compensated by the successful re-establishment of the same species on a suitable site close by." This will not always be possible, and very difficult to monitor. Why would landowners of adjacent or nearby land agree to change of land use or farming practice in order to accommodate our lost species, especially those rare arable plants that feature in the GV site, together with the insects, birds and mammals that depend on them? All after years of careful land management (HLS, etc). Also, there is no guarantee that 'biodiversity offsetting' will work.

PARA 7.3 - After "no traffic relating to the construction of any new development should be permitted through existing village roads", please add "or near existing residences in the garden village site".

PARA 16.3 - Re "separation areas shall not include residential development". Ha! Good luck with that. The only structural buffer between Eynsham and the GV will be the A40.

PARA 16.9 - I must insist that you delete the words "set out at low density". Low-density housing is a criminal waste of rural space.

... but it is the only way to mitigate the situation if the land is allocated for housing. Those species which have scheduled protection will be protected but those not on the list have only the general requirement to 'identify and pursue opportunities for net measurable biodiversity gain' which does not guarantee anything in practice.

Sadly, I cannot see how that would be acceptable. There is a requirement to minimise the impact on residents – ENP7.3. I think a change from 'village' to 'local' roads may make clearer that this applies to roads anywhere in the parish. I'll also add 'suitable' to the access roads of 7.3 to strengthen this aspect of the policy

There is a definite risk of what you say happening. The whole point is that no one can say that low density housing is a 'buffer'.

This policy applies to **non-residential** development, e.g. offices or factory premises. Our preference is not to have a high-density urban style industrial area but more of a genuine 'science park' which has more chance of blending into the rural environment.

<p>CF no. 48.</p> <p>Technical Comments concerning Other documents to support the Neighbourhood Plan</p> <p>p2 In the <i>Basic Conditions</i> document, the legend on the map on p.3 is confusing as there is a turquoise colour on the legend, but not on the map. Same goes for the map in the <i>ENP policies</i> document on p.6. What about the new build down Newlands Street around the Peace Oak Orchard (should be in bright green and where is the Oxford Green Belt in paler green as shown in the legend</p> <p>Local Green Space Designation link does not work.</p> <p>p. 9-10 ENP maps are empty.</p> <p>Regarding the <i>Sustainability report</i>, presumably now the Local Plan is adopted Section 1.1 will be changed. I think you have done a great job by reframing our assessment of site options during the creation of this plan as material that has informed the drafting of the ENP policies.</p> <p>Consultation report link not working.</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>p.6 In discussing the land east of Eynsham, I think we should include the potential gravel extraction sites that OCC put forward in its recent consultation. I see you do on p.8, but I think it needs to go here as well to introduce the ring of construction and digging that will make Eynsham an island for decades. I think this should be mentioned in relation to master planning and the stepped development that Malcolm Rivett put forward in his adoption of the Local Plan. Relating to this idea, I have included on pp. 6-8 at the end of this document, a relevant extract from EPIC's response to the recent West Eynsham SPD Issues Consultation.</p>	<p>Done</p> <p>It's this document so not ready yet!</p> <p>Minerals is a subject specifically excluded from Neighbourhood Plans so it can only appear as part of the general context.</p> <p>Adding further references will not strengthen any of the land use / planning policies and might jeopardise the plan if it is considered to be straying into 'prohibited' territory.</p> <p>I understand the concerns but the ENP needs to remain objective and concentrate on its purpose of guiding the determination of planning consents.</p>
---	---

Tricia Crowley (with her EPIC hat on) has read my notes and she wanted to add one thing in relation to Eynsham as place:

“I strongly disagree that Eynsham has 'easy access to open countryside within easy walking distance' (p.5). This is only partly true down the private road/ bridle path that is Chill Bridge road. Even then one older woman told me she not longer felt safe going down ChillBridge because of having to move off the tarmac onto uneven verges when cars came along. Overall car users on ChilBridge are considerate. But this may not always be so.

Also can only get to the countryside in other directions if you are an able-bodied adult. At what age would we consider it safe for any child to cross the A40 or B4449 without adult supervision to reach open country side? I suspect not many children cycle or walk to the cricket club down Cassington Lane but rather they are driven by parents. We are fortunate to have lots of footpaths around, but I suspect older people who don't feel steady on their feet or have bad knees don't use the footpaths. Many adults feel unsafe crossing B4449 due to the speed of the traffic and reduced visibility due to overhanging vegetation and the curve of the road.

Also there are no cycle routes listed in the area in any of the Oxfordshire cycle books that I've looked in possibly because the road are not conducive to accommodating cycling.

So I think the description of Eynsham as a place in the current ENPv3 is outdated. We have limited green spaces and many age groups are dependant on a owning a car or the private operated bus service to get out.”

I agree and think the description of Eynsham as place would be more accurate if these points are summarised in the plan. Thereby, we could make a case for improving, as well as protecting, access to countryside.

ENP1 – Housing

Eynsham does have quite good access compared with the centre of an urban area for example. It would be nice if it were easier particularly for young, old and less-able alike but if that were the case, from one of the very rural villages for example, everyone would be dependent on the private car to be able to live there at all.

For most people it is possible to be in countryside after a walk of 10 minutes or so which I think justifies the generalised statement, the purpose of which is to suggest that we want to keep it that way.

If we said 'access is terrible' developers could say 'it doesn't matter anyway'!

If there are particular impediments to access for some groups we cannot expect developers to remedy these directly but we can add these to the list of possible projects for CIL / S106 funds that will come to the Parish Council as the result of development. This list is outside the ENP itself – it should be kept and maintained by EPC.

A – include self-build and co-housing (young people say they want this)
C – Also they say they need studio flats, and 1 bedroom accommodation – we had this in earlier versions of the policies, but it seems to have been dropped. Flats are not mentioned either. **We need these words in here for the referendum or it may look as if there is more emphasis on provision for older people in the ENP. This might not go down well with younger people and those hoping their sons and daughters leaving home can live nearby.**

1.2 include smaller houses, ‘flats and studios’
p.14 – just checking – I assume statutory footpaths in countryside would not be paved.

ENP2 – Design

Huge omission here, given the recent World Scientists’ Warning that we only have 13 years to save this planet for human habitation. If we do not act, the mass extinction of the human species will begin in the life-time of the little ones alive today. I know there are EPC Climate Change intentions in ENP5 (p.23), but that it not enough!!! It should be POLICY but I know the sadly lacking legal constraints you are working within, Richard, so I think designing for urgent climate change should be strongly included in the EPC Intentions on p.17 (ENP2) and strengthened as I suggest below, in ENP5 p. 23.

Creating homes that will enable Eynsham Parish to contribute to the Paris Agreement target of 1.5 degrees centigrade reduction in global temperature is vital.

(GreenTEA met with Robert Courts last week and he agreed to support our drive to ensure that the GV is built with well insulated homes and buildings and becomes a green energy producer and provider, i.e , smart meters in each house and building and smart grid providing free electricity for the entire Eynsham Parish - in his words, as ‘payback to Eynsham’).

2.8 – all buildings should be designed to operate with as little energy

I thought there was something about these specific options but there isn't. The biggest problem we face is 'justifying' any particular housing outside of the recognised 'needs' assessment.

The need for small units is clearly set out in the ENP – interestingly Eynsham is already one of the best places in West Oxfordshire for building smaller homes.

The term 'home' does not preclude a flat as offering that home!

The need for both older people and those starting out is clearly made without any bias towards older people.

A mention of apartments here will be a useful reminder but it would be unwise to go further without a specific needs assessment to justify.

No – it's quite specific, paving only applies where a 'footpath' gets incorporated into the urban landscape; once back into the countryside it can revert of 'normal'

There is no possibility of getting this past examination.

ENP 5 is as far as we can go and there is still the possibility that that an examiner will insist it be removed although we have had the plan checked by an examiner and he thought it unlikely.

That's great – but it is still inadmissible in a Neighbourhood Plan.

That's as far as we can go with this policy.

<p>input and energy production as possible, not just modern house designs.</p> <p>In addition, this section focuses on design as having an aesthetic and harmonising function and not on its health and well-being function. Beauty inherent in good design fosters mental and physical health, energises positivity and reduces stress.</p> <p>ENP 3 – Community facilities</p> <p>Best, in this section, to refer readers to new primary and secondary school provision in ENP 5, 16 and 17, in case, for the Referendum, they don't get that far in their reading of the plan and consequently vote against the adoption of the ENP. They will be looking for the developers to build primary schools and further secondary provision, not just pre-schools as in Policy G.</p> <p>You may know that supporters of EPIC are keen to keep the OCC field south of the Chil Brook (locally known as the dog-walking field), as part of the Linear Park idea, as a recompense for only having very little green space in the village for walking and recreation. Could this amenity be added in ENP3 Policy H to ensure community access to wildlife, key views and countryside and maintenance of health and well-being? Also relevant to 3.2. If not here, then in ENP4?</p> <p><i>EPIC supporters – this version of the ENP appears to have continued to support the notion of this dog-walking field being part of the Linear Park along the Chil Brook (see end of this commentary).</i></p> <p>ENP 4 – Green infrastructure – the setting for new developments</p> <p>4.2 Trees are vital to physical health – they absorb carbon and give off Oxygen, as well as having beneficial effects on both body and mind in terms of well-being.</p> <p>4.10 Communal gardens, widely used in the Netherlands (where land is in short supply) in the centre of rows and rectangles of houses create open space and cut down need for front gardens. In this case, extra space could</p>	<p>The nearest we can go is in emphasising standards such as BfL12. Anything else would stray into 'no additional technical standards are permissible in NP' territory</p> <p>I've moved the 'see also ENP 6 Education' link to just above 3.1. Link does work</p> <p>Schools are addressed in Education</p> <p>It's good to know that EPIC support what has been EPC policy for some time now.</p> <p>We cannot add something which will clearly reduce house numbers on an allocated site – it will simply be struck out. It would be hard to make a viable claim for LGS even if the site were not allocated.</p> <p>Specific reference is made in ENP17. We have tried to avoid duplication and only put things in the most appropriate place in the ENP</p> <p>I've added 'communal gardens' to 4.8 which is about communal areas</p>
---	--

be given for back gardens for growing food (a feature of old Eynsham).

ENP5 Sustainability: Climate Change

A – typo in 3rd line

p. 23 - Again, **it is utterly wrong that the urgent EPC Intentions are not policy NOW**, given the state of the planet and the dire warnings we have received recently in March from the World Scientists Warning to Humanity and the IPPC report to the United Nations and the World Wildlife Fund this month.

ENP7 – Sustainable Transport

7.1 Since consultation events were completed in 2017, **traffic congestion on the A40 and in the village has got worse and residents' complaints and concerns have increased**. People talk endlessly about how long the daily commute whether by car, bus or train took them today.

7.2 Master planning should alleviate and reduce congestion in and around Eynsham and especially in the village centre (see also ENP17). For example, in our EPIC campaigning, people have suggested that HGVs have 'access only' rights in the centre and must use the eastern and southern bypasses only to navigate around the village.

7.4 – these routes should have pedestrian traffic light crossing points that give enough time for people over 65 to cross the road. For research, see: <https://www.ukdataservice.ac.uk/use-data/data-in-use/case-study/?id=162>

7.6 WODC use the term 'active travel' which I think is a good description for what is set out here.

ENP10 Building a strong sustainable economy

F – should we say 'small, perhaps boutique' accommodation – I have visions of a big hotel like the one at Wolvercote roundabout or from Helen Goldberg, an EPIC supporter, 'the monstrosity at the new Bicester development' that would be unacceptable on greenfield sites (which is all

That's mentioned in 4.8 but not specifically for food crops

Thanks

I don't think there is much disagreement, certainly not within EPC, but it simply isn't allowed in a NP!

We have to be very careful not to require improvement to existing situations – that is not permitted – but there is always the possibility of helping and we do encourage improvement. We can insist on not making things worse but it is hard to see how that can be done without a more radical approach which is outside the scope of a NP.

Again this is suggested in the ENP but it's not within the scope of a NP except where new access is concerned, particularly in relation to using Thorbury Rd as access into the village.

These are national standards which it would be difficult to go against. At-grade crossings on busy routes are a bad thing for everyone anyway.

Good point – I have used the phrase and referenced WODC policy in 7.6

There must be the risk of a Premier Inn. Changed to

Provision of additional hotel accommodation will be supported where unlikely to cause inconvenience to residents or exacerbate problems such as access and parking. The scale, size and design of a new hotel shall be in keeping with its location and context.

we have available)

10.4 This point does not read well for grammatical reasons.

ENP12 – Local Green Space

Could we put forward the OCC dog-walking field as local green space here, as well as pushing for it in ENP3 as set out above? Pointing out the saving of building an expensive crossing of the Chil Brook (14.9)

ENP 14 – Sustainable Growth

Good to see points on ensuring masterplanning of contiguous sites and phasing of development.

14.11 I have heard only minimal support for this so-called ‘Eynsham’s aspiration to become part of the Oxford Knowledge Spine’, either in Eynsham Futures’ community engagement or in EPIC’s campaign work. Where is the evidence for this aspiration please? Most people I talk with would prefer this investment to be put into the north where universities and industry need more support for knowledge creation and use. Personally, I see the Knowledge Spine as an initiative for privileged universities and businesses who are already flourishing. Also, as the richer South sucking away much-needed resources from more impoverished parts of the UK.

REC14 – EPC intentions – first para is ungrammatical.

ENP16 New Settlements

D - add health and well-being needs of current and future residents of Eynsham Parish.

REC 16 – EPC Intentions

It's also incorrect as the 3.5ha site has not been redeveloped as hoped

No because it is already allocated – that's why ENP9 has been removed

EPC has consistently supported employment alongside housing – what better way to get people to walk or cycle to work than have the jobs locally.

We have to be consistent in wanting good jobs locally – the alternative is no jobs and commuting out or just low-skill, low-wage* jobs, neither of which is attractive. *Technology businesses will provide jobs for the less skilled but it doesn't work the other way round.

The biggest worry is that the Science park looks very unlikely now.

No one will dispute what you say but this is not part of the NP remit!

Agreed, amended to include health

2nd para - It is important to include **non-listed and non-designated heritage assets because of the significance of the unexcavated Medieval Village site on the north (as you do in ENP 17, B).**

**ENP17 – Strategic Development Areas
SDAs should have an AAP – see comments in REC17.**

Protection of and net gain of wildlife and Biodiversity should be in the Policy Box – this could be linked to the research that shows that wildlife species have declined by 60% since the 1970s.

<https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/oct/30/humanity-wiped-out-animals-since-1970-major-report-finds>
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3oT4AEJL3yI>

Helen Goldberg points out that this includes British wildlife – and the ‘WODC should be doing all it can to preserve habitats’. In addition, valuable farmland should be reserved for growing plant-based food.

Link dog-walking field with ENP 17D

17.1 new developmen should REDUCE village centre traffic problems (see ENP 7 suggestion - Master planning should alleviate and reduce congestion in and around Eynsham and especially in the village centre . For example, in our EPIC campaigning, people have suggested that HGVs have access only rights in the centre (using entry and exit cameras) and must use the eastern and southern bypasses to navigate around the village.

17.4 A biodiversity statement should also be included also in relation to biodiversity asset in relation to plantlife on the disused railway line and barn owls sited by many residents in the OCC owned ‘dog-walking’ field.

17.6 compensation for lack of village green or park in relation to the OCC

agreed, changed to 'designated and undesignated'

Unfortunately it doesn't and that's WODC's decision

The need to 'seek to achieve' net biodiversity gain is in ENP4.

That's saying 'you can't build on any green field' which will be rejected in any planning policy document.

It is part of the Linear Park area already

As before, it is impermissible to **require** retrospective improvement – but we can hope it will help.

Roads issues are being tackled through the village-wide traffic improvement project currently underway by EPC which includes access, parking and 20mph. There are agreed HGV routes which do exactly what you say for regular traffic – most of the problems are with 'one-off' HGV trips (i.e. they have no pre-agreed route) or associated with local building work.

What you say tallies with Natural England's suggestion that the NP should include a survey/register of the biodiversity assets including things such as the rare arable weeds on GV site. Unfortunately there isn't any time to do that now and most of the issues are already documented to some degree and cannot be ignored when planning applications come forward.

REC 17D goes a long way to doing what you suggest. It would have to be in

<p>field could be mentioned here. If legally, Richard, you are unable to make this suggestion, you could make a general case and put here and then elaborate in the EPC Intentions</p> <p>Caption of photo on p49 is inaccurate – Looking EAST (not west!) from Chilbridge Road in winter</p> <p>REC 17 - EPC Intentions</p> <p>A- As you probably know EPIC challenged the West not having an AAP which means that the SPD is not legally binding. I think you are referring to this nature of the SPD in the opening para of the EPC intentions.</p> <p>B – Also, you have picked up on Malcolm Rivett’s urging WODC to develop a stepped approach to planning. EPIC forcefully made these points in their latest response re West Eynsham SPD Issues consultation</p> <p>REC 17 C So Richard, could you include in a new recommendation following B, the harmful effects on residents’ health and well-being of simultaneous construction potentially on all sides of Eynsham and the duty of care for WO residents during construction. (Note also that the intentions leap from B to H which indicates to me how many you might have taken out in this re-iteration!)</p> <p>REC 17 I - This duty of care for the health, well-being and stress reduction of current and future residents could also be mentioned here as being another positive reason (the first being saving money) for preserving the land south of the Chilbrook (ie the dog-walking field). This field could be incorporated into the Linear Park as hinted at in the map. Thereby, providing Eynsham with a park given the lack of a village green or park in the existing, densely built village.</p> <p>Appendix B A12 – any chance EPC could purchase the dog-walking field at agricultural price?</p>	<p>Policy to be any more 'enforcible' and it would be struck down as the land is allocated in WOLP. I think we have made the best case we can.</p> <p>You are right – it's corrected.</p> <p><i>The submission included EPIC's submission in response to Q1a of the SDA Issues paper consultation which has not been reproduced here for brevity.</i></p> <p>If there was likelihood that it would strengthen the case already made by A and B it might be worthwhile. We site 'harmful effects' of which health and well-being would be one. (I think its just careless editing – for some reason REC17(cont) followed on from ENP17G)</p> <p>There is no doubt truth in this but it's too tenuous and we would be asked for evidence. Loss of amenity is considered more 'obvious' and doesn't get challenged so much so that's what is used here.</p> <p>That would be an ideal outcome but unlikely as OCC will want top price for their land. The old railway line (ex LGS9) is another site to look at if the through road doesn't happen or the land is not needed for it.</p>
---	---

<p>CF no. 49. Natural England</p>	
<p>In our review of the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan we note that there are no designated sites or protected landscapes within or near the Neighbourhood Plan area and the plan does not allocate any additional sites for development. We are therefore satisfied that the Neighbourhood Plan can rely on the Habitat Regulations Assessment and Strategic Environmental Assessment undertaken for the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan.</p> <p>We welcome inclusion of Policy ENP4 addressing Green Infrastructure, including Policy ENP4(a) which seeks to enhance biodiversity. Such an approach is supported by paragraph 174 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which recommends that plans should identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.</p> <p>The NPPF also highlights the need for plans to identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks. As such, we would advise that the Neighbourhood Plan could map existing biodiversity assets, such as those mentioned in the text, including lowland meadows, ponds, the Chil Brook and other watercourses and woodlands. There is also considerable rare arable weed interest in the area, some of which is included in Local Wildlife Site designations.</p> <p><i>NE recommended the Neighbourhood Plan for Benson as an exemplar</i></p>	<p>NE concur with ENP intention to rely on the HRA / SEA of the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan</p> <p>These resources are well mapped elsewhere as noted in the text. While this additional information might be helpful in highlighting the issues, as in the very comprehensive Benson NDP, we chose not to include more than was necessary in the Eynsham NP to prevent the document becoming overlong.</p>

<p>CF no. 50. (Professor Emeritus) John Dowling</p>	
<p>TOWARD CONFORMITY</p> <p>I am that seemingly rare Eynsham resident that actually can hardly contain my excitement at the prospects of economic development taking place around us. So great is it that I feel I have to try to curb my enthusiasm. But this is difficult because the resolution of so many socio-economic problems seem to be addressed within it. The two most relevant are, firstly the digital/manufacturing/service transformation, and the second but related to it is the emerging change in the scale of geographic planning now underway.</p> <p>The Westminster government has, in two budgetary allocations, identified this area as of critical significance to the emerging national economy, and this is expressed through new quasi-unitary institutions, OxLEP, the Oxford Growth Board, and, by extension, the West Oxfordshire Local Plan. This is reinforced by our personal experience in that Christine</p>	

and I have lived in Greenwich, Connecticut, home of the hedge and private equity funds, the new sources of investment capital, and later in Palo Alto, California, source of the world spanning digital, research University spin-off economy. Thus in our life experience we have become sensitive to two of the most important global locations setting the world standards for a competitive economy that is already here and within which we here in the OxCamLondon triangle, perhaps uniquely in Europe, are capable of responding. It is from this direct experience that we welcome the political judgement that the OxCamLondon triangle could be a coherent area perhaps equivalent to the Ruhr and Silicon Valleys, in a world economy where the applied intellectual industrial nexus has such huge potential impact. This leads us to agree that, here, we may be in the best placed single location for the essentially competitive development critical to our economic future. The presence within this triangle of its universities, the three best cradles of applied science, together with supporting financial and legal services of the highest importance and reach, creates a sense of competitive advantage of the very first order.

I have tried to reach out to test my enthusiasm in conversation with for example Professor George Smith FRS, on the inevitability of the university tech spin off model of national economic restoration, and equally confirmatory has been my review of the Google entries of Professor Vincent Goodstadt, who has spent a large part of his recent public life urging the recognition of the necessary 'mega-regional' scale for contemporary planning of housing, investment and employment. The application of this policy most immediate to us is the iOCGV and it is my understanding that EPC WODC Grosvenor talks are progressing.

The degree of change that this represents locally is of course nearly impossible to take in and, even in a well educated local population such as ours, the political problems of absorbing and effectively addressing the process of change is very considerable, although probably the crisis of incomprehension is past its peak. It is important, however, to grasp the scale of incomprehension as a political problem yet to be solved and I am forced to wonder whether we are doing this sufficiently effectively. It remains unresolved because the EPC approach to the re-submission, ENP2, may have become primarily an expression of a deliberately non-conforming restatement of protest against, rather than a contribution to planning within the parameters set by WODC's Local Plan as the responsible Planning Authority. I am anxious lest current planning, following the prior submission of the EPC, and the adverse resolution, in the two earlier Examination stages, is in danger of becoming a last gasp of EPC's policy of 'tolerant accommodation' to the ENP as primarily a vehicle of protest rather than of planning (4).

When we come to unpacking the ENP second submission, (ENP2), it may be useful to consider some of the actions that have led us to where we are. ENP1 was, so far as I can see, always the use of a village level planning process as a means of harvesting and expressing protest which seemed to predominate (1),(4) and to which the EPC essentially adopted a posture of tolerant accommodation; while i greater regularity came

with appointment of Cllr Andrews as Vice Chair, EPCD for example, subsequently rendered the text put to them, even less in conformity with the then Draft Local Plan by deleting the possibility of a connecting road.

In a similar way questions of decision-making ethics (2), too, were controversial from the very start over the participation of interested parties in decision-making. Following referral to the WODC Monitoring Officer around December 2016, non-participation of interested parties in decisions was officially adopted in Terms of Reference, (5) an agreement between the EPC and ENP Steering Group. But it is not clear that these were universally respected, particularly over the Green Space schedule. This matter was then referred again to the Monitoring Officer particularly over the duty of ENP-participating Cllrs to observe, and see observed, the agreed Terms of Reference; so, too, a little later, was the EPC's published response to that second referral. In these responses, there may be more evidence of EPC's approach of tolerant accommodation (1) (2). If there was such accommodation, it may have given rise to ENP1's tolerance of a degree of non-conformity undercutting the then Draft Local Plan on a number of critical Draft Local Plan matters, including site boundary, housing numbers, and the connecting road (4). These divergences from the Draft Local Plan seem to have been decisive factors in the ENP Examiner's call of an extra-ordinary meeting in early December, 2017. (4)

The subsequent continuation of the ENP1 submission was then essentially taken against the grain of her advice both at, and in the correspondence about, that Meeting with EPC and WODC, which so profoundly shook the ground under the ENP (4). She referred to regretting the rejection of her advice again when she later recommended ENP1 not proceed (4). Those events changed the relationship between EPC and WODC (4). In addition since then,, the WODC Local Plan has been approved by the Planning Inspectorate and formally adopted by WODC, the Local Plan Inspector having also taken into account, and rejected the EPC submission made along similar lines to him (6). This second rejection, of the EPC approach by the Local Plan Inspector, reviewed the specific question of consultative procedure over the OCGV and found it satisfactory (6). Given this history of prior multiple rejection at both the levels of the ENP1 and the WODC Local Plan Examination, one cannot avoid questioning the prospects of a successful re-submission of a similarly, or even less compliant ENP2.

Further, with the passage of administrative time, following the double blow to the EPC view, the Planning Inspectorate's Approval and consequent WODC Adoption of their Local Plan (4) (6), WODC/EPC consultations have moved matters on to the stages of a legally binding AAP on the OCGV to the north, and a SDA Issues consultation on the west Eynsham SDA (3). These stages raise the question of the relevance of further pursuing ENP resubmission. In the latest EPC submissions on the SDA, on west Eynsham if EPC raises already resolved objections once again, and adds some new ones, most significant of which is the idea that the two proposed primary schools supported in the two ENP processes be combined in an expansion of the present primary school (3). In this, EPC now argues that if the pupil roll were to be raised at the present Primary School

Eynsham Parish Council has never supported the expansion of the existing Primary School. Advice from OCC is that the existing site is not large enough to accommodate

to 630, a substantially reduced number of western houses would be the implied limit to any further village expansion in the west; so, instead of housing numbers being determined by the need for a new western school, pre-setting limits to school expansion on the eastern site would set a limit to western housing numbers (3). This would then also remove a western school as the base for a social and retail hub, while concentrating infrastructural problems and schooling in an abnormally enlarged eccentrically located school. This could lower the quality of Village education, certainly add to traffic congestion, making walking to school more difficult, increasing pollution at peak hours, and perhaps erode the quality of the only outdoor amenities in the eastern part of the Village (7). Here, again we might find evidence of EPC policy of tolerant accommodation to western protest than more limited planning to conform with the now Adopted Local Plan. Meanwhile the two school model is supported by a very considerable number of submissions to the SDA consultation and, possibly, in this consultation on a second ENP too. This example clearly demonstrates the confusion between ENP and SDA processes and raises the overwhelming question of why we would pursue an almost certainly non-conforming ENP2.

The one big school idea is said, in one supporting SDA submission to be the view of the OCC and School staff (3), although this was in one of only very few submissions putting this point of view, apart from that of the EPC itself. However among the 124 submissions to the west Eynsham SDA consultation this contrasts strongly with the views of some 69 people who supported a second western primary school most of whom called it 'essential'. These 69 submissions make up a significant and widespread body of public consultees whose clearly expressed opinion should be unambiguously reflected in ENP2 which would then, of course, not only restore consistency with, ENP1 & Draft ENP 2 but, even more importantly, conform to the Adopted Local Plan.

For were a one oversize school to form a part of ENP2, it would take the ENP2 submission even further from legally required conformity with the Local Plan, adding to the earlier failure of conformity over siting, housing, and a western connecting road, the risk of less educational ease of access and affecting attainment Village-wide, adversely affecting outdoor amenities to the eastern part of the Village, support for which, it must be remembered here, was submitted by some seventy five residents to ENP1 (8) looked at in this light, the one oversize school scheme is a non starter, and as such, should be excluded from ENP2 if submitted.

The combination in ENP2 of possibly even greater non-conformity to the Local Plan, while the Local Plan itself has moved to greater levels of legal adoption is bewildering; and worrying about the capacity of the EPC to face a future being shaped by planning on a mega-regional scale and within the imperatives of a digital national economy. The prospect simultaneously of a non-conforming ENP2, perhaps shaped within a regrettable softening of ethical restraint seems misplaced in planning matters which of necessity call for constructive intergovernmental co-operation. Am I alone in feeling for those Councillors caught between accommodating an intensely felt, but perhaps

3FE.

This comment references EPC submission to a recent consultation by WODC on the West Eynsham SDA 'Issues Paper' which noted that if a new school was not built to the west there would most likely be the consequential loss of a 'local centre' for what is a substantial extension to the village.

EPC's submission to the SDA consultation is entirely consistent with the NP which expects a new school to be built, as does the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan (WOLP).

These are exactly the concerns raised by EPC in their SDA submission.

Unfortunately, it doesn't matter how many people want something if the matter is outside the remit of a NP, as is the case with school provision.

It is hard to know what changes could be made to the ENP which already assumes that a new school will be built.

Education is an important matter for the community and has therefore been included in the ENP but with full realisation that the ENP cannot make demands about what schools should or should not be provided.

At best the ENP can emphasise local issues, including the need (ENP6.9) for adequate provision for dropping off and collecting children at *new* schools which is in response to the problems experienced at *existing* ones. **An addition to 6.9 pointing out the extent of existing problems at both schools would not go outside the ENP remit.**

Requests have been made for examples to justify these general criticisms but none have been forthcoming.

<p>undisciplined, need for local protest and the Planning Inspectorate's legally binding Local Plans, which are further underpinned by the substantial financial incentives offered by a soon-to-be-implemented CIL payment system should ENP2 be so redrafted as to be likely to be found in conformity with the Local Plan (9).</p> <p>I would therefore like to see, prior to your bringing a revised ENP2 to EPC, a number of matters referred to the grant-funded consultant to the EPC in the matter of ENP2. These primarily concern the political and economic wisdom of submitting to the Neighbourhood Planning Inspectorate a second, equally or perhaps yet more, non-conforming ENP 2, especially giving due consideration to a clearly established Adopted Local Plan, and taking under consideration, the value to Village revenues of the substantially higher CIL rate of payments that would soon accompany an ENP2 should it be found in conforming with the Local Plan.</p> <p>Firstly, the matter of schooling must take account of the overwhelming, almost universal, resident hostility in the SDA, and other, submissions to the one school policy. It follows that ENP2 should more clearly conform to the two primary school model, recognising its contribution to primary schooling, to a western social hub, and to a balance of services across the Village. These themes should be advanced by EPC in ENP2, in accordance with the now adopted Local Plan;</p> <p>Similarly, the connecting spine road should be retained to lessen Village congestion, and in accordance with the now adopted Local Plan;</p> <p>A western hub, based on a second primary school together and a significant new retail provision, should be supported in accordance with the now adopted Local Plan;</p> <p>The site determination and housing quotas should be reconsidered so to be in accordance with the now adopted Local Plan;</p> <p>Any matters of conflict of interest, perhaps inevitably recurrent throughout an ENP process (1) primary self directed and unduly expressive of protest, and perhaps most evident in the departure from the normative procedure of the Terms of Reference (5) over decision-making in the Green Spaces schedule, together with the EPC's public rulings and interpretations following the three conversations with the Monitoring Officer of WODC, should, prior to a second submission, all be put before the grant funded Consultant to the EPC for his fully informed professional scrutiny and advice (2).. Secondly, following his familiarisation with these processes, the question of protest accommodation by the EPC in the process should then be fully and critically revisited, in guidance conversations between the Consultant and the Officers of EPC, so that, in the event a protest-accommodative but substantively non-conforming ENP2 were to be submitted again to WODC, it would be knowingly done, after proper due diligence, fully aware of the administrative history of the processes at two Examinations including the repeated earlier failure of these ideas. and, also in fully informed knowledge of the risks non conformity runs as regards the possible loss of an extra ten percent rate to EPC</p>	<p>The ENP is intended to be in "general conformity" with the adopted West Oxfordshire Local Plan. Our purpose, agreed with WODC, is to contribute an additional level of local detail while remaining compatible with the principles and purposes set out in the Local Plan.</p> <p>It has been checked by a qualified planning examiner in respect of the new Local Plan and found, in his opinion, to be in conformity. If there are any points of non-conformity highlighted during consultation, they will be corrected.</p> <p>The ENP has always had a new primary school as part of the western extension, together with a new convenience store and public building as appropriate to a 50% increase in village size.</p> <p>It isn't for a Neighbourhood Plan to set school provision policy.</p> <p>The 'spine road' is not intended as a bypass as was agreed during the WOLP examination. The ENP expects the road to be designed as a 20mph street compatible with the village-wide 20mph project currently in progress but does not oppose it joining both B4449 and A40.</p> <p>A 'local centre' has always been part of the ENP</p> <p>The ENP does not allocate land or set numbers; this is entirely a matter for the WOLP.</p> <p>As noted already, the plan itself has been reviewed by a qualified professional.</p> <p>A complaint of conflict of interest was made to the appropriate authority, investigated and dismissed.</p> <p>The Local Green Space allocations are approved for submission by Eynsham Parish Council based on the substantial supporting evidence supplied with each. Each application meets the requirement for LGS.</p>
--	--

<p>financial contributions from CIL Payments to EPC as compared with that lower rate (1% as opposed to 25%) accruing on the submission of another submission substantially non-conforming with the adopted Local Plan. Foregoing that capacity for Village improvement compensating for loss of amenity might concentrate some minds powerfully</p> <p>Additionally, of course such an exploration should take place within an examination of how EPC can best return to a generous spirit and play its full part within the larger planning context and with the fullest possible understanding of the development of, and reasoning behind, Central Government policy on the planning relationship of housing, investment and employment, and its implementation through OxLEP, the Oxford Growth Board, the Planning Inspectorate, and in a full and proper recognition of WODC as West Oxfordshire's Planning Authority.</p> <p>Footnotes</p> <p>(1) On likelihood of conflict, see EPC Minutes June 2018, and EPC/ENP Terms of Reference, (5).</p> <p>(2) On referral of possible conflict anomalies to Public Consultation, see EPC Minutes June 2018, see also EPC Minutes September 2018</p> <p>(3) On no second primary school, see EPC SDA submission, but compare OCC SDA submissions from Susan Halliwell, Director Of Place and Planning, and the OCC Education Team; but also see individual submission of Cllr Emery, Vide Chair EPC; see also OCC Cllr Mathew in EPC Minutes June 2018</p> <p>(4) On intent of ENP1, and failure of ENP1, see Minutes and correspondence, Examiner Anne Skippers , WODC</p> <p>(5) see Terms of Reference, Code of Conduct, Appendix in EPC/ENP Agreement</p> <p>(6) See West Oxfordshire Adopted Local Plan, 2018</p> <p>(7) see Dowling SDA submission; and some 69 submissions opposing enlargement of the present Primary School</p> <p>(8) see 75 submissions to ENP1 Green Space ,from Dovehouse Close residents.</p> <p>(9) Community levy distributed at higher rate if neighbourhood plan is made</p>	<p>Eynsham Parish Council (EPC) is fully engaged with all the developers/ promoters of land in the SDA and has recently entered a collaboration agreement with Grosvenor Developments, the promoter of OCGV land.</p> <p>EPC has not opposed OCGV or the provision of employment sites to go with it. EPC has raised concerns that too many houses were allocated to the west and the ENP notes those areas of concern but cannot and does not attempt to resist the allocation made in the now adopted Local Plan.</p>
--	---

<p>CF no. 51.</p>	
<p>I have, for most part, only commented where I see a change, amendment, deletion or addition would help.</p>	

<p>Words: substitute dwellings for houses. Reason: accommodation can be houses, flats, co housing, etc.</p> <p>P 5: The single carriageway A40 between Witney and Oxford is not the primary cause of congestion. The interruptions to flow (roundabouts, junctions, traffic lights) and traffic volume are the main causes.</p> <p>Toll Bridge queues: add queues on the approach road in the village.</p> <p>P 7 and top P8: WODC as the LPA can, in consultation with OCC, require developers to fund off site infrastructure such as the A 40.</p> <p>ENP can advocate the reduction of A 40 junctions to maintain traffic flow.</p> <p>ENV 2 Design: Not withstanding the absence of a national policy, the ENP should advocate Passivhaus energy standards for all dwellings, whether affordable, social and market housing.</p> <p>ENV 3: Compactness in new development is the foundation for sustainable living and travel.</p> <p>ENV 5: Road and path networks in new developments should be designed to discourage car use and encourage walking, cycling, public transport and social interaction.</p> <p>One of the Masterplans' key aims should be to restrict vehicular access along village roads. This applies to new residents and commuters from outside the village.</p> <p>ENP 1 Housing : Delete B. Strongly support D. Walking distance criteria are excellent planning tools.</p> <p>ENP 2 Design: Add requirement that all new buildings should have a small carbon and environmental footprint, and, preferably, a zero carbon footprint.</p> <p>2.6 High density is essential.</p> <p>2.8 Low energy dwellings can be designed to be acceptable in most contexts.Text needs attention to avoid the ambiguity being used by applicants to justify low quality estate houses.</p> <p>ENP 4 Green Infrastructure : Add existing access routes to the countryside, and their setting, should be enhanced for recreational use by walkers, cyclists, horse riders and users of disability vehicles, for example, Chilbridge Road.</p>	<p>The word mainly used is 'homes' which also covers other types of dwellings.</p> <p>... but it is the primary location of the congestion. The importance of 'flow' is also noted in the text</p> <p>... they may be able to obtain funds for new safe access points but cannot prohibit development. The ENP does do this - ENP 7A</p> <p>as explained elsewhere, Neighbourhood Plans are prohibited from doing this.</p> <p>Active discouragement seems inappropriate while so many people need to use their cars outside the ENP area.</p> <p>ENP 1B is substantially altered following comments by WODC.</p> <p>See comment above.</p>
---	---

<p>ENP5 Sustainability: Travel is the fastest growing source of carbon dioxide. Add policies for: network design, density, parking, segregated paths proximity to facilities, especially schools to encourage non car mobility.</p> <p>ENP 5.3 Developers must take account of all their on and off site costs before agreeing the net price of development land.</p> <p>ENP 6.8: Walking Distance. Hence the importance of new primary schools (and their sites) in the GV and Western Development. If there is no primary school in the west, parents will drive their children to and from the existing school. Congestion, pollution, noise and danger will thereby increase.</p> <p>ENP 6.9: Access to any new school should be by foot, cycle or public transport. Car access by parents should be controlled, and restricted, by road and network design and parking restrictions. Car journeys by parents inhibit healthy access by other means.</p> <p>ENP 7: Add policy for layout, land use and network to be designed for sustainable movement and not car convenience. Add policy for all village roads to be restricted 20 MPH.</p> <p>Road infrastructure connecting new development to the main roads (A 40, B 4044 and 4449) should be completed before construction starts.</p> <p>ENP 7.2: The exception for local people is a logical weak spot and may be used by developers to justify direct access from the western development into the village. 20 MPH speed limit should be complemented by network and road design , traffic management and speed measures.</p> <p>ENP 10.10: Delete reverence to improved A 40 access.</p> <p>ENP 12 and 13: Add policy for "greening" / tree planting in the village and new development.</p> <p>ENP 14 :Add policy to encourage insulation of existing buildings.</p> <p>Add new policy F: A 40 and Toll Bridge improvements are a necessary part of enabling off site S 106 work. No new dwellings should be occupied before this work has been completed.</p> <p>ENP 15: Add new E: reduce traffic and long stay non-residential parking in the Conservation Area and historic core.</p> <p>ENP 16 : Add H: buildings should be sustainable and have minimal adverse</p>	<p>Access restrictions outside remit of NP – appropriate encouragement is given to no-car use but some parents will need to use car and should be able to do so safely</p> <p>see ENP 7C / 7.5</p> <p>exception is logical but restricted (7.2) see ENP 7C / 7.5</p> <p>A40 access issues does restrict businesses.</p> <p>Outside ENP – being addressed by EPC traffic management project</p>
---	--

<p>environmental impact, eg Passivhaus or low carbon and healthy non car mobility.</p> <p>ENP 16.8 Out of centre retail would encourage car use to the detriment of sustainable and healthy travel.</p> <p>ENP 17 A , replace "limited" with "restricted".</p> <p>Add new H: Western development should be designed sustainably to minimise its adverse environmental impact by, inter alia, Passivhaus / low carbon, maximum opportunity for convenient safe non car travel, protecting the village from cars and protecting / enhancing countryside access for walkers, cyclist, riders and disabled riders.</p> <p>17.1 Add: vehicular access to and through the village along existing roads should be restricted.</p>	
--	--

<p>CF no. 52.</p> <p>01 Introduction states the ENP is in accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), March 2012. Does it need to refer to the substantial revision of July 2018?</p> <p>02 Strategic Context. para 2 ‘easy access to open countryside’- not really true. Busy roads on 3 sides make crossing hazardous even for the able bodied, with the only safe access along Chilbridge Road, which is at risk from the SDA.</p> <p>Map 1: Mention potential gravel extraction on east side- show on map 1. Solid red line looks like SDA, not Conservation Area boundary. CA boundary is legible on map 2 but not on map 1 – maybe omit from map 1?</p> <p>Section 04 para 1.6 - Please reinstate requirement for self-build and co-housing, as well as studio flats, and 1 bedroom accommodation. Also applies to ENP 16- new settlements and ENP 17-SDAs</p> <p>ENP 3 – Community facilities: H: suggest this includes open space to compensate for Eynsham’s lack of village green or park. Many want to save the OCC field south of Chilbridge Road (locally known as the dog-walking field), as part of the Linear Park idea. Could this amenity be added in ENP3 Policy H to ensure community access to wildlife, key views and countryside and</p>	<p>Not if submitted before Jan 29, 2019.</p> <p>Mentioned by previous respondent – see answers to CF 48. <i>There is much commonality with CF 48 although the submissions are distinct.</i></p> <p>Map amended to make distinction between CA and SDA boundary</p> <p>see answers to CF 48</p> <p>see answers to CF 48</p>
--	--

<p>maintenance of health and well-being see 17.11. Also include in ENP 12 (see below) and REC17-I</p> <p>ENP 3b Infrastructure and Utilities: 3.17 Should refer to the <i>'Energy and Sustainability statement'</i> or <i>'energy feasibility assessment'</i> (as required by Policy EH4 of the Local Plan) and desirability of provision for integrated local energy generation and a local smart grid (see 5.4 and 5.6 below)</p> <p>ENP4 C/4.2 'Appropriate species' needs to be defined: to include significant numbers of forest scale, local, native trees rather than the favoured small fastigate ornamental trees, to better blend into the countryside and for the countryside to extend into new development along streets, paths/ green corridors. The policy should require a net increase of tree cover. See also ENP13</p> <p>4.7 Fruit and nut trees desirable and build on Eynsham's heritage</p> <p>4.8 and 4.10 Add communal gardens and allotments as a desirable way of providing amenity and productive space in desirable higher density development without individual private gardens.</p> <p>ENP5 Sustainability: Climate Change</p> <p>ENP 5 Mention that EPC expect WODC to forward an <i>'Energy and Sustainability statement'</i> or <i>'energy feasibility assessment'</i> contributions to the Parish Council and relevant stakeholders for comment.</p> <p>As there are unreasonable constraints on what can be put into policy, could there not be recommendations which suggest higher standards as suggested below as well as strengthening the intentions to take account of recent IPCC projections and findings of the Energy and Climate Change Committee? Eg zero carbon/Passivhaus construction (including reducing embodied energy); pv on roofs as standard; energy feasibility to include local grid and storage options to give low cost renewable energy to residents and be a net exporter of clean energy to the wider community, for example, free recharging points for electric cars.</p> <p>ENP 6.8 Essential that the West Eynsham SDA has a primary school. The distance to the existing primary school is too great for walking, and driving will create congestion, pollution, CO2 and unhealthy habits.</p> <p>ENP 7 Suggest opening statement includes pedestrian and cycle access. 'new development shall have safe access to local transport networks by private car</p>	<p>3.17 is addressing a different issue. EH4 will apply anyway.</p> <p>Species need to be appropriate in form and scale to their location and surroundings. WODC has a tree officer who will be able to advise the LPA on the 'appropriateness' of each application.</p> <p>see answers to CF 48</p> <p>see answers to CF 48</p> <p>it might be valuable to reference EH4 but, given the status of ENP5 as only aspirational at this stage, EH4 carries far more weight in its own right.</p> <p>The possibility of no new school has only just surfaced – the WOLP and the ENP both expect a new school will be built.</p>
---	---

<p>and public transport <u>with good connections for pedestrians and cyclists'</u></p> <p>ENP B/7.4 Link RoadsADD '<u>and should have controlled crossing points at footpaths and cycle routes to ensure safe access to the countryside to allow all to cross safely.</u>' Could speed not be reduced to 30mph?</p> <p>para 12.8: could something be proposed to compensate for planning application affecting LGS15? Could the linear park idea ('Chilbrook Linear Park' in the LGS supporting document) be mentioned here, even if outside LGS ; I would suggest extending this to include the dog walking field south of Chilbridge Road and to link to the railway route (LGS 9). Some uses here may be compatible with protecting and enhancing biodiversity eg green burial, community allotments, community farmland, natural play space. Housing and a fast road here would not achieve this!</p> <p>ENP 13 Trees: Eynsham is a dense settlement with few mature trees and very few street trees; the ENP should seek net increase in tree cover (see also ENP4) with significant street tree planting.</p> <p>ENP 14 D: co-ordinated masterplanning of all sites (in SDA and GV) is essential; surely EPC (and the community) should have some role in the masterplanning process. Can this be required rather than just an intention as in REC 14 C? Especially important as this affects the much valued land south of Chilbridge Road, as mentioned in para 14.9.</p> <p>ENP17.3 S106 contributions could contribute to the B4044 community path.</p>	<p>ENP 8 deals with the 'active travel' modes.</p> <p>Will add “; appropriate safe crossing places should be provided in support of policy ENP 8C to ensure easy access to countryside.” to ENP 7.4 as 'bypass' style roads do affect access as noted at introduction 02. A bypass style road does not seem appropriate for the west as it would be bypassing the eastern bypass and be a poor use of land but the paragraph is included for completeness.</p> <p>No.</p> <p>The scope of LGS prevents this.</p> <p>The policy does set out to do this on newly developed sites but cannot demand change to existing sites. CIL money could be used for increasing tree cover.</p> <p>WODC is organising local 'consultation' events.</p> <p>EPC does have meetings with all the developers/promoters to lobby on such matters and has just approved a collaboration agreement with Grosvenor on OCGV.</p> <p>EPC will consider this for CIL funding but that would only cover the path within the Parish itself. OCC is planning to fund the path with HIF money.</p>
---	--

CF no. 53. National Grid	
<i>National Grid confirm that there are no high voltage electricity or high pressure gas assets within the Neighbourhood Area</i>	

<p>CF no. 54. Carter Jonas on behalf of Berkeley Strategic Land Limited</p>	
<p>The Village</p> <p>3.1 Map 1 – ‘Village Context’ on page 5 of the Neighbourhood Plan shows an incorrect extent of the West Eynsham SDA allocation boundary. At the southern end, next to Stanton Harcourt Road, part of the Scheduled Monument is included in the allocation area. This should be corrected to reflect the allocation in the Local Plan.</p> <p>3.2 In addition, Map 1 also shows a ‘Proposed Western Extension Boundary,’ and also ‘Proposed area of OCGV’ and ‘Proposed P&R’. These elements of the Local Plan are now adopted and therefore no longer need to be referred to as ‘proposed.’ To avoid confusion over the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan and to make clear that the strategic policies of the Local Plan are being followed ‘proposed’ should be deleted from each of the labels on the map.</p> <p>3.3 Berkeley notes that a number of the policies contain repetition of national or local provisions. This repetition is explained in the Neighbourhood Plan’s introduction as being for “the benefit of residents” to aid in their understanding. Whilst Berkeley appreciate the intention of this approach to policy writing, there is the potential that an examiner could strike these references from the policies as they would not meet the basic conditions. It is suggested that the EFSG reviews the draft policies and considers removing repetition. An alternative could be to cross reference elements of the NPPF – noting that this has recently changed – and the West Oxfordshire Local Plan. The Neighbourhood Plan will, once ‘made,’ form part of the Development Plan and therefore the policies will carry the same weight as those in the Local Plan and unnecessary repetition risks ambiguity and confusion for the decision taker for planning applications, especially in understanding any hierarchy in policies.</p> <p>3.4 The Neighbourhood Plan as drafted includes a number of policies which effect the West Eynsham SDA. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ENP1 and ENP8 and Notes A and B, which draw heavily on a concept of walking distances as a measure of sustainability; • ENP3, 3a, 3b and ENP6, which consider the provision of services and facilities; • ENP4 and 4a, which seek to enhance biodiversity; • Policy ENP7 (and Appendix D), which seek to direct transport considerations; 	<p>The map is now corrected.</p> <p>The note on the previous page addresses this matter.. The annotation needs to allow for both the allocation in the Local Plan but also the possibility that the actual area developed may be different when it comes to implementation.</p> <p>The note has been changed to make it clear that these are inadvertent covering of the same ground and not really 'repetition'. A true repetition should indeed be replaced by a direct reference to NPPF or WOLP policy and we have done that where we are aware of it.</p> <p>Anything else is 'inadvertent' and will be corrected when noted.</p>

- Policy ENP12, which identifies two areas on the West of Eynsham SDA to be preserved for 'Local Green Space';
- ENP14, which sets out a description of sustainable development; and,
- ENP17, which is a specific policy for Strategic Development Areas.

Policies ENP1 and ENP8 and Notes A and B

3.5 Berkeley has some concerns that Policy ENP1, as written, lacks sufficient flexibility regarding the mix of houses. In Berkeley's experience the provisions of Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) – as a 'point in time' assessment – can become out-of-date. A policy that relies too heavily on a certain mix of homes without allowing for some local context and reassessment, where appropriate, may result in the disproportionate delivery of potentially unneeded house types. Berkeley notes that the SHMA recommendations are referenced as 'supporting text' to Policy H4 of the Local Plan and are not policy in their own right. Berkeley therefore suggests that the EFSG reviews part A of their policy ENP1 to ensure conformity with the Local Plan.

3.6 Regarding walking distances – a theme in a number of the Neighbourhood Plan policies – but particularly those elements of the plan referenced above; it is too simplistic to measure a site's sustainable credentials solely on the walking distance to the existing village centre and key village facilities. The West Eynsham SDA lies on the western edge of Eynsham, within walking and cycling distance of the wide range of shops, services, clubs and community facilities in the village. There are a number of public houses, cafes and restaurants, a medical centre, a pre-school nursery, a primary school and a secondary school in the village. Development of the SDA will also bring with it new facilities and also new residents who would contribute to the viability and vitality of this Rural Service Centre and the sustainability of the West of Eynsham site.

3.7 The site is also close to existing employment areas within Eynsham including Oakfield Industrial Estate and Siemens. Moreover it has good access to Oxford (and the 'knowledge Spine') and Witney via the A40. Eynsham is the closest West Oxfordshire 'Rural Service Centre' to Oxford. It is also located just beyond the Green Belt on a Premium Bus Route.

3.8 West of Eynsham has been identified as a sustainable location for development and this is confirmed by its allocation in the Local Plan. The SDA will support the sustainability of the village by investing in new and enhanced

This is a valuable point – the original policy pre-dated H4 which now covers all the aspects envisaged in ENP 1A. Policy can be reworded to emphasise the local application of H4 to Eynsham which already has a larger preponderance of smaller homes than WODC average and which the local community wants to continue. H4 is also strongly in favour of housing suitable for older people and those with special needs.

Sustainability isn't the primary goal of the 'distance' policies. As indicated in policy ENP 1D the primary concern is an inclusive community which comes about through unplanned meeting of residents at the school gate, in the street and in the shops. This is much more likely when people are on foot as the NPPF recognises (Note A)

The policy tries not to be prescriptive while being clear.

ENP 1D gives the LPA plenty of opportunity to use its discretion.

Emphasis is on a few 'key local facilities' which should be made available as part of a new development which increases the size of the village by 50%. Other facilities may be further away without raising concerns.

The intention is that the developers should see the first row of table 1 as the green light for acceptability and the LPA would not look for any mitigation. Obviously the construction of new key facilities near new housing will immediately remove any concerns.

The second row give distances which ought to be acceptable given some

<p>infrastructure, delivering affordable housing and supporting the local economy.</p> <p>3.9 Given the arguments presented above it is suggested that the EFSG makes it clear in policy ENP1, and in other places where they are referenced in the Neighbourhood Plan, that the walking distances are for guidance purposes and are not a policy requirement. An alternative approach would be to amend the plan to remove reference to specific walking distances and instead refer to the principle that new development should, where possible, be provided within a convenient and safe walking and cycling distance of new and existing facilities.</p> <p>Policies ENP3, 3a and 3b</p> <p>3.10 It is unclear how much work on these draft policies has been undertaken in conjunction with necessary consultees, such as service providers. There are assertions in the supporting text to the policies that Eynsham will lack school and health care capacity in the future but not recorded is the view of the education authority – Oxfordshire County Council – or the local Clinical Commissioning Group.</p> <p>3.11 Infrastructure matters are considered in the Local Plan and supporting Infrastructure Delivery Plan (“IDP”). There are adopted policies to provide some additional planned infrastructure and this does not appear to have been reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan. The policy requirements repeat much of what is in the Local Plan. For the larger developments covered by parts G and H of policy ENP3 it would be more appropriate for this to be considered through the emerging Garden Village Area Action Plan, West Eynsham Supplementary Planning Document and, the IDP rather than in this policy.</p> <p>Therefore it is suggested that these last two criteria are deleted from the policy.</p> <p>3.12 There is a requirement for allotments included in ENP3 that lacks sufficient justification and evidence. Whilst there is some commentary that suggests an anticipated increase in ‘take-up’ there is no reference to an evidential requirement. It should be noted that there is no legal national minimum provision standard for allotments. Some useful guidance can be found in the 1969 Thorpe Report which recommends a minimum provision equivalent to 15 allotments per 1,000 households, but this is not legally binding.</p> <p>3.13 Policy ENP3a quotes the walking distances about which Berkeley has already raised concerns. Furthermore, this policy lacks robust justification that the desired ‘infrastructure’ or care facilities buildings will actually be taken on by</p>	<p>mitigation for the extra distance.</p> <p>Beyond that, development is really going outside the natural envelope of a 'neucleated' village but even then there may be perfectly acceptable exceptions.</p> <p>ENP 1.8 now adds “Distances are intended as a guide to the appropriate use of land, rather than to prevent its use, by emphasising the need to concentrate development close to facilities or the building of new facilities.” and by a slight change of tone in ENP1D – alternatives 'may be supported' rather than 'will only be supported'</p> <p>School governors were represented on the Steering Group and consultation with Eynsham Medical Centre and the CCG took place during plan preparation.</p> <p>Policies primarily reflect local concerns and it is encouraging that these are closely aligned with the Local Plan. Policies largely complement those of WOLP with an emphasis on specific local needs with further details in the supporting text.</p> <p>The Health Care policy would not be complete as it stands – it depends on the Local Plan / IDP to be viable – but it does emphasise a local concern about the impact that a new settlement will have.</p> <p>Likewise, the infrastructure networks need to be adequate so that existing residents are not affected.</p> <p>It is true that there is no accepted standard for allotments so we have based our suggested allotment capacity on current provision and utilisation. This is not a binding requirement in the ENP either but we have presented evidence of existing local utilisation and, given that the balance of the population will remain largely similar, that seems a good guide to what is appropriate for the future.</p> <p>The policy addresses the need for 'adequate health care facilities' and in close proximity to new and existing homes. This is a reasonable requirement and does</p>
---	---

providers. This policy should be revised and clearly aligned with the plans of the local Clinical Commissioning Group.

3.14 Policy ENP3b is an instance of repetition of national and local policy and its role specific to development in Eynsham is not clear. Notwithstanding this, the policy should be revised to ensure it meets the basic conditions, it is not reasonable to suggest that *planning consent* will not be given before utility networks are assessed, as this can be acceptably conditioned as part of a *development consent*.

3.15 Reflecting the same issue as identified for policy ENP3b, the proposed requirement of part B of policy ENP6 is unlikely to be either reasonable or justified in every case.

Education infrastructure enhancements may need to be phased through development and can be effectively conditioned as part of a planning consent. The requirement to provide these facilities prior to first occupation should be deleted from policy ENP6.

Policies ENP4 and 4a

3.16 Berkeley understands and supports the importance of biodiversity and Green Infrastructure. Policy ENP4 closely reflects the words of Local Plan Policies EH2 EH3 and EH4 and could be revised to better reflect local level needs and identify more specifically how biodiversity can be maintained and, where appropriate, enhanced in Eynsham.

3.17 Policy ENP4a would benefit from some revision to avoid any unintended consequences. As currently written the policy would require all development to demonstrate a net-gain in biodiversity. This will not necessarily be achievable for schemes that only involve the extension of a building, for example. Furthermore, it might not always be possible, or indeed preferable, to demonstrate a net gain on a 'site by site' basis, but instead a strategic approach to achieving a net gain – through plan making and offsetting – might be more reasonable.

Policy ENP7 (and Appendix D)

3.18 There is little evidence presented to support the proposed provisions of policy ENP7. Berkeley has particular concerns about criteria B and C and the supporting text in appendix D that suggests all new residential streets should be designed to a 20mph speed limit. This blanket approach is unreasonably

not specify any particular buildings, leaving that to be worked out between the LPA, developers, Eynsham Medical Centre and the CCG – see 3.12 particularly. It would be good to see plans emerge as part of SDA / AAP processes.

The distinction is noted and the policy reworded.

The note under “Reasons:” makes clear the purpose is to reassure (existing) residents before building starts as much as to ensure everything is ready when occupation begins.

Agreed, the wording is not precise enough. Wording changed and 6.10 added to make clear that the purpose of the policy is to ensure that each child has the opportunity for local education as they move in and this requires proper phasing of schools and homes.

The policy now references the Local Plan policies. The ENP policies and supporting text do contribute an extra level of detail which is appropriate for a NP. It would have been good to go into more detail but was not practical given the large allocation in the Local Plan. Hopefully there will be an opportunity to go into finer detail with developers as the masterplans are developed through the SDA/AAP processes.

A good point is made here although it was always intended that even the very smallest development should contribute in an equally small way. The word All has been removed and 'appropriate' added with more explanation included in 4.14 to explain what is 'appropriate' and to note that offsetting is acceptable but should be part of masterplans for strategic sites.

The NP is fulfilling its role of adding an additional level of detail. The evidence is that Eynsham Parish Council is already embarked on a project which should result in making the existing village a 20 mph zone. It would be much easier and hardly any more difficult to design and build new streets to the standard which

restrictive and does not pay sufficient regard to the emerging Supplementary Planning Document and masterplanning exercise. There is the potential that these other planning documents could identify different transport solutions that could conflict with what is proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan.

3.19 Policy ENP7 should be reviewed by the EFSG to make it clear that it is guidance and not a requirement. The EFSG should ensure that the policy relates only to land use and not to road safety, the latter could be moved to the supporting text. The blanket reference to “all new streets” in appendix D should be deleted.

Policy ENP14

3.20 The purpose of Policy ENP14 is not clear. This policy repeats not only national wording regarding character and setting, but also the wording of the Local Plan and other policies of the Neighbourhood Plan. However, Berkeley is pleased to see that the EFSG has highlighted the need to effectively write briefs for, and masterplan, large scale sites and the need to coordinate infrastructure provision. These elements of the policy could be made more specific, and would operate more effectively if included in proposed policies ENP16 and ENP17.

3.21 Berkeley respectfully suggest that the provisions of this policy are better served by existing policies of the Local Plan and/or others proposed in the Neighbourhood Plan. The policy wording should be significantly reduced and moved into site specific policies. Moving the policy wording could have the added benefit of focusing a reader’s attention on site (or theme) specific policies in the Neighbourhood Plan.

Policy ENP12

3.22 In proposed policy ENP12 Local Green Space (LGS) 9 is listed as “no longer included” and yet it is still shown on Map 3. Reference to LGS9 should be deleted from the policy.

Berkeley also suggests that Map 3 should be revised to reflect the fact that LGS 9 is no longer a proposed Local Green Space.

Policy ENP17

3.23 It is not made clear in the Neighbourhood Plan what the relationship is between policy EW2 of the Local Plan, the emerging Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and the draft Policy ENP17. This risks particular confusion in decision making, and raises the potential for duplication and / or contradiction.

brings speeds down to that required by OCC for inclusion in a 20 mph scheme. It is accepted (ENP 7B) that non-residential roads may be built for higher speeds - although that may be a poor use of land that should be used for homes – but such roads should be configured to prevent loss of amenity to residents.

While road safety is a concern which, to a degree, has driven the 20mph project, the purpose of ENP 7 is to ensure consistency between new and existing street design. The use of 'street' is used to mean a road with houses along it as opposed to a non-residential road. A street is seen as being the best use of developable land.

The comments are valid enough but the format to some degree reflects the difficult process which the ENP has gone through.

ENP 14 was intended to set the context with a few general policies but the original examination found that site-specific policies were entirely unacceptable which has resulted in policies which would naturally have been better suited to 'spatial' policies have been distributed between ENP 14, 16 and 17.

I think we agree with the sentiments expressed in 3.21 but we feel prevented by the first examiners decision.

This has now been done – it was simply a matter of resources to update the map to match the text.

The general relationship is set out in the introduction, e.g.

“The Plan is intended to complement and inform the Garden Village (OCGV) Area Action Plan (AAP) and West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (SDA)

3.24 The West of Eynsham SDA is a key strategic housing allocation in the Local Plan. National planning policy, paragraph 184 of the NPPF (2012) states:

“Neighbourhood plans must be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. To facilitate this, local planning authorities should set out clearly their strategic policies for the area and ensure that an up-to-date Local Plan is in place as quickly as possible. Neighbourhood plans should reflect these policies and neighbourhoods should plan positively to support them.

Neighbourhood plans and orders should not promote less development than set out in the Local Plan or undermine its strategic policies.”

3.25 As such, Berkeley would respectfully suggest that it is not appropriate to have policies in the Neighbourhood Plan which directly relate to the SDA and could complicate or jeopardise the work done to date by the District Council on the Local Plan and in its emerging SPD.

3.26 If the EFSG has concerns over the West of Eynsham SDA, or has specific requirements for it, they should be raised through the SPD process; not through potentially conflicting policies in its Neighbourhood Plan.

3.27 Berkeley notes the ‘recommendations to the parish Council’ and in particular those at Rec 17 H:

“Creation of a Link Road and development south of Chilbridge Road (OptionW2) have significant drawbacks. While recognising that a western link road may reduce through traffic on Witney, Acre End and Station Roads, 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 that can be demonstrated at present and remains unconvinced that such development is desirable or viable, given the need for an expensive crossing of the Chil Brook.”

3.28 There is a Local Plan requirement for the West of Eynsham SDA to deliver 1,000 new homes and a new spine road between the A40 and Stanton Harcourt Road. The landscape and visual baseline work carried out to date by Berkeley, which formed part of its submissions to the Local Plan Examination, has shown that there is scope in landscape terms to deliver that number of homes and the spine road without affecting adversely the landscape character of the area.

3.29 It is understood that development south of Chilbridge Road is not

documents in preparation by WODC. “

Perhaps this should be repeated in ENP17 but this is our intention and policies have been worded to prevent conflict with the Local Plan.

The ENP has been subject to a thorough review by an experienced planning inspector and the relationship with the SDA and AAP was considered as part of that technical review as it is a complex matter.

His advice is that there is no specific prohibition on policies applying to an SDA although there doesn't seem to be any guidance either.

The Policies of ENP17 are applicable any large (e.g. SDA-scale) extension to the village. Only the reference to the Chil Brook, as an example of a significant water course, is specific to the western SDA throughout the policies and supporting text.

REC 17 does address specific issues of the SDA but it is addressed to EPC and preceded by the statement

“Eynsham Parish Council will work closely and constructively with Developers and the LPA to ensure that SDA-scale and larger developments are master-planned and the development managed in such a way that the new and existing residents receive maximum benefits while cumulative disturbance to and harmful impact on local residents is minimised. The aspirations that follow overleaf will guide this collaborative engagement.”

It is considered appropriate to set out EPC concerns in a way that seeks to inform future discussion as it has EPCs response to the SDA issues paper.

supported, however, landscape evidence which Berkeley has produced does not support this view and it is suggested that the suitability of this area for development should be tested through the SPD process rather than being determined in the Neighbourhood Plan.

3.30 As to access, there is a clear requirement in transportation terms for a spine road through the SDA linking the A40 with the B4449. A spine road will also ease congestion in Eynsham village centre. The spine road to Stanton Harcourt Road is not included in the guidance and drawing on page 50, and it should be reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan.

3.31 Therefore, the recommendations at REC 17; criteria H and I, and the diagram on page 50 should be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan because they prejudice the SPD process.

3.32 Berkeley supports a comprehensive masterplan approach to the development of the West of Eynsham SDA and would welcome input from the EFSG and Eynsham Parish Council.

3.33 Berkeley hopes it can work proactively with the EFSG and Parish Council. It has a proven track record in promoting and delivering large, complex strategic sites. Some of its current projects include 1,250 homes with associated services facilities and infrastructure on Land North-East of Bury St Edmunds; circa 500 homes at Abbey Barn South in High Wycombe; and 750 homes with associated services facilities and infrastructure (including a link road and a primary school) at Warfield, near Bracknell).

All of these projects were master plan led.

3.34 To recap, the West of Eynsham SDA will:

- Assist in meeting the Council's increased requirement for housing;
- Be ideally placed to assist in meeting Oxford's unmet need;
- Contribute by way of direct provision and financial contributions to -
 - improved community infrastructure (health, library provision, community buildings, sport and recreation provision, public open space, etc.);
 - primary education; and,
 - secondary and special needs education provision

EPC has always taken the position that the area south of the Chil Brook should be subject to the minimum development but does not dispute the Local Plan allocation or the need for access from both the A40 and the B4449, particularly if the land south of the Chil is to be used for housing.

EPC's preference would be for development to be concentrated closest to the village with land further away developed sensitively and with low impact, low density building that retains maximum amenity in terms of countryside.

The Linear Park concept was included following the SDA Issues paper which picked up on a much less significant comment in the previous version of the ENP.

The map was intended as illustration but incidental details within are clearly being interpreted as prejudging what should be decided as part of the SDA process and is therefore removed, being replaced with supporting text. The wording of REC17C and D is changed to better reflect EPC concerns and its starting position as it seeks to collaborate with relevant parties in the SDA masterplanning process.

Likewise, EPC welcomes the opportunity to engage collaboratively with all developers / land promoters and will do so positively through the SDA process and in whatever other situation arises.

- Provide further support for the existing village centre and assist in the delivery of additional services and facilities within the strategic allocation; and,
- Assist in the delivery of a new road linking the A40 with the B4449 thereby reducing congestion in the village centre.

4.0 CONCLUSION

4.1 Berkeley is pleased to have an opportunity to comment on the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan. It is clear to see the effort that has been put into the Neighbourhood Plan and the ambitions of the Parish Council and community. The Neighbourhood Plan would benefit from the general revision of policies to avoid duplication of national and local policy provisions, and to instead focus on local specifics.

4.2 National planning policy states that Neighbourhood Plans should be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. As such, it is Berkeley's view that the Neighbourhood Plan should not have policies which relate to the West of Eynsham SDA and could potentially conflict with SDA policies in the Local Plan and emerging SPD. Given the strategic nature and scale of the allocated growth at West Eynsham the SPD and IDP are more appropriate mechanisms to plan for the development of the site and the infrastructure required to support the growth

4.3 The policies of the Neighbourhood Plan should also be reviewed with the understanding that the SPD and subsequent planning application processes will allow for the further consideration of detailed matters relating to the West of Eynsham SDA.

Therefore, the detailed solution to the challenges relating to this site do not need to be included in Neighbourhood Plan policy.

4.4 Berkeley does however support the Neighbourhood Plan's aspiration for an overarching West of Eynsham SDA Masterplan and would welcome the opportunity to work with the EFSG and Eynsham Parish Council as that masterplan develops through the SPD process.

EPC has taken professional advice on the difficult matter of the relationship between SDA and NP and has been very careful to include only policies and supporting text for policies which are in general conformity with the adopted Local Plan and which will inform the SDA and IDP processes in a positive manner.

While local concerns and aspirations are raised we do not consider that any of the policies impede the aims of the Local Plan or do anything other than provide valuable local input with a view to achieving the goals of the Local Plan in a way which is best for the local community.

Removal of the contentious and non-essential map noted above will hopefully help minimise concerns.

Eynsham Parish Council is in full agreement with these sentiments.

<p>CF no. 55. Grosvenor Developments</p> <p>Introduction</p> <p>1. Grosvenor represents a consortium of landowners that controls the majority of the Strategic Location for Growth (SLG) and is committed to working collaboratively with West Oxfordshire District Council (WODC) and other stakeholders, including the local community, to ensure that Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village (OCGV) is promoted and delivered consistently with policy aims and objectives in order to meet local need.</p> <p>2. Grosvenor has already begun working with stakeholders including the Eynsham Futures Steering Group and Eynsham Parish Council (EPC) and will continue to engage throughout the development of the Neighbourhood Plan, the Area Action Plan (AAP) and the preparation of the planning application for OCGV.</p> <p>Role of policies and WODC Local Plan</p> <p>3. The WODC Local Plan, adopted on 27th September 2018, designated OCGV as a strategic location for growth for approximately 2,200 homes as well as employment land. Policy EW1 provides that site specific policy development is to be led by an AAP</p> <p>The AAP</p> <p>4. The role of the AAP is to develop policies for OCGV based on an agreed evidence base. There will be community engagement throughout the development of this document to ensure that key elements are formulated in collaboration with the community and statutory stakeholders. The AAP will subsequently be tested at Examination prior to formal adoption.</p> <p>5. As part of the evidence base, key documents will be prepared including an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to ensure that appropriate infrastructure will be delivered in a timely manner for OCGV. This critical document will inform policies of the AAP and set parameters for the outline planning application.</p> <p>6. As set out in the Issues Paper the AAP will assess options for the nature and extent of the employment provision within OCGV which will be reflected in policy provisions.</p> <p>Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan - Village Context</p> <p>7. Map 1 should be updated to reflect the extent of the approximate site boundary of the OCGV as set out in the Garden Village Issues Paper.</p> <p>ENP1 - Housing</p> <p>8. Grosvenor supports the desire for a mix of housing types to reflect needs</p>	<p>Has been changed to cover the whole AAP area rather than the built area of OCGV itself</p>
---	---

<p>within this area of West Oxfordshire including the provision of housing for an ageing population and those with special needs. Grosvenor considers that the housing mix should be informed by demand and need assessments including but not limited to the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment. The AAP will establish the most appropriate mix, type and tenure of housing for OCGV.</p> <p>9. Grosvenor considers that the provisions within criteria B are not in conformity with the provisions of the adopted Local Plan.</p> <p>10. Grosvenor supports the promotion of walkable networks for the new and existing community as part of its commitment to promote sustainable travel choices. However, Grosvenor considers that the distances used within Note A and Table 1 are too prescriptive at this stage because land use distribution is yet to be determined which will influence the nature of the local centre(s) and facilities. As stated, the NPPF is not specific with regard to walking distances and, although not known at present, there could be sound placemaking principles which require an alternative approach.</p> <p>ENP 2 Design</p> <p>11. With regard to criteria G, a masterplan for OCGV is likely to be required by WODC as part of an outline planning application.</p> <p>ENP 3 - Community Facilities</p> <p>12. Grosvenor considers that reasonable access will require further definition as the provision of facilities must be determined by their location, users, access routes and function within the community. Access must also be considered in the context of access to, and relationship with, existing facilities in Eynsham and planned developments in the Eynsham area.</p> <p>13. It is considered that the size, nature and timing of the delivery of community facilities should be determined once the housing mix and provision is understood in the context of a phased masterplan and the role of the facility has been determined. For example the shared use of facilities such as those provided for education could provide significant benefits to the existing and new communities but will need to be understood in relation to the statutory specification requirements for education provision.</p> <p>ENP3a</p> <p>14. The location of primary health care facilities will result from close liaison with the community and stakeholders including the Clinical Commissioning Group and the Eynsham Medical Group. The set distances (1000m at ENP3a(l)) are too prescriptive given that the nature of the facilities, which could provide additional services (as at 3.14) to a wider community which have yet to be established.</p> <p>15. The mechanisms for the delivery of healthcare provision will be established</p>	<p>Paragraph has been altered to reference H4 of local plan and remove too much emphasis from SHMA</p> <p>This paragraph has been amended to achieve conformity.</p> <p>Policy is carefully phrased to provide clarity about what is considered acceptable without reservation and more problematic distances where the decision rests with the LPA based on a balance of harms (in terms of community-building) and benefits. The NPPF is specific about the community-building benefits of people meeting in the streets and the distances are based on what seems to work well for Eynsham. If an alternative approach shows benefits then the LPA will be able to make a decision based on the benefits of that approach.</p> <p>This is indeed acknowledged in ENP6</p> <p>The distance is prefixed by 'ideally' to encourage what the community considers the best outcome but not to prescribe.</p>
---	--

<p>through the planning application and Section 106 agreement. Grosvenor understands the need for the provision to be bespoke, complementary and respond to needs of the existing and new community. This is recognised by Policy EW1(g) of the adopted Local Plan which states that 'development is to be phased in accordance with the timing of provision of essential supporting infrastructure and facilities'.</p> <p>ENP3b</p> <p>16. The timing of the delivery of new infrastructure will be determined once the capacity of existing and planned infrastructure is fully understood. It may be appropriate to provide certain upgrades to utilities and other infrastructure at a particular number of residential occupations rather than prior to any residential occupations across a development of the scale of OCGV.</p> <p>17. A utility statement provided with the planning application, together with the Section 106 agreement and infrastructure delivery plan, will set out the capacity of infrastructure following extensive engagement with providers.</p> <p>ENP 4a -Enhancing Biodiversity</p> <p>18. It is noted that the net biodiversity gain requirement does not accord with Policy EH3 of the Local Plan which provides that a net gain should be demonstrated where possible. References to paragraphs within the policies are not clear.</p> <p>ENP5 -Sustainability —Climate Change</p> <p>19. We are unclear as to the evidence or the need to achieve the specific criteria in ENP5 c per home in terms of energy generation. A site wide strategy for energy generation will be developed for the OCGV.</p> <p>ENP6 -Education</p> <p>20. Grosvenor is committed to providing the education provision appropriate to the mix of homes and complementary to existing facilities. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan being prepared for the Eynsham area in collaboration with the community, schools, the County Council and the Eynsham Partnership Academy Trust will inform the nature of provision and its distribution across the strategic sites. The appropriate timing for the delivery and opening of new education facilities for OCGV is yet to be determined. As currently worded, assuming that the assessed provision is two primary schools, Criteria B would require their provision prior to first occupation of dwellings.</p> <p>21. Grosvenor supports the need for training and employment opportunities associated with any new employment provision at OCGV.</p> <p>ENP 7 -Sustainable Transport</p>	<p>This seems entirely logical and in accord with the ENP policies.</p> <p>The wording requires 'necessary services' which, by logical interpretation, would be the services necessary for that occupation rather than services in general; this would allow the necessary phasing but without inconveniencing new or existing residents.</p> <p>That would seem to be an ideal solution.</p> <p>There is a slight conflict between the last two paras of EH4, one requires gain where possible the other calls for all development to incorporate biodiversity enhancing features. This policy has been amended slightly and supporting text added at 4.14 to make clearer the appropriate scale of net gain expected.</p> <p>3 kW capacity is considered a reasonable average target. A site-wide strategy would be a positive approach.</p> <p>This has been noted and wording changed to eliminate this interpretation.</p>
---	---

22. While primary accesses to OCGV are expected to be established through the AAP, it is considered that determining access at this stage could preclude any provision of access from existing roads such as Lower Road and Cuckoo Lane.

ENP 9 -Parking

23. The appropriate level of parking provision and associated charging points is a matter to be assessed through the AAP and further considered as part of the planning application to respond to prevailing technologies and trends. It is considered that the requirement for charging at each new home may be too prescriptive before the form and type of housing is determined.

ENP 13 -Trees

24. Green infrastructure will be a key defining element of OCGV. An arboriculture survey will afford the appropriate level of protection to trees rather than a 'blanket' approach to Tree Protection Orders. With regard to replacement it is often not practical to replace trees of a similar maturity.

ENP14 -Sustainable Growth

25. Grosvenor supports the intention to plan OCGV having regard to future expansion of Eynsham village and seeking to create and share mutual benefits from such development. The nature of any green buffer or zone as a defining boundary should be established through engagement, the AAP and the planning application.

26. The impact of transportation should be considered in the light of the provisions of the NPPF having regard to the impact of development and required mitigation strategies. Grosvenor will work closely with the local highway authority to agree a scope of assessment for a planning application that brings forward the appropriate mitigation strategy for the proposed development.

ENP16 - New Settlements

27. Grosvenor notes that the Infrastructure Delivery Plan for Eynsham area will provide the evidence base for the AAP for OCGV. Safe connections to Eynsham are supported and critical to the creation of a sense of place as well as social value.

28. As previously acknowledged, the timely provision of adequate facilities including social infrastructure is critical to the establishment of the new community.

29. Grosvenor is supportive of the provision of a range of housing including that for the elderly or disabled with good access to services.

The policy does not mention Lower Road or Cuckoo Lane specifically although it is recognised that they may form a natural part of the access to the A40 and, as such they are not excluded from such use.

As explained in 9.6 this is intended to ensure that each home has the possibility of charging an electric vehicle which should be relatively easy if considered from the start of design.

It does say "as similar maturity as can be reasonably achieved" so there is no requirement to plant a 100 year old oak to replace an aged tree that is lost but neither should a year-old sapling be considered an adequate replacement.

ENP14 accepts that by not being too prescriptive and even encouraging paths crossing the buffer zone.

30. In relation to criteria C, it is expected that the options for vehicular access routes to OCGV will be determined through the AAP taking account of all aspects of transportation including safety, new connections, desire lines and journey time impacts.

31. Garden Village principles (as noted in Criteria G) are key but the development of OCGV will be required to also consider the need to respond to site specifics, promote distinctiveness and reflect local policies including the provisions of the ENP.

32. Grosvenor considers that an illustrative masterplan will be developed as a key component of the planning application process and will support approved documentation including parameter plans and design principles for OCGV.

33. Current investments on improvements of the A40 are focussed on modal shift towards public transport and reduction of private car usage. Should a viable scheme for a rapid transport route along the A40 come forward from the County Council in the longer term we would support these. However, we do not consider that land within the allocation should be safeguarded to achieve this as the feasibility and deliverability of any option should be assessed without requiring any additional land.

34. It is considered that both social housing and an appropriate variety of market housing for sale or rent will be expected to deliver hand in hand in order to promote a balanced community from the outset rather than one tenure being prioritised as set out in the plan (16.14).

35. Although not determined, the constraints of the site and the distribution of the uses at OCGV could lead to a solution for the 'village centre(s)' which would not be strictly at the geographical centre (16.18) of the site. The centre or centres of the new settlement should be determined by function and access and not constrained by this 'definition' at this early stage in design development.

36. Grosvenor remains committed to progressing an outline application with input from stakeholders including the EFSG and Eynsham Parish Council.

Agreed that this should be taken forward as part of the AAP process. The reference is to a Parish Council aspiration, based on suggestions they have made for improving the 'flow' on the A40, to consider the use of land close to the A40 to provide a new through route leaving the existing A40 line for local access including to OCGV. Much of the land would otherwise be a target for the 'buffer zone'.

This is a suggestion for ensuring a rapid build-up of homes which can fund services. It is a phasing suggestion rather than a housing mix requirement.

Wording changed slightly to be 'centralised services as close as practical' which seems fairer and a note allows for 'key facilities', defined in ENP1, to be decentralised if appropriate.

CF no. 56. Oxfordshire County Council Capital Investment & Delivery

Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) - Capital Investment and Delivery (Formerly Property and Facilities) welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan.

As you are aware the County Council owns a key proportion of the West Eynsham site and wishes to work effectively with all of the relevant stakeholders in the masterplanning and delivery of the site for 1,000 homes as set out in Policy EW1b of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan.

OCC Capital Investment and Delivery supports the general principles set out in the Neighbourhood Plan, but has the following comments on the policies as set out below.

The main body of comments relate specifically to:

Policy ENP17 Strategic Development Areas.

It is supported that strategic developments shall be in accordance with a masterplan approved by WODC and in consultation with the Parish Council.

The main element of concern relates to page 50, which contains an indicative concept plan for a Linear Park. The accompanying text sets out:

“Indicative concept for a Linear Park following the course of the Chil Brook. An accessible green zone extends from the Oxford Green Belt boundary east through Playing Fields, Fishponds and north to the A40. Low-profile buildings such as primary school and features such as allotments and burial ground have low impact and make use of easy access to countryside. New and existing paths link village and new developments with countryside and facilities”.

The provision of a linear park through the development, which also provides a dual function in preserving the floodplain and promoting biodiversity enhancements is supported in accordance with Local Plan policy EW1b.

Notwithstanding the above, the indicative concept plan shown for the Linear Park should be removed as currently shown in favour of text which sets out that any concept must be based on a full analysis of the constraints and opportunities of the overall site. Such work has been undertaken on behalf of OCC Capital Investment and Delivery and concludes that the indicative proposal would not be the most appropriate solution for a linear park. There are a number of options for the provision of a linear park and it is considered that these should be tested via a masterplan approach.

It is essential that the function of the park would enable both formal and informal recreation and provide access to the countryside beyond. It is key that the amount and type of uses proposed is compatible both with the landform and its constraints in addition to not adversely impacting the deliverability of the required number of homes.

The map in question has caused a number of distinctly negative comments which are surprising as it is only an indicative sketch of what might be possible and does not form a significant element of the ENP or even of the local aspirations which it was intended to support pictorially.

As it is not of great importance to the ENP it will be removed and replaced with a text note as suggested by OCC below.

The Linear park concept is included in the preliminary SDA documents and is given support in principle in comments from both OCC and Berkeley Strategic. This will be noted in the new text which sets out Eynsham Parish Council's intention to work collaboratively with other parties involved with the West Eynsham SDA to meet the requirements of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan in a manner most closely aligned with the wishes of local residents.

Both the West Eynsham and Garden Village sites should contribute to providing appropriate levels of open space and activities within the individual sites. It would not be appropriate for one site to provide significantly more than the other as this may adversely impact viability and jeopardise the timely delivery of housing.

Any provision would have to be based on an identified shortfall in facilities. Where possible it is preferred to improve current facilities unless this approach is found to be inappropriate in any detailed examination. The provision of facilities must also be analysed and balanced with appropriate walking distances to facilities and services. Where it is identified that there is a requirement for such uses, these could be accommodated integrated within the 'linear park' provision.

An appropriately scaled linear park could form the basis for an extended green infrastructure network to that which already exists into and across the site. There may be opportunities to enhance greenspaces in the wider area that would contribute to the sustainability of the SDA. Further work is required to identify any shortfall in provision and how it can be successfully accommodated to meet the needs of the West Eynsham site.

It is considered that the indicative concept plan should be removed from the Neighbourhood Plan in favour of text which sets out that the site should be planned following a detailed masterplan approach as favoured by WODC.

With regard to the wording of policy ENP17 Strategic Development Areas itself, the objective of the policy is supported and the following comments should be noted.

Criterion A which limits vehicular access through the village to promote sustainable transport methods, is supported to ensure that the village centre is not adversely affected by vehicular traffic.

The provision of well-connected walkable neighbourhoods which are integrated into the existing route network are essential. It is recommended that the overall masterplanning approach working in collaboration with WODC and OCC Highways should be referenced.

Criterion C requires that developments retain the rural setting of the village in terms of the long-term quality and stability of any new urban – countryside boundary. In addition to this Criteria D sets out that the form of any development should have regard to its impact on the village edge as viewed

This is not implied by the ENP. Much of the land suggested for the Linear Park is unsuitable for building as it is flood zone 2 and 3 while any facilities associated with it such as play areas would relate specifically to developments close by.

from public paths and bridleways.

The supporting text at paragraph 17.5 set out that:

“It has been an aspiration of WODC policy for many years to seamlessly blend the village into the open countryside beyond it to the west. Views west into open countryside and east back to the Parish Church and Wytham Hill are important features of Eynsham that contribute significantly to the rural feel of the village that is highly valued by residents. The methodology used in ‘Oxford View Cones Assessment’ is recommended in assessing the impact of any development.”

It is supported that the key views should be identified alongside appropriate landscape integration.

Supporting paragraph 14.9 is also of reference in this regard and states *“The total number of houses is set by the West Oxfordshire Local Plan (WOLP) (NPPF 184). However, expansion south of the Chilbridge Road could have an adverse impact on the setting of the village and requires an expensive crossing of the Chil Brook, a matter to be resolved when a masterplan is prepared”*.

It is considered that the wording is somewhat misleading and should recommend that a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment (LVIA) will be required as part of the masterplan approach which will identify and inform sensitive areas of the West Eynsham site.

Criterion D goes further in adding that developments should include new paths to link in with the existing path network wherever practical.

Supporting paragraph 17.6 sets out that *“Public paths often provide popular access points to the countryside; the short time it takes to walk from ‘urban’ village streets into open countryside contributes very significantly to the perception of a rural location and is very important to retaining the ‘village feel’ of Eynsham given the lack of much internal green space such as a village green or park.”*

It is recommended that reference is made to the requirement for close collaboration with OCC to ensure essential to integration and provision of a well-used rights of way network.

Both criterion F and policy ENP6 Education specify that adequate Primary and Secondary School capacity shall be provided.

The supporting paragraph 17.12 sets out that *“Adequate school places for new residents are essential before any major development is occupied and the provision of appropriate land will be significant in achieving this goal.”*

Although we don't see the wording as misleading there is the basis of a more positive wording here in using the LVIA to fully evaluate the options including the possibility of minimising any 'urbanisation' of land bordering open countryside.

Agreed – meaningful collaboration is always welcomed by Eynsham Parish Council.

It should be noted that in terms of school provision, more specifically siting, this should be located once further masterplanning work has been undertaken. In particular, it is essential that flood plain modelling is undertaken to ensure that any site proposed is appropriate.

Once work has been undertaken in this regard, the potential locations of any school site should be considered in early collaboration with the education team at OCC to ensure appropriate and effective delivery.

Therefore, in view of the complexities in delivering appropriate education provision, it is considered that such matters should not be shown within any concept plans or supporting text in the Neighbourhood Plan. Such work should be referenced as being part of the masterplan approach in conjunction with the education team at OCC.

Criterion G requires that large developments contribute wherever appropriate to the wider community by providing or enabling new facilities of which the village is currently in need.

In addition to general opportunities, Paragraph 17.13 sets out *“Eynsham has been searching for a suitable site for a new burial ground with funds set aside for this purpose. This would be an ideal use for land that is too far from the village centre for residential development and could be integrated with necessary planting for visual barriers and the landscaping (although not the burial ground itself) could merge with the floodplain or other areas too sensitive for development. The Linear Park concept also makes use of land otherwise unsuitable for building development.”*

It should be noted that the provision of appropriate community facilities should those identified within Local Plan policy EW1b and should be considered as part of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. It should be clear that this provision should be proportionally split in terms of a financial contribution among both the West Eynsham and the Garden Village sites. It may however be possible to provide some of the facilities mentioned as part of the linear park approach if a need is identified. Whilst it is helpful that such facilities are listed, the inclusion of siting on the indicative concept plan of the West Eynsham site should be removed as this is not based on a full and detailed analysis.

Further Policy Comments

With regard to the remaining elements of the NDP, we would wish the following to be noted:

This relates to the 'map on p50' which is being removed.

This relates to the 'map on p50' which is being removed.

The map will be checked and corrected

The map shown on page 5 entitled 'Village Context' is incorrectly drawn in reference to the western extension boundary.

Policy ENP1

Policy ENP1 should refer to the most up to date housing data not just to a specific document, which although is currently produced as a Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) at present, this may change during the life of the NDP. The policy therefore should be worded to ensure that this is taken into account.

ENP 3a Health Care Facilities

This is not currently worded as an appropriate land use planning policy and cannot be implemented as such. Where it refers to new development, this should be made clear, although this would not be considered reasonable without further evidence to support it.

ENP 4a Enhancing Biodiversity.

Criterion G is not appropriate to all types of development, such as changes of use and therefore should be reworded accordingly. Some sites by their very nature may not be able to demonstrate a net gain.

General Comments on all Policies relating to the West Eynsham SDA

In addition to the above, any policy reference such as ENP1, ENP3(a+b), ENP6, ENP7, ENP8, ENP12 and ENP14, which could prescriptively affect the West Eynsham site on matters such as the provision of community facilities, education, housing mix, siting, walking distances, road provision etc should be reconsidered. As it stands, these are inflexible criteria which may be in conflict with the objectives of the Adopted Local Plan housing allocation sites. It is intended that such sites are considered in detail through a masterplan approach, an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP), and the emerging West Eynsham Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

In this regard, it is requested that the criteria of such policies should be caveated to refer to the SDA specifically in relation to the forthcoming Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the emerging West Eynsham SPD.

These documents will be the main tools for influencing the detailed form of development to take place and will be based on a full masterplan approach drawing on consultation and participation with the local community and all relevant stakeholders including the Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group and Parish Council.

ENP 1A and B have been reworded to better reflect the Local Plan in this regard.

Wording changed to make clear that the ideal distance – which should actually be 1200m to match the table in Note A – is intended for new homes.

Wording has been changed and 4.14 extended to correct this point.

Actually the criteria are not inflexible. The wording has been carefully considered and set out to be clear about the circumstances where no harm is created and plan details are automatically acceptable while allowing the LPA to balance benefits, harms and mitigations for other developments.

The purpose is clearly stated on the first page

“The Plan is intended to complement and inform the Garden Village (OCGV) Area Action Plan (AAP), West Eynsham Strategic Development Area (SDA) and associated Infrastructure Delivery Plans (IDP) currently in preparation by WODC” but it will be helpful to repeat this message at key locations in ENP16 and 17 and other infrastructure-related locations in the plan.

CF no. 57.

GENERAL POINTS:

1. Build in a review of the ENP, then link it when the legislation changes and when the WOLP is reviewed, for measures to meet the provisions of The Paris Agreement.

2. WODC has accepted Oxford City Council's request for 'unmet need' for 2750 dwellings, which, with Eynsham's fair allocation of 450 houses, bring the total of new dwellings to 3,200, compared with the existing total of approx. 1,800 i.e. nearly trebling the size. This is going to cause havoc for commuters who already waste unacceptable hours in traffic jams, not to mention unnecessary CO₂ production and other pollution, adding to climate change, mental stress and to ill health.

3. The Garden Village and West Eynsham developments should be treated as a whole for planning and design. ENP 16 mention of 'masterplan' - could wider consultation with the community be mentioned here?

SPECIFIC POINTS:

01 Introduction

Plan Policy Context '(NPPF), March 2012 (substantially revised July 2018) and with a presumption

04 Policies

ENP1.6 - very important to reduce car transport within the village because of unnecessary carbon emissions and damaging effects on health. Similarly in the new developments, car use should be actively discouraged and sustainable travel promoted.

ENP2.8 - wherever possible a south-orientation of dwellings will give maximum 'passive solar gain' and so save energy.

ENP3b 3.17 Should refer to the '*Energy and Sustainability statement*' or '*energy feasibility assessment*' (as required by Policy EH4 of the Local Plan) and desirability of provision for integrated local energy generation and a local smart grid (see 5.4 and 5.6 below).

This is stated as part of ENP5 Intentions box.

Wide consultation is encouraged at various points in ENP but we cannot enforce this.

If the ENP is presented to WODC before Jan 29, 2019 2012 version is valid

Active travel is encouraged but 'active discouragement' is outside our remit and not particularly practical for many people.

Fall into 'no additional technical standards' prohibition.

Not quite the same area as 3b is addressing.

<p>ENP3.7 - a 'Green burial ground' with a right of way would help access to the countryside, and be part of a 'linear park' in which valuable 'carbon sink' trees could be planted.</p>	<p>Perhaps too specific; Linear Park would be mainly flood zone so not suitable for burials.</p>
<p>ENP4.2 'Appropriate species' needs to be defined: to include significant numbers of forest scale, local, native trees rather than the favoured small fastigate ornamental trees, to better blend into the countryside and for the countryside to extend into new development along streets, paths/ green corridors. The policy should require a net increase of tree cover for 'carbon sink' purposes. (See also ENP13)</p>	<p>See answers in CF 52</p>
<p>ENP4.7 a good proportion of fruit and nut trees would help to ensure local food supply in case of shortages in the future.</p>	<p>See answers in CF 52</p>
<p>ENP5 Sustainability: Climate Change</p> <p>As there are unreasonable constraints on what can be put into policy, could there not be recommendations which suggest higher standards as suggested below as well as strengthening the intentions to take account of recent IPCC projections and findings of the Energy and Climate Change Committee? EPC expect WODC to forward <i>an 'Energy and Sustainability statement' or 'energy feasibility assessment' (as required by Policy EH4 of the Local Plan)</i> to the Parish Council and relevant stakeholders for comment.</p>	<p>See answers in CF 52</p>
<p>ENP5.2 On the grounds of price, embodied carbon, low costs of building as well as aesthetics; local, prefabricated wood-framed buildings could be used in some areas (e.g. Stewart Milne Group, Witney).</p>	<p>I have advocated this for many years at WODC and otherwise but it isn't for the NP to prescribe constructional techniques.</p>
<p>ENP5.4..... to exceptionally high standards such as Passivhaus <u>or Zero Carbon for all dwellings</u> but, where they can show</p>	
<p>ENP5.5 developers should aspire to install solar PV, <u>preferably as solar tiles, which would ensure wider coverage and better aesthetics</u>, but as a minimum shall</p>	
<p>ENP5.6 Local generation and local grid systems to give low cost renewable energy to residents and be a net exporter of clean energy to the wider community, for example, giving free recharging points for electric cars.</p>	

<p>ENP6.8 The West Eynsham development must have a primary school or branch-school onsite. The distance to the existing primary school is too great for walking, and car transport would generate too much greenhouse gas and too little exercise.</p> <p>ENP7 Suggest opening statement includes pedestrian and cycle access. 'new development shall have safe access to local transport networks by private car and public transport <u>with good connections for pedestrians and cyclists</u>'</p> <p>ENP 7.4 Link RoadsADD '<u>and should have controlled crossing points at footpaths and cycle routes to ensure safe access to the countryside to allow all to cross safely.</u>' Could speed not be reduced to 30mph?</p> <p>ENP12.3 or local varieties of fruit <u>and nut</u> trees, through improvements</p> <p>ENP12.4 Could the linear park idea ('Chilbrook Linear Park' in the LGS supporting document) be mentioned here, even if outside LGS ; we would suggest extending this to include the dog walking field south of Chilbridge Road and to link to the railway route (LGS 9), where, again, many trees could be planted.</p> <p>ENP 13 Trees Eynsham is a dense settlement with few mature trees and very few street trees; the ENP should seek net increase in tree cover, so important as a carbon sink (see also ENP4), with significant street tree planting.</p> <p>ENP14.3 It is difficult to imagine how the existing, and already large village of 4,600 residents, could retain its identity and village nature with nearly three times this population, making it the size of most towns. It would at best be a collection of villages, and at worst, a suburb of Oxford. The huge increase in Oxford commuters would increase greenhouse gas and pollution.</p> <p>ENP16 C'<u>and existing road users but contribute to improvement of local access and reduction in pollution from transport.</u></p> <p>ENP16 F of the new community. This to enable the elderly to 'size down' to a lower-carbon dwelling.</p>	<p>The ENP assumes this and the adopted local plan includes this in the SDA policy EW2</p> <p>There is a bias in ENP7 towards motorised transport as ENP8 covers 'active travel' modes.</p> <p>See answers in CF 52</p> <p>this will all have to be part of the SDA process; we have said as much as we can in the ENP about this matter</p> <p>See answers in CF 52</p> <p>We can't require (retrospective) improvement of pre-existing problem – but we can hope new things will help</p>
---	---

ENP16 G.....'interconnected green spaces, infrastructure, sustainability, layout and impact on the wider countryside.'

ENP17 needs more policy detail - vehicular access to the village should be limited. In the village centre, a pedestrian zone with bus and cycle access should be established.

ENP17.3 and 8 Connected Place. Landowner and developer contributions to S106 offsite sustainable infrastructure should be maximised e.g. the toll bridge road community path, dedicated bus lanes etc. Emergency access via

we have gone into as much detail as we dare – a lot will be decided in the AAP / SDA processes but we have set out local aspirations as far as we can given that we don't have the final say

as 16C above

CF no. 58. Historic England

Thank you for consulting Historic England on the revised Regulation 14 Consultation version of the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan. Having gone through a considerable process of preparation, examination and redrafting the plan has developed into a robust planning document with few areas relating to those areas of interest to Historic England that we now wish to comment on. We continue to support the identification of Local Green Space for the green space of the Abbey Fishponds and share the Parish Council's concern that the Chilbrook Stream and views to prominent landscape features, including Wytham Hill and the historic village core in its landscape setting should be conserved.

As a minor point, we recognise that part of the historic interest of the village core is its commercial character, including the presence of the market place, shops and public houses. We support the use of Policy ENP11 to protect this character and associated historic or architectural interest. However, we feel that bullet point c. requires some areas of clarity. Firstly, the use of a building may not be dependent on a single 'business' (i.e. a company) whilst the success or viability of a business may be affected by factors outside market forces or the viable use of the land for commercial use.

Also the term 'short-term' is not defined within the policy. A mere matter of weeks might be considered a short-term period and yet might not give a sufficient period to bring a historic building into a viable commercial use. Whilst

Good point – policy and supporting text amended accordingly

it might not be desirable to leave a business premise vacant in a conservation area for an extended period we would suggest that leaving only a short period to demonstrate its lack of viability provides a disincentive for landlords to maintain a commercial use or actively seek commercial occupants - particularly given potentially higher value for housing use. We would recommend adding criteria to this policy including requiring a property to be marketed to the satisfaction of the Council for an appropriate period of time.

I hope these comments are of assistance to the steering group and wish them well with taking the plan to the submission version consultation stage.

<p>CF no. 59.</p> <p>Page 4, top right 2nd para- typo “existing not exiting”.</p> <p>ENP1 Housing</p> <p>This section is necessarily quite complex and detailed. I follow what is Policy and the Reasons relating to it, also what is Recommendations. I get confused at Pages 14 to 15 where the para numbering stops. The text here is not identified as was the case above in say “Note A, Note B or Table 1”. It doesn’t seem to follow on from the Policy or Recommendations boxes or the Reasons paras. Can I suggest that you make some of it “Note C. Foot, cycle and mobility vehicle paths” and/or make it part of the Reasons paras or the Recommendations? Page 15- the 4th para starting “Currently....” There is now spare capacity at the primary so it might be safer to say “little spare capacity”?</p> <p>ENP5 Sustainability: Climate Change.</p> <p>There was some talk last year of lifting the 2016 ban on imposing higher eco standards above Building Regs/restoring some form of “Code for sustainable homes”. The 2018 NPPF does not seem to have done anything radical from my reading of Section 14, but para 152 may be relevant?</p> <p>“Local planning authorities should support community-led initiatives for renewable and low carbon energy, including developments outside areas identified in local plans or other strategic policies that are being taken forward through neighbourhood planning.”</p> <p>Could that be used in ENP and allow something extra-eco to go into Policy? Also, could a statement be added to the effect that ENP will be Reviewed and the Climate Change recommendations will be upgraded to Policy, as soon as the “Code for sustainable homes” or similar is restored by the government under their obligations in the 2008 Climate Change Act?</p> <p>ENP 12 LGS</p> <p>Could we add in a similar statement that the LGS designations will be added to at Review. That might allow the addition of –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✂ • The old railway line- ex LGS 9 ✂ • The land next to Monkswood, Pink Hill Lane - ex LGS 15b ✂ • The “dog-walking field”- being the land south and east of Chilbridge Road if it is saved from development. ✂ • The whole of Fruitlands, LGS10, and maybe the woods to the west of it too. ✂ • The whole of the Hanborough Road corner at LGS3. 	<p>Thank you</p> <p>Agreed – opportunity has been taken to make the purpose of the text more obvious and more relevant</p> <p>The note is purely explanatory – policies relating to 'paths' are elsewhere</p> <p>True</p> <p>Unfortunately it's all about decentralised energy generation rather than the obvious point of making homes energy efficient.</p> <p>It does say that at bottom of main 'aspirations' box</p> <p>Good idea – have added 12.10</p>
---	---

ENP14 Sustainable Growth

ENP14 B- Typo “masterplans”

Page 42 para 14.11. The new Science Park. I disagree with “Eynsham's aspiration to become part of the Oxford Knowledge Spine”. I think it should either be omitted or replaced with “EPC’s aspiration”. The steering group did not agree with this aspiration and it was not supported in public engagement. Also, this para references ENV1 and ENP10 in relation to the Science Park proposal but I can only find references there to existing Business Park. We should be encouraging expansion and better use of this site rather than pushing an oversized new Science Park on the GV, where the need and viability has yet to be proven. If the business land-take on the GV was substantially reduced there might be more chance of saving the biodiversity and heritage assets around City Farm and Tilgarsley DMV. I think the following should be deleted-
“and the building of a campus-style Science Park to accompany a new settlement would be in full accord with Eynsham's aspiration to become part of the Oxford Knowledge Spine.”

Para 14.16 Change NPPF 2012 to NPPF 2018

Para 14.17

“Where proposals would nevertheless result in unavoidable harm, this should be clearly identified along with any public benefit that could not otherwise be delivered and is considered to justify that harm.”

I do not agree with this “let-out clause” and hope you will delete it! There should be no foreseeable circumstances in our NP area where harm to any heritage assets can be justified.

ENP 16 New Settlements

Typo- REC 16 has “A” before “Eynsham Parish Council”. There’s no B or C so it should go.

Heritage-

I would like a similar Policy to ENP 17B inserted in ENP 16 thus-

“Development should sustain and enhance the significance of designated and non–designated heritage assets and avoid harm to them and their settings.”

I think it is just as important for the GV as the West Eynsham SDA. The designated heritage assets at City Farm need protecting as do the undesignated, prospective, heritage assets at Tilgarsley Deserted Medieval Village and the Salt Way and medieval boundary path and possibly more. Can this be put into Reasons. Also, Para 17.4 for the west Eynsham SDA provides for a “heritage statement”. This should also be provided for in ENP 16 too.

This will be tested at the EPC meeting which ratifies the ENP for submission to WODC.

There was a couple of questions asked in one of the surveys which indicated support for new businesses but the main concern would be that Eynsham or OCGV will become dormitories if everyone has to go elsewhere for work. As it is, the idea of a 'science park' seems to no longer be in the thinking of the promoters of OCGV so we may well get the dormitory anyway.

That form of words looks like something added at a previous 'consultation'. It isn't a get-out as it is not policy but what it does say is that any harm must be recorded but ultimately the decision will be made by WODC.

These policies don't relate to specific areas now. Perhaps we should say that policies relevant to strategic sites are also applicable to new settlements which are, by their nature, strategic sites.

Added note to policy box and 16.19

<p>In this connection para 2 of REC 16 should just read “heritage assets” taking out the word “listed” so that all of them are included (see above).</p> <p>Traffic- REC 16 final para- Would you please include that EPC will seek a ban on all construction traffic through the village to include the centre, Station Road, Acre End, Witney Rd, Mill St, Hanborough Rd etc! This should go in REC for the West Eynsham development too if not already there.</p> <p>Healthcare- ENP 16 opening para, B, D and Reasons para 16.1- add “healthcare”. Para 16.5 refers to 15 year lifespan of plan. Amend that to 13 years? 2019 to 2031. Para 16.10- add a proviso that a new health centre must not be at the expense of closure of the existing Eynsham Medical Centre.</p> <p>ENP 17 Strategic Development Areas. REC 17A doesn’t make sense to me. Is it meant to say the following? “When two developments of SDA or greater scale take place at the same time within the Parish of Eynsham, both projects should be phased such that the rate of building on each site is not compromised <i>and</i> so that the infrastructure of either development is (<i>“not” removed</i>) delivered at the appropriate time.”</p> <p>REC 18 Park and Ride- Can a new recommendation be added to seek to conserve existing hedgerows and plant new ones around the car parking areas. Also, to use the existing landscape features more sensitively than in the terrible draft design OCC have produced.</p>	<p>it now says designated and undesignated.</p> <p>This is already standard practice</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Reality is that there won't be another practice so close and EMC doesn't have space to expand. We have to word things very carefully as Health Care is not really within a NP's remit.</p> <p>Wording was a bit convoluted – the suggested text is better.</p> <p>We are not allowed to address individual sites (according to the previous examiner) and it isn't clear if the NP applies to that type of development. If a NP does apply then we have this covered by other ENP policies. OCC change designs regularly – everyone has told them their urban geometric pattern is inappropriate.</p>
---	---

CF no. 60. Oxfordshire County Council

Thank you for inviting Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) to view and make comments on the draft Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan (ENP). We believe that communities should have the freedom to develop their own plans providing they conform to the relevant local plan and they follow the process of public engagement and examination which the district council helps to administer.

Therefore, we are keen not to unnecessarily interfere in the development of Neighbourhood Plans. However, we do need to ensure the plans do not put unrealistic service or financial demands on the County Council. Hence it is important that the impacts of the developments proposed are mitigated and that any infrastructure requirements are fully funded by the developments individually or collectively.

Infrastructure requirements and aspirations identified need to be deliverable directly or indirectly through development. Other than existing developer contributions secured it is very unlikely funding over and above that secured through future developer contributions will be available.

For more information on how Oxfordshire County Council can assist in the formulation of Neighbourhood Plans, please find details of our Neighbourhood Planning Toolkit on our website through the following link: <https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/content/neighbourhood-planning-toolkit>

Oxfordshire County Council is supportive of the intention to adopt a Neighbourhood Plan, and of many of the details of the draft plan. However, we have identified some issues in the way that the plan is currently drafted, particularly in relation to education and transport. Further detail is set out below in relation to specific services provided by Oxfordshire County Council, including suggested amendments and clarifications which may assist in the preparation of the submission version.

Archaeology

The Neighbourhood Plan contains a section and policy that provides provision for the historic environment, including both designated and undesignated assets, which is supported.

Education

Detailed comments on specific sections of the consultation document can be found in Annex 2. No school site location can be agreed until further work has been done to demonstrate that it would meet the OCC design criteria.

Infrastructure Funding

Strategic context

- Is there evidence to support the statement that 'Eynsham has been unable to capitalise on its proximity to that spine due to poor transport access as well as high property prices due to the closeness of Oxford city'? Eynsham has good transport links to both Oxford and Witney.

- The Park and Ride is not certain as funding has not yet been secured. It will be the west Eynsham development that connects Eynsham to the A40.

- Until modelling is done the number of junctions cannot be dictated. Keeping the A40 flowing is a priority. OCC has a statutory duty to reduce congestion and ensure that there is not a severe impact from the development.

- 'The planning context is further complicated by continual changes. There are now two Garden Village proposals within 5km of Eynsham' – the Barnard Gate proposal has been withdrawn and it may not be appropriate to refer to this within the Neighbourhood Plan as the West Oxfordshire Local Plan has now been adopted including policies supporting the Cotswolds Garden Village.

Objectives: ENV 8 A New settlement

It is unrealistic for the developments to be totally stand alone as there will be independencies relating to employment and education. The expansion or provision of secondary schools would need to be on the new Garden Village and this would serve both the existing and new populations.

1.7 – Extra care housing –The type and location will need to be agreed by Oxfordshire County Council adult joint commissioning team. Developments would be expected to provide a minimum of 60 units where indicated by OCC.

04 Policies – (Page 15)

WODC do not have a CIL charging regime in place a present.

Therefore, the paragraph on CIL should describe the current process of obligations being secured through s106. When a CIL charging regime is in place then there is opportunity for the Parish to receive

Yes, this is what local technology businesses told us, citing the difficulty of organising meetings in the morning due to the unpredictable traffic delays.

OCC has published plans for a Park and Ride ... added 'should **help** improve access' as we do hope OCC will be helpful in this regard.

We were not aware that there is a 'statutory duty' to reduce congestion – we noted the duty on WODC to meet housing targets which we accept but we mistakenly said that OCC didn't have a similar duty to try to explain the lack of progress in this area to local residents as it was the most complained about issue during the plan preparation. We will correct that.

The proposal was made – we are simply recording a fact.

Wording changed to 'largely independent' as the this is what is intended as indicated by the inclusion of the benefits of sharing services.

Not sure how the number of units could be used though good to see; policy sets out to encourage this, particularly close to services.

Valid point: change to 'CIL **will be** the mechanism for smaller developments...'

<p>25% of the CIL contributions and small developments to contribute towards larger strategic area based schemes. The relevant councils would undertake an assessment of need and appropriate mitigation to identify what is required of the development. – standard designs will ensure that the site is safe.</p> <p>ENP7 - Sustainable Transport This policy is pre-empting the transport modelling for Eynsham. The wording – ‘wherever possible’ should be added as the development of the AAP and SPDs needs to be able to explore the connections needed to make a sustainable development. This Neighbourhood Plan also covers smaller emerging sites and so this policy does not suit the needs of developments up to 10 dwellings as these will need to access from other roads.</p> <p>ENP16 – New Settlements There is a contradiction with ENV 8 regarding independencies. There is no mention of the emerging AAP and this will set the principles and objectives of the development. Page 46 – ‘<i>There is local concern that the separation is not enough, partly based on lack of trust that the infrastructure will be built as promised, leaving new residents dependent on Eynsham with its limited parking and facilities already near to capacity</i>’ The wording of this section should be reconsidered as it may not be appropriate for a policy document. The focus should be on appropriate phasing of the facilities to ensure that there is capacity and services. The plans in the document are not based on evidence and pre-empt master planning that the developers will undertake.</p> <p>REC18 – Developer funding is not providing the Park & Ride. The developments will connect into the infrastructure through direct works not developer funding. This also pre-empts the Infrastructure Delivery Plan work on the infrastructure requirements for the development. Development cannot feasibly fund all of the measures outlined in the plan as this would make the development unviable and push the housing prices up, contrary to the aspirations of the Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>A11 – There is no CIL charging schedule in place therefore at present there will need to be these elements secured by S106.</p> <p>Appendices The document should be reviewed considering the definitions of ‘shall</p>	<p>7.2 modified to emphasise the AAP/SDA process and traffic modelling as well as call for optimising traffic flow.</p> <p>There is a well signposted exception for smaller developments</p> <p>ENV 8 reworded to 'largely independent' – it was never intended that there would be no sharing which may be positively beneficial.</p> <p>This is simply describing the reality to inform decision makers but it is not policy.</p> <p>Phasing is also addressed</p> <p>Probably refers to map on p50, now removed</p> <p>It doesn't say that – it simply sets out the PC intention to seek to improve a major and long-standing problem. This does not pre-empt anything - it simply sets out EPC intentions / starting points. There is no suggestion that it can or should 'fully fund' major works such as those proposed for HIF funding but a £Billion development should be able to contribute by ensuring the access points on the A40 minimise additional traffic delays.</p> <p>No, but hopefully there will be CIL... S106 added just in case.</p>
---	---

or must' and 'should' in Appendix C, as this will affect planning permissions. No evidence is provided to support the assertion that 'house prices are high and in no way limited by the cost of building which is typically less than 50% of the price of each dwelling. Under these circumstances developers are able to sell anything they put up.' There is no evidence to suggest that developers would agree to the proposal that 'the cost could be taken off the extra value of land when it is given planning consent which is a windfall profit given to private owners.' No evidence is provided to support the statement that 'Developers would love lots of small sites as they would not have to provide these facilities. For this reason, our policies insist that large sites are developed as an integrated whole.'

Public Health

Although several criteria with direct relevance to public health are embedded within the plan, such as the desire to "protect and enhance" community spirit, ensure new homes meet the 'Building for Life' standard, the need for community facilities and the provision of "excellent paths for pedestrians, cyclists and mobility vehicles", neither the vision nor objectives specifically make the case for new development to take account of and support the health and wellbeing of residents. To make a stronger case for development that will maintain and improve the health and wellbeing of people living, working and visiting Eynsham, we strongly recommend that health and wellbeing are specifically referred to within the vision and objectives. Such an approach is supported by Chapter 8 of the revised NPPF 'Promoting Healthy and Safe Communities' and would reinforce/complement health and wellbeing objectives specified within the Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village Area Action Plan.

Data on the health and wellbeing status and needs of people living in Eynsham can be found using Public Health England's Local Health tool: [http://www.localhealth.org.uk/GC_preport.php?](http://www.localhealth.org.uk/GC_preport.php?lang=en&s=176&view=map13&id_rep=r03&sellid0=3977&nivgeo=ward_2)

http://www.localhealth.org.uk/GC_preport.php?lang=en&s=176&view=map13&id_rep=r03&sellid0=3977&nivgeo=ward_2 016 Oxfordshire's Joint Strategic Needs Assessment (JSNA) provides wider contextual information about Oxfordshire's population and the factors affecting health, wellbeing, and social care needs. It also includes a section on the natural and built environment:

<http://insight.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/joint-strategic-needs-assessment> Key public health criteria to highlight throughout the plan would include encouraging the development of an environment which:

Provides opportunities for people to be more active – we strongly support

Some things are self-evident – and this is an explanation for the benefit of local residents.

Too right they wouldn't – but what happens in parts of the country where prices are not so high – houses cost much to same to build so the price of land is lower.

Some things are self-evident – during plan preparation residents continually asked for 'small developments' and we had to explain that often this results in lack of adequate funding for services

Unfortunately this may be a opportunity missed but it is not practical to add another 'vision' at this late stage.

However, some of the practical actions to promote health and well being are in the plan.

the aspiration that “development should normally be within reasonable walking distance of key facilities”, the criteria laid out within ENP8 for ‘designated paths’ to facilitate this and the recognition that ‘purposeful activity’, such as walking to school, is “an important factor in enhancing the health, well-being”. Rather than develop on site drop off points for parents using vehicles which may discourage active modes (see 6.9), consideration could be given to developing safe walking and cycling corridors from nearby carparks to the school and other community amenities that could be used for ‘park and stride’ initiatives. This would help embed healthy travel behaviours from an early age and help to reduce physical inactivity, obesity, school gate air pollution and school run congestion.

Provides opportunities to make healthier food choices – the plan makes no specific reference to food or encouraging healthier food choices. Explicitly citing the need for development to facilitate access to healthy food would support the desire to retain a range of shops to serve basic needs as set out in Policy ENP11 and also support the provision of allotments as specified in Policy ENP3. As part of a whole systems approach to tackling obesity, consideration could be given to including a policy restricting the opening of hot food takeaways near schools and educational establishments.

Fosters good mental health and wellbeing by increasing opportunities for social interaction/reducing social isolation and loneliness – we strongly support aspirations for multifunctional community facilities as set out in Policy ENP3, enhancement of the public realm referred to in Policy ENP15 and policies around connectivity as set out in ENP8. Explicitly citing how these policies could help to promote social interaction - including by creating opportunities for meetings between people who might not otherwise come into contact with each other – is supported by Chapter 8 of the revised NPPF and could also be used to reinforce the case for retention of green space as set out in Policy ENP12.

Enables people to maintain their independence for longer – we strongly support Policy ENP2 seeking high quality design for life time homes, Policies ENP8 and ENP9 that seek to enable the use and storage of mobility vehicles and Policy ENP11 to ensure that basic needs are supported by local shops without the need to travel by car. In addition to the availability of public seating set out in A13, access to suitable WCs is also an important consideration for people with reduced mobility who might not otherwise feel sufficiently confident to use public spaces.

Excellent idea – ENP6.9 has been extended to include consideration of the idea of safe off-site parking (which is essential given the traffic problems experienced currently) rather than on-site although, in practice, the success of this will depend on co-operation of the school in organising a 'walking bus' or similar to ensure the resulting walk is safe.

Good point – add ENP11D and (new) 11.7

Also take opportunity to promote local food for similar reasons...

.. and mention take-aways as well although it is noted that senior school students patronise sandwich shops and co-op in Eynsham.

Transport

Transport Strategy

Annex 1 contains detailed comments on transport strategy. Many of these comments have been made in responses to previous versions of the Neighbourhood Plan, however they are all considered to be relevant to the latest version.

Travel Plans

The policies should be consistent with the Oxfordshire County Council documents. The Oxfordshire Walking Design Guide and Cycling Design Guides and Oxfordshire Cycling Design Standards should be used for any new developments layouts.

New developments will need to connect in to the existing walking and cycling infrastructure and where possible provide for improvements to bring the existing infrastructure up to the standards set out in the guidance documents.

New school sites should where possible be co-located with the local centres and in a central location with direct walking and cycling links provided from the housing areas.

The Oxfordshire County Council document 'Transport for New Developments, Transport Assessments and Travel Plans' sets out the thresholds and requirements for the travel plans needed to support any developments:

<https://www2.oxfordshire.gov.uk/cms/sites/default/files/folders/documents/roadsandtransport/transportpoliciesandplans/newdevelopments/TravelAssessmentsandTravelPlans.pdf>

Further information on Travel Plans can be found on the website:

<https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-and-transport/transport-policies-and-plans/transport-new-developments/travel-plans-advice>

Traffic and Road Safety

We are very supportive of measures to promote sustainable transport and safe walking routes, including safe crossings and design speeds for new development. We are supportive in principle, subject to funding being identified of the proposed 20mph speed limit referenced in paragraph 7.5 and the parking proposals set out in REC9. These would be subject to the statutory consultation process required for all traffic regulation / speed limit orders.

Environmental Strategy

References to specific paragraphs in the NPPF should be updated to reflect the 2018 version. For example, the reference to NPPF para 109 in

Reference has been made to these guides in ENP8. On reading the guidance and OCC submission to SDA issues, it seems clear that 'bus routes' should be included in the list of 'key facilities'

Added to ENP 6

References already in ENP8 changed to these documents

4.14 should now refer to NPPF para 174 onwards of the 2018 NPPF. It would be helpful to include reference to the Oxford Meadows and Farmoor Conservation Target Area (CTA) part of which lies within the parish in the south east. CTAs are areas identified at a county-wide scale of particular importance for biodiversity conservation and, of particular relevance to Neighbourhood Plans, are areas where additional investment in biodiversity to achieve net gain or through CIL funding could be targeted. For further details on CTAs see <https://www.wildoxfordshire.org.uk/biodiversity/conservation-target-areas/> The plan could usefully note that Long Mead Local Wildlife Site - a species rich floodplain meadow located within the parish boundary, north of the Thames just south of the B4044. Identifying these two features would be supported by para 174a) of the 2018 NPPF which requires plans to “identify, map and safeguard components of local wildlife-rich habitats and wider ecological networks...”

Waste Management

We welcome the considerations towards waste collection services in the plan. We would expect any new developments to be designed in accordance with West Oxfordshire District Council’s waste planning guidance which aims to enable new residents to participate fully in waste management services, helping to maintain Oxfordshire’s high performance.

That is very helpful information which we were not aware of. Has been added to ENP4.19

Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan 2018 - 2031

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the revised draft Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan (ENP). The District Council remains wholly supportive of the Parish Council's intention to adopt a neighbourhood plan and the comments set out below are intended to be as constructive as possible.

In particular, I have sought to highlight a number of issues that could cause potential difficulties at examination so that they can potentially be addressed prior to formal submission and consultation.

My comments are made in the context of the basic conditions that the ENP must meet in order to proceed to referendum, in particular the need to have regard to national policy and to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031.

For ease of reference, the comments are set out in plan order followed by some more general comments.

I. Introduction

The text states that the ENP will run from 2018 until 2031 to align with the West Oxfordshire Local Plan. This is slightly inaccurate as the Local Plan covers the 20-year period 2011 – 2031. It would therefore be appropriate to re-word this to state that the ENP is intended to align with the end-date of the Local Plan.

The text states that the ENP policies are in general conformance with the West Oxfordshire Local Plan (WOLP 2031). However, as the ENP is yet to be tested at examination it would be more appropriate to state that the ENP policies are required to be in general conformity with the Local Plan.

The text also states that the ENP can rely on the Strategic Environment Assessment and Habitat Regulations Assessment undertaken in support of the Local Plan. This will be a matter for the neighbourhood plan examiner to consider. The examiner's assessment will be informed by the SEA and HRA Screening which will be undertaken upon finalising the ENP post Regulation 14 consultation, and the responses to this screening from the Statutory Agencies (Historic England, Environment Agency and Natural England). I understand advice has been received to the effect that the ENP can rely on this higher-level work and it would be worth referencing this advice as appropriate.

The text also refers to repetition of Local Plan policy. Where Local Plan policy is referred to, it should be quoted verbatim and referenced accordingly so that it is clearly distinguished from the ENP.

I note that the plan has been written to conform with the NPPF 2012. A more

Agreed – done

changed to 'intended to be'

reference to NE consultation response which has been included in referenced documents.

Wording changed to inadvertent covering of the same ground which is a better statement of our position

Most references are to 2012 edition valid as long as plan is presented for

<p>recent version of the NPPF was published in July 2018 and whilst transitional arrangements are in place, it would appear sensible to consider the ENP in the context of the more recent version before being formally submitted prior to examination.</p> <p>The text refers to pre-application engagement by developers being encouraged. This is a reasonable statement but appears rather out of context and perhaps should be relocated to the supporting text of one of the policies later in the document. It should also be made clear if this is referring to pre-application discussions between developers and the District Council and/or Eynsham Parish Council.</p> <p>The text explains that the plan includes a number of aspirations. It would be helpful to clarify from the outset that unlike policies, these aspirations will not be a material consideration in the determination of any planning application. They should also be more clearly distinguished from the proposed policies themselves.</p> <p>The text explains that the evidence base underpinning the ENP is summarised in the SA scoping report which is available separately. For ease of reference and so that it is entirely clear what evidence the policies and proposals set out in the ENP are based on, it would be helpful if a list of evidence could be included as an appendix to the ENP itself with relevant links (e.g. web page references) provided where available.</p> <p>The 'other supporting documents' referred to could also usefully be set out as a complete list in the appendices.</p> <p>The text refers to the alternative garden village planning application at South Leigh/Barnard Gate. This application has now been withdrawn and the text should be updated accordingly.</p> <p>There is a minor typographical error in the final paragraph under the heading 'Locational References'.</p> <p>The text included in this section on masterplans appears rather out of context and should be relocated to the supporting text in the policies section of the document. I understand the intention of the ENP is to stipulate a requirement for a masterplan to be prepared in certain circumstances. This should be clearly explained elsewhere in the document to avoid duplication and potential confusion.</p> <p>Map 1 should be amended to show the boundaries of the West Eynsham and Garden Village allocations as set out in the Local Plan. The delineation of the area shown as a 'science park' should be removed as it will be for the Area Action Plan (AAP) process to determine the most appropriate location and distribution of any business use within the garden village site.</p>	<p>adoption before Jan 29, 2019</p> <p>relates well to previous paragraph and relation to the changing context over plan period. Engagement will help understanding of plan in the then current context.</p> <p>'matters outside the remit of of the ENP..... aspirations to be pursued by EPC' should be clear enough</p> <p>They are a different colour and have a different prefix to the numbering.</p> <p>The SA itself has all the cross-referencing included in it and duplicating it here would just extend the ENP without adding value to it.</p> <p>There is a table of supporting documents inside the front cover</p> <p>OK</p> <p>Section on masterplans has been changed to reduce confusion</p> <p>Map has been changed to include the full AAP area and borders of SDA. Science Park still features in WOLP and is mentioned in subsequent ENP text so indicative area is included as reference.</p>
---	---

2. Strategic Context

The text should be updated to reflect the adoption of the Local Plan and factually set out what the Local Plan says about future growth in the Eynsham area. Some of the references which have carried forward from the previous draft ENP could be deleted to make this section more concise.

There is some repetition in this section regarding the difference between policies and aspirations which is already set out in Section 1.

This section includes a further reference to masterplanning which again appears a little out of context.

As suggested above in relation to Section 1, the issue regarding masterplans should be dealt with in one part of the document, with any requirement placed on new development clearly explained and justified. As an aside, whilst masterplans can be incorporated into/form part of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) this is not always the case and thus they do not always carry the same weight as SPD as the wording currently suggests.

3. Vision and Objectives

As a general observation, the proposed vision is quite brief and succinct which is fine but in turn doesn't convey the sort of place Eynsham will be by 2031. An alternative potential approach would be to draft a vision along the lines of 'By 2031 Eynsham will be a place where...'

As currently worded it suggests a degree of maintaining the 'status quo' rather than positively setting out what the local community would like to see happen by the end of the plan period.

The vision is supported by 8 primary objectives.

ENV1 relates to housing mix which is clearly an important issue but is less appropriate to many smaller developments and obviously not applicable to non-residential forms of development. Perhaps it should be reworded to refer to 'Larger residential development (e.g. 10 or more homes) shall ensure...'

ENV3 relates to community facilities and suggests that new residents should have at least the same access to community facilities as existing residents. Again this infers a degree of status quo and perhaps it should be re-worded so that the objective is '*to ensure both existing and new residents enjoy excellent and convenient access to a range of community facilities with new development expected to contribute towards new and enhanced provision as appropriate*'.

4. Policies

It should be noted that the comments set out below are focused on the 17 proposed policies for the sake of brevity although a number of the comments made also have potential implications for some of the supporting text to those policies.

This has been done to reflect the latest 'current' situation.

Wording has been changed to reduce any duplication but opportunity is taken to restate the difference between blue policy and green aspiration.

Emphasis is on retaining the positive community aspects – status -quo if you like but why is it implied / assumed that that is a bad thing – while accepting the reality of change.

Every vision is positively worded apart from not making the traffic situation worse but that recognises the ENP cannot require retrospective improvement.

If this were policy, agreed, but the vision can be more generally expressed

The suggested wording is very much couched in terminology of a public body.

We have set a baseline of 'no worse' and expectation of 'better where practical' and used wording which is more typical of the community.

<p><i>Policy ENPI – Housing</i></p> <p>There appear to be two main elements to this policy – housing mix and location. Dealing with the issue of housing mix first, whilst I understand the intention, the opening sentence of the policy is a little confusing and unclear. For example, how would a proposal for a single house in Eynsham influence the mix of housing types and tenures in the garden village?</p> <p>This should perhaps be re-worded along the lines of: <i>“Larger residential development proposals that come forward in the ENP area will be required to demonstrate an appropriate and evidenced mix of dwelling types, sizes and tenures to help meet identified needs’</i></p> <p>Criteria A of the policy refers to the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). Whilst the SHMA does give an indication of the likely proportions of house sizes for market and affordable housing, it also includes a number of caveats about using these proportions with too much prescription. Furthermore, the District Council’s intention is to explore the most appropriate type, mix and tenure of housing at the garden village through the Area Action Plan (AAP) process. This may lead to a different outcome from the indicative proportions set out in the SHMA.</p> <p>Criteria B refers to the West Oxfordshire Local Plan requirement for 50% affordable housing and where exceptions to this may be permitted. This should be deleted as it is not in conformity with Policy H3 – Affordable Housing of the Local Plan which already sets out the circumstances in which the 50% requirement may be reduced.</p> <p>Criteria C places particular emphasis on 2 or 3 bed units. It would be helpful if the supporting text were to clearly explain the evidence underpinning this requirement.</p> <p>Criteria D requires residential development to be within walking distance of key village facilities with longer distances only supported when significant alternative benefits can be demonstrated. The supporting text provides some further explanation including specific distances to be used in determining applications that come forward.</p> <p>Whilst I understand the intention of the policy to ensure new homes are provided close to key facilities to enable walking and cycling and maintain the ‘compact’ nature of the village, I have concerns that the use of specific distance thresholds is too prescriptive.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to relocating this element of Policy ENPI to another more general policy such as ENV7 – Sustainable Transport and requiring all development (not just residential) to be located within convenient distance of key facilities to encourage active non-car modes of travel. In my opinion, the</p>	<p>It is clear that policies A and B needed rewording and they have been.</p> <p>Policy A references H4</p> <p>Policy B references H3</p> <p>The risk is very apparent and we have taken considerable care to ensure that the numerical values are there to make things clear – the following has been added</p> <p><i>Distances are intended as a guide to the appropriate use of land, rather than to prevent its use, by emphasising the need to concentrate development close to facilities or the building of new facilities. ENP 1.8</i></p> <p>We consider that numbers provide better clarity than terms like 'convenient distance' and have been used without trying to make them into hard-and-fast limits in making planning determinations.</p>
---	---

<p>policy should however avoid the use of set distances as this is overly prescriptive.</p> <p><i>Policy ENP2 – Design</i></p> <p>The policy seeks to promote high quality design in line with the NPPF and Local Plan and is a sensible inclusion within the ENP. I note that Criteria A relates to heritage matters and the wording should therefore be consistent with relevant aspects of the NPPF/Local Plan.</p> <p>Criteria E refers to the use of a widely accepted design standard such as ‘Building for Life’ and the fact that this should form the reference point for planning and determining new developments. Importantly, the Building for Life principles apply only to housing development and this should be made clear in the policy. For example re-wording to state:</p> <p><i>‘Residential development proposals within the ENP area will be expected to comply with Building for Life (or equivalent) principles unless it can be robustly demonstrated that these cannot be achieved or are being met in an alternative way’.</i></p> <p>Criteria G should be re-worded. The Local Plan allocates two strategic sites in the Eynsham area – land to the north of Eynsham (the garden village) and land to the west of Eynsham. The policies for those sites stipulate a requirement for an Area Action Plan (AAP) for the garden village and a comprehensive masterplan-led approach for the land west of Eynsham.</p> <p>If the intention of the ENP is to require a masterplan to be prepared for any other large-scale residential proposals that come forward this should be clearly stipulated for example:</p> <p><i>‘Any large-scale residential development proposal of more than 100 homes and/or where this is a clear inter-relationship between one residential development and an adjoining proposal, will be required to be supported by a masterplan’.</i></p> <p><i>Policy ENP3 – Community Facilities</i></p> <p>The aim of the policy is essentially to ensure that new development is supported by convenient access to community facilities.</p> <p>As currently worded, the policy would apply to development regardless of type or scale. Thus a single dwelling proposal would be seen as needing to provide funding or land towards infrastructure. Perhaps as an alternative, the policy should relate to larger developments (e.g. 10 or more dwellings or 1,000m² for non-residential development)?</p> <p>The way in which the policy is worded also needs to be given further consideration to enable it to be effectively used for development management purposes and to give it more precision. For example what is the definition of reasonable access or appropriate distance? What does it mean if a proposal comes forward that doesn’t ensure reasonable access or an appropriate</p>	<p>Not sure what the problem is so text amended to be less prescriptive</p> <p>Rewording in this way makes sense</p> <p>Agreed – changed</p> <p>That's where Table 1 comes in – added reference to ENP 3.2 to make clear that it is a 'guide'.</p>
---	--

<p>distance? Is it refused planning permission?</p> <p>I have specific concerns regarding criteria G – as the requirement for a community building or pre-school would be determined on a case by case basis. Furthermore, as worded, it would mean that any residential proposal of 100 or more homes would be required to contribute which in some instances may not be justified or viable.</p> <p>Also, as worded under criteria H, any development subject to a masterplan (i.e. more than 100 dwellings) will be required to make land available for sports, allotments, play areas and where appropriate, a burial ground. In many instances this level of provision would be inappropriate other than in respect of much larger development proposals.</p> <p>An alternative approach for this policy would be to adopt a more general approach to state something along the lines of:</p> <p><i>'New development within the ENP area will be expected to benefit from convenient access to community facilities including education, health, recreation and leisure. Larger development proposals that would have a potential impact on the capacity of existing facilities and/or their ability to serve the local population will be expected to address this situation either through direct provision or through an appropriate alternative mechanism such as a financial contribution'</i></p> <p><i>Policy ENP3a – Health Care Facilities</i></p> <p>The policy is essentially an off-shoot of Policy ENP3 and focuses more specifically on health care provision. Again, the wording of this policy needs consideration in terms of how it will be used in practical terms for development management.</p> <p>The first criteria for example reads as a statement of intent and it is not clear how it would actually be used to inform planning decisions. Does it mean that if development more than 1,000m from a primary health care facility comes forward it will be refused?</p> <p>Criteria J reads as a statement for intent and it will be for the AAP and underpinning evidence on infrastructure to determine the most appropriate approach towards primary health care provision in consultation with stakeholders.</p> <p>Criteria K is also a statement rather than a policy requirement.</p> <p>An alternative approach would be a more general policy that states something like:</p> <p><i>'Particular support will be given to proposals that help to improve the quality and range of health care provision within the ENP area.</i></p> <p><i>Where new development is likely to have an effect on existing provision (e.g. capacity of the facility to serve the future population) appropriate mitigation will be required</i></p>	<p>G now makes clear that contribution should be 'where appropriate and proportion to the scale' – the latter being left for the LPA to determine.</p> <p>Quite happy to use the wording suggested</p> <p>Definitely not – that is not what was intended with Table 1. Wording has been changed to ideally within the distances suggested in Table 1.</p> <p>Policy is generally a statement of intent so this doesn't seem unreasonable. This does not prejudice the AAP but it does expect the AAP masterplan to address the issue.</p> <p>This form of words is acceptable and will be adopted</p>
---	---

<p>and sought through a planning obligation or other appropriate mechanism. A Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required for any large-scale residential development proposal of more than 100 homes’.</p> <p><i>Policy ENP3b – Infrastructure and Utilities</i> The intention of the policy is clear and reasonable but the wording requires further consideration. For example, criteria I – it shall be demonstrated by who? Presumably this means a developer and this should be made clear. Furthermore, consideration should be given as to whether it is reasonable to impose the policy on a ‘pre-occupation’ basis. In some instances, larger development proposals are likely to have ‘trigger’ mechanisms built into planning obligations whereby a certain number of homes are able to be built before the supporting infrastructure is fully provided.</p> <p><i>Policy ENP4 – Green Infrastructure</i> The intention of the policy is supported in principle but the wording of the policy requires some further consideration. Does the policy for example apply to all forms of development and at all scales? For example, criteria F - would all development proposals (irrespective of scale) be expected to be supported by a maintenance plan for Green Infrastructure? Also, as worded it suggests it only applies to development within the village which is presumably not the intention.</p> <p><i>Policy ENP4a – Enhancing Biodiversity</i> The policy is intended to apply to all development irrespective of scale and type. I note that criteria G requires all new development to demonstrate a net biodiversity gain. This is different to Policy EH3 of the local plan which requires a net gain where possible and this more rigid approach will need to be justified to the ENP examiner if taken forward. Criteria I requires development to seek to protect the best and most versatile (BMV) land? Does this mean that any development involving BMV land will be refused? No further reference is made to this issue in the supporting text to the policy. Paragraph 170 of the NPPF requires planning policies and decisions to recognise the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside, and the wider benefits from natural capital and ecosystem services – including the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land, and of trees and woodland. It does not however say that no development can take place on BMV land so there is a need to think about conformity/consistency here.</p> <p><i>ENP5 – Sustainability: Climate Change</i> At first glance this appears to be a policy – it has a reference number and title</p>	<p>The HIA is a valuable addition and has been included to be part of the masterplan.</p> <p>Wording refers to 'appropriate utilities' allowing a measure of discretion (is broadband necessary? Often it is these days but a measure of discretion will allow someone to get into a property that the Building Regs people say is habitable without developers thinking they can do the same for everyone.</p> <p>Yes, but each policy is worded so it is not onerous for even the smallest developments as it needs to be appropriate – something the LPA will determine.</p> <p>Add 'any included GI' – if it doesn't have any then it doesn't need a maintenance plan</p> <p>It did – reference removed as the application should be to whole NA</p> <p>Yes, but gains are to be 'appropriate' which is qualified in reworded 4.14 based on scale of development. Policy G reworded to require net gain unless it can be shown to be impractical. This is in accordance with EH3 but it does put the onus on the party who says it is impractical thus giving the LPA more encouragement to strengthen EH3.</p> <p>Not intended to prevent use of BMV land – have added 'unless demonstrably impractical' so it does not prevent use of BMV land but does require a measure of proof that it could not have been protected. The reference takes you to supporting text at 14.14 which relates to 'sequential testing' which would constitute proof if the only land available was BMV.</p> <p>It is all in green and does say 'EPC Intentions' so it is fairly clear. It does read like policy because it would be policy if not prohibited.</p>
--	---

together with a series of criteria in an identical style to the policies in the ENP. However, this is a series of intentions rather than a policy and that should be made clear. The text should be differentiated more obviously so that it does not read as a policy.

Instead of having no policy on this issue however, I wonder if a general policy could be included along the following lines:

'Within the ENP area, particular support will be given for proposals that help meet the intentions of the Climate Change Act 2008 including development that make the most efficient use of land and materials and maximises the opportunities for the use of renewable and low-carbon forms of energy.'

Policy ENP6 – Education

The intention of the policy is to ensure new development (presumably residential) is supported by appropriate education infrastructure and availability of school places. This is supported in principle but the wording of the policy requires further consideration and greater clarity.

For example is there a particular threshold at which the requirements of this policy effectively kick-in? Would a small residential scheme of say 5-10 dwellings need to be supported by an assessment of school capacity?

I also have concerns regarding criteria B which requires provision to be made prior to the first occupation of any dwellings. As set out above, it is often the case with larger residential proposals that 'trigger' mechanisms are built into planning obligations allowing for a certain number of homes to be built and occupied before some infrastructure is provided.

An alternative form of words for this policy would be something along the following lines:

'Where proposed new development is likely to have an effect on school capacity within the ENP area, this should be supported by a robust assessment to determine whether there is a requirement for additional provision (e.g. increased school capacity or new provision). Proposed development that has an unacceptable impact on education capacity that cannot be mitigated will be refused. For larger development sites where new school provision is made on-site, access arrangements should emphasize both walking and safe pick-up and drop-off arrangements for vehicle-borne students and staff.'

Particular support will be given to development proposals within the ENP area that help to facilitate or deliver improved skills and education including for example apprenticeships or other training opportunities. The loss of any existing education and training facilities will be refused unless there is clear and convincing justification for the loss or appropriate replacement provision is made elsewhere within the ENP area'

This latter paragraph would in part pick up Rec 6 – EPC intentions.

The purpose is to make it easy to adapt to be policy at some future date when it is permitted.

This is a very good idea – it is a viable policy which is definitely better than none at all - and does clearly make the distinction between policy and aspiration. Also included a reference to EH4 which obviously applies to NP area.

Does say 'appropriate to size and nature' which would normally exclude commercial and also cover the threshold issue.

If the LPA doesn't think that small developments matter as far as education is concerned then a detailed assessment isn't required and payment is all that is needed.

The suggested form of words is adopted with a few modifications as it is stronger in some ways than the original.

This is primarily 'vehicular transport' while ENP8 deals with paths used for the

Policy ENP7 – Sustainable Transport

As a general observation, the title of the policy is sustainable transport but the first three criteria relate to road use by car.

More specifically, I have concerns that criteria A, B and C are overly restrictive and that access arrangements for development proposals are a matter for the planning application stage rather than prescription through the neighbourhood plan.

A more general policy along the following lines would perhaps be a potential alternative.

'Within the Eynsham NDP area, particular support will be given to proposals that help reduce reliance on the private car, maximising opportunities for non-motorised forms of movement including walking, cycling, riding as well as use of public transport such as bus and rail. Larger development proposals will be expected to make appropriate provision either directly and/or through a financial contribution towards helping to reduce car use.

New roads provided within residential environments should be effectively and safely integrated with consideration given to appropriate speed restrictions and home zone principles.

Larger development proposals will be expected to include electric vehicle charging points'.

Policy ENP8 – Connected Place – integration of new developments with the village

The focus of the policy is on the provision of appropriate connections for pedestrians, cycles, pushchairs and mobility vehicles in new developments.

The intention of the policy is supported in principle. The wording of the policy should take into account any views expressed by Oxfordshire County Council as highway authority.

Policy ENP9 – Parking

The general intention of the policy is supported. I note that criteria D requires provision to be made for charging of electric vehicles at each new home. This is a significant requirement and yet little information or justification is provided in the supporting text. If it is retained in the plan it will be a matter for the neighbourhood plan examiner to consider how reasonable this requirement is as well as whether it should apply to other forms of development e.g. workplace charging points.

Policy ENP10 – Building a Strong and Stable Economy

Eynsham is a key employment location and it is appropriate for the ENP to include a policy or policies on employment matters. I do however have some concerns about the wording of Policy ENP10 as currently proposed.

Criteria A for example states that the land currently allocated for employment

active modes of travel.

In this case we would like to retain our form of words. A is quite strong in wanting not to use village streets but 7.2 does give all the flexibility necessary and has been extended to include Cuckoo Lane / Lower Road as these are probably essential to allow access from A40 to OCGV and it wasn't intended to exclude them as they are not streets with houses off them which would be adversely affected by extra traffic.

B seems to be supported by OCC who also want the spine road to have a cycle path – we would not have expected that if it was a 20mph street.

OCC seem very supportive of the 20mph idea set out in C – subject of course to appropriate consultation and Eynsham paying for it – so this doesn't seem to be too prescriptive for highways.

Reference has been made to OCC guidance and Home Zone dropped as OCC seem to have withdrawn support for them in latest guidance.

OCC seem supportive but did ask for reference to their latest walking and cycling guides which has been done.

We want to encourage the use of electric cars by providing parking places which have easy access to an electricity supply without, for example, having to put the cable across a footpath or otherwise cause a hazard. This is a parking policy and doesn't actually specify that a particular type or capacity supply point be fitted – just that provision is made as explained in the text which is extended to be even more clear. It does say dwellings – it would be nice to apply it to workplaces but that was considered a step too far.

A and B should probably be one policy – it makes more sense that way

<p>use shall be retained for such purposes. Firstly it is unclear which land this is referring to and this should be clarified. I assume it perhaps refers to existing employment sites however this overlaps with criteria B.</p> <p>Consideration also needs to be given to the interrelationship of this policy with Policy EI of the Local Plan which sets out the circumstances in which the re-use of existing business sites for other uses will be considered.</p> <p>Perhaps a more general form of words would be appropriate along the following lines:</p> <p><i>'Within the ENP area, proposals to bring forward new business land in accessible locations will be favourably supported particularly where there will be a demonstrable and significant increase in job creation and/or skills.</i></p> <p><i>Proposals to expand and improve existing business land will be supported in principle unless the proposal would lead to any specific concerns such as loss of amenity or additional noise disturbance and traffic congestion.</i></p> <p><i>The loss of existing business land will generally be resisted unless it can be robustly demonstrated that the site is no longer able to play a beneficial role to the local economy and/or the alternative use would deliver a significant community benefit'.</i></p> <p><i>Policy ENPI 1 – Retail</i></p> <p>The general intention of the policy is supported but I have specific concerns regarding criteria B which requires new homes to have ready access to a local convenience store without requiring the use of a private car.</p> <p>It would be clearer if this policy were to focus solely on proposals involving retail uses (e.g. provision of or loss of retail) with the locational aspects of new housing deferred either to Policy ENPI or ENP7.</p> <p>As set out previously however, I have concerns about the prescriptiveness of the set walking distances referred to under those policies and would prefer a more general approach.</p> <p><i>ENPI 2 – Local Green Space</i></p> <p>The policy seeks to designate 16 local green spaces as shown on Map 3. I note that LGS9 is 'no longer included' and it is not clear why it is still mentioned in the policy and shown on Map 3.</p> <p>It would be useful if the supporting text to the policy were to explain more clearly what a local green space designation is and what it is intended to achieve. The text should also set out the qualifying criteria for LGS designation i.e. spaces that are demonstrably special to the local community.</p> <p>I note that supporting information is available in a separate document but for ease of reference it would be useful to include some further explanation in the ENP itself perhaps with a brief summary of each proposed LGS and why it is being designated.</p>	<p>There is considerable push back from residents against more business use (although EPC has been generally supportive of more local employment) so first paragraph suggested is not in accord with local wishes.</p> <p>There is local support both for some residential development on previously business only land where it supports the business (e.g. housing for workers) and for small-scale workshops within otherwise residential areas so B and C now reflect these policies which add useful flexibility in determining consent.</p> <p>A now uses the form of words you suggest for 'resisting' change of use generally.</p> <p>Reference to not using a car can be removed and reference to ENP 1D does defer the distance issue to the relevant policy as suggested here.</p> <p>Have taken the opportunity to refer to 'guidelines in ENP 1D' to further emphasise that these are guidelines to be used by the LPA and not mandatory rules.</p> <p>Map still needed to be changed but will be removed from both policy and map.</p> <p>Our approach has been to keep the ENP itself as the document which guides determination of planning consents so we have been reluctant to include much of the evidence base unless it will be helpful in guiding the LPA when making decisions.</p> <p>It isn't clear to us whom extra pages to the ENP will help in this case. There is an explanation of the purpose and process of LGS but the examiner will need to look at the full LGS pack – formulated by WODC / Cotswold DC for the purpose – rather than a summary which is only included in the ENP for completeness.</p>
---	--

I have not commented on the merits of the proposed designations as this will be a matter for the neighbourhood plan examiner to consider when the plan is formally submitted for examination.

Policy ENP13 – Trees

No specific comment.

Policy ENP14 – Sustainable Growth

The overall aim of the policy is to ensure that new development coming forward in the ENP area protects the character and community of Eynsham. This is a perfectly reasonable intention and is supported in principle.

Criteria A and B are also supported.

The remaining criteria C – G relate more specifically to strategic growth identified in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan to the west and north of Eynsham. I understand the intention of the ENP is to influence these strategic sites alongside the Council's proposed Area Action Plan (AAP) for the garden village and supplementary planning document (SPD) for West Eynsham.

There is however considerable overlap between this policy and ENP16 – New Settlements and Policy ENP17 – Strategic Development Areas.

I wonder if a more appropriate approach would be to set out the intentions/requirements of the ENP in a single policy entitled something like 'principles for strategic development or strategic growth'. This could set some specific parameters that development at the garden village and to the west of Eynsham would need to comply with as well as some more general parameters that would apply to both developments.

As an example, the policy could state something along the following lines:

'The ENP recognises and acknowledges the two strategic sites allocated to the north and west of Eynsham in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan and seeks to ensure that these proposals come forward in a timely, co-ordinated and comprehensive manner so as to minimise any potential negative impacts on Eynsham and to maximise the potential benefits to existing and new residents alike.

Key guiding principles for any development at the garden village are as follows:

A Compliance with 'garden village principles'

B Effective and safe connectivity between the new village and Eynsham

C A broad mix of housing types and tenures including opportunities for the elderly or disabled

D Timely provision of adequate facilities including a neighbourhood centre to meet the social, educational, religious and cultural needs of the community

E The provision of appropriately designed and located employment opportunities as part of or adjacent to the development

F Vehicular access designed to minimise delays to through traffic and existing road

There is a degree of hierarchy in the policies – ENP 14 is the general case, ENP 17 is the case for very large sites but which are clearly integrated / part of the existing settlements and 16 is the case for new settlements with minimal linkage to the existing settlement.

It is unfortunate that 16 and 17 are not in the natural progression but too late to change at this stage. Test has been modified to make clearer that particular policies in 17 are applicable to new settlement to minimise duplication.

The suggested form of words would probably cover the policies set out in ENP 14, 16 and 17 with appropriate supporting text to flesh out the details.

However, it is not clear if the result would be any clearer or how those matters which affect a distinct settlement (which should have most of its own facilities on-site) are to be distinguished from those which apply to an extension which will share most facilities with Eynsham while having a few key ones built on site.

It is definitely worth checking that we have included all the matters listed in the relevant policy/policies but we have had the policy format presented in the ENP validated by an independent planning examiner and are reluctant to adopt a wholesale re-write unless clear deficiencies or errors in our approach have been noted which doesn't appear to be suggested here.

users

Key guiding principles for any development to the west of Eynsham are as follows:

G Effective and safe connectivity with the existing village of Eynsham but with vehicular access through the village to be limited

H Development to conserve and/or enhance the significance of heritage assets

I Development to ensure the rural setting of the village is retained in terms of the long-term quality and stability of any new urban-countryside boundary

J The form of development to have regard to its impact on the village edge as viewed from public paths and bridleways, particularly over open fields towards the historic village centre and significant distant landscape features such as Wytham Hill.

K Due regard must be given to impact on the natural environment and safeguard existing trees, hedgerows and water-courses

L Provision of high quality greenspace in the form of a linear park

M Ensuring that development is not at risk of flooding and does not increase the risk of flooding elsewhere

Key guiding principles that will apply to both strategic sites are as follows:

NA A co-ordinated approach between development to the west and north in particular in terms of transport and the timing and delivery of key infrastructure

O Any development to ensure no harmful impact on the character and community of Eynsham

P Any development to sustain the village character which results from its walkability and its designated and non-designated heritage assets while protecting these assets and their various settings

Q Appropriate provision must be made to mitigate infrastructure constraints including the main access roads (A40, B4449, B4044) and the capacity of existing employment education and health facilities

Policy ENPI 5 – Eynsham Village Centre

No specific comment.

Policy ENPI 6 – New Settlements

See comments on ENPI 4 above.

Policy ENPI 7 – Strategic Development Areas

See comments on ENPI 4 above.

General Comments

As a general observation, I note that in some instances the supporting text to certain policies introduces additional requirements that are not referred to in the policies themselves. Two such examples are:

Paragraph 1.5 – ‘all developments subject to a masterplan should have a proportion constructed to Lifetime Homes standard or equivalent’.

Paragraph 10.1 – ‘Use of existing employment sites for general housing should

<p>higher proportion of larger homes to be justified by evidence before acceptance by the LPA or the extent to which the scale of new development should adhere to the SHMA mix. This is not in conformity with the Local Plan as adopted. We would suggest that criterion C is deleted, and criterion A is revised as follows:</p> <p><i>'A - All new residential development in the Parish will be required to provide a range of house/types to reflect the most recent Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (OSHMA) where practicable. Provision should also include support for the needs of an ageing population and those with special needs. Developers will be required to demonstrate how their proposals help in creating a more balanced housing stock both within the District and to meet the needs of a range of different groups having regard to specific local need.'</i></p> <p>Criterion B provides for the provision of affordable housing in line with Local Plan policy, however, also introduces exceptions to the District requirement in supporting paragraph 1.4. which are ambiguous and inconsistent with the Development Plan. For example, Local Plan Policy H3 confirms that 'where it can be demonstrated that the level of affordable housing being sought would make a scheme unviable, a revised mix and type of housing will be considered before a lower level of affordable housing provision is accepted'. However, criterion B of ENP1 states that exceptions to the affordable housing requirement will only be permitted where 'alternative benefit to the wider local community or that this level of affordable housing is not viable can be demonstrated'. No such exception is made in Local Plan Policy H3 and this raises a conformity issue.</p> <p>Criterion D has been amended from the previous submission draft Neighbourhood Plan and now removes reference to a specific walking distance. This additional degree of flexibility in the policy wording is welcomed and is consistent with the adopted Local Plan which does not include any such distance requirements.</p> <p>The supporting text and associated Note A and B, however, remain in the Neighbourhood Plan and seek to define and expand the 'reasonable walking distance' criteria. This includes Table 1 which identifies that an acceptable walking distance for new development is a maximum of 800m for key facilities and 1200m for other village centre facilities. A second sub-set of criteria is then provided for permitting development beyond these limits if it offers 'compensating benefits'. One such example is cited as rural exception sites which increases the reasonable waking distance thresholds to between 1000m and 2000m. Further exceptions are also identified for extra care housing and small holdings/community farms.</p> <p>Whilst the intention behind ensuring development is within a sustainable and reasonable walking distance of key village facilities is understood and to be commended, the supporting text and notes A and B lack clarity, are not</p>	<p>Policy still requires a reasonable walking distance but relegates the numbers to a table which provides clarity as to what is considered reasonable while allowing the LPAS to make the final decision on a case by case basis by balancing benefits and harms</p> <p>They seek to clarify the criteria</p>
---	--

supported in the Local Plan and, indeed, introduce further policy matters which do not provide a concise or precise framework upon which future planning applications can be considered.

ENP2 - Design

Goldfield Estates and Pandora Properties continue to support Policy ENP2 and the need for new development to be well related to, and in keeping with, its immediate setting, character and the wider village and landscape context in accordance with the requirements set out in the Development Plan. Moreover, as set out in Part G of the policy, the need for a comprehensive masterplan, to be agreed with the LPA, for allocated sites of over 100 dwellings is supported. This requirement is consistent with Local Plan Policy OS1 and in the case of the West Eynsham SDA Policy EW2.

Policy ENP2 is again supported by extensive text which includes additional requirements, exceptions and items that do not appear in the policy itself. For example, whilst criterion G requires the completion of a masterplan for schemes or site allocations of over 100 units, the supporting paragraph at 2.2 notes that the masterplan should include a viability assessment of appropriate detail showing how the infrastructure will be funded. Furthermore, whilst criterion C requires that the height of buildings should match their contextual setting, paragraph 2.7 seeks to restrict the use of three storey buildings at the edge of the village.

We recommend that Policy ENP2 and the supporting text is rationalised to be more concise and clearer on the key design principles to be sought on new development in the Neighbourhood Plan area. In looking at refining the policy, it should be recognised that specific and detailed design principles for both the Strategic Location for Growth (Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village) and the West Eynsham SDA as allocated in the Local Plan will be supported by an Area Action Plan and Supplementary Planning Document respectively.

ENP3 - Community Facilities including Infrastructure and Utilities

It is recognised that all new development puts pressure on existing services and facilities and that, where development is proposed, it is supported by the right level of infrastructure. Local Plan Policy OS5 identifies that new development will be required to deliver, or contribute, towards the timely provision of essential infrastructure.

The objective of Policy ENP 3 and the need for new development to preserve and enhance the services and facilities of the existing village is supported. The detail of the policy however is confusing, as it comprises a mix of generic principles in criterion A-F, with no definition of the term 'reasonable access', and then specific requirements in criterion G-H, for larger developments to contribute towards a community building and preschool (which the supporting text stipulates should be 300m²) or land to be made available for sports facilities,

WODC have suggested an alternative for G which has been used

It seems perfectly reasonable that the developer of a large site should explain how they are going to make sure infrastructure is provided at the appropriate time.

Reasonable access has been defined by table 1 – add note to 3.2 to say so

300 m² is 'ideal for the the activities listed'

allotments, play areas, burial ground etc.

The supporting text does not justify or evidence the basis for such specific requirements, includes more requirements than the policy and furthermore introduces at supporting paragraph 3.5 a requirement for new developments to contribute 1 allotment space per 20 houses.

The policy therefore lacks clarity, exceeds the requirements of the Local Plan and the infrastructure requirements set out in the strategic site allocation policies.

We therefore request the proposed policy wording is amended to ensure consistency with the Local Plan. It would be more appropriate for the Neighbourhood Plan to identify the key issues the local community consider need to be addressed by way of community facilities through strategic sites and set these out as recommendations rather than policy requirements. The Eynsham Infrastructure Delivery Plan, West Eynsham SPD, and the Garden Village AAP process for the strategic allocations can then be used to determine which recommendations can and should be taken forward.

ENP5 - Sustainability: Climate Change

In a change to the submission draft Neighbourhood Plan, ENP5 has been downgraded from a policy requirement to an aspiration of the Parish Council. However, the recommendation still includes the requirement for developers to provide justification where the standards set out in criterion A-F are not met. It is considered that some of the requirements set out in the recommendations are not appropriate for inclusion in the Neighbourhood Plan as they are akin to the introduction of local standards or requirements relating to the construction or performance of new dwellings.

ENP6 - Education

The provision for education facilities through new development is supported by Goldfield and Pandora and indeed supported in the Local Plan for the West Eynsham SDA. The preparation of a comprehensive masterplan for West Eynsham SDA will include provision for a new primary school in consultation with key stakeholders including Oxford County Council and the Eynsham Partnership Academy. Work to inform the masterplan and phasing of the delivery of a new educational facility will be based upon an assessment of existing educational capacity and anticipated demand for school places and facilities informed by the type and number of dwellings proposed to determine the level and location of new or additional provision.

Goldfield and Pandora note the reference in paragraph 6.8 to the information regarding expected walking distances between educational facilities and new homes identified in Note A and Table 1. The need to ensure any new educational facility is centrally located is welcomed, however, we would reiterate that any reference to distance requirements are identified as recommendations and that flexibility will be afforded in the consideration of development proposals to

changed to 'ideally' to give LPA the final decision but justification is in the text itself.

A NP should add detail specific to the locality within the general scope set by the LP. In this case 1 allotment per 20 houses is an appropriate figure for Eynsham based on current utilisation – but would not be applicable elsewhere in the District so does not appear in such detail in LP policy

It may be 'akin to' but that isn't the same as 'being the same as'. These are clearly the what EPC will aspire to achieve through discussion with developers.

It is good to see that the tone is now slightly different towards the distances which are considered acceptable as 'recommendations' but not 'requirements' with flexibility (for the LPA) in making decisions. This is exactly what the ENP is aiming for! Hopefully the amendments to the wording noted previously will

<p>assess distance parameters on a site-specific basis. Criterion B requires that any assessed education provision should be made available and ready for use prior to the first occupation of any new dwelling. Concern is raised over this onerous requirement. The delivery of a school may be outside of the control of the developer and/or the assessed need for the school may be later in a construction programme once child yield from a new development generates the demand for additional school places. We request this criterion is deleted.</p> <p>ENP7 - Sustainable Transport Goldfield and Pandora support Policy ENP7 aimed at ensuring all new development has safe access to local transport networks by private car and public transport. Detailed policy requirements are sought through a number of criteria, however, there is a lack of robust justification or evidence to support, for example, the need for restrictions through the village or the requirement for 'residential streets' to have an overarching speed limit of 20mph. This requirement is considered too rigid, restrictive and inconsistent with the Local Plan and national policy. Whilst it is noted that exceptions to the restrictions are set out in supporting text at paragraph 7.2 these are not explicit to the policy.</p> <p>ENP8 - Connected Place - Integration of New Developments within the Village Goldfield and Pandora recognise and support the importance of integrating new developments within the village. The comprehensive masterplan for the West Eynsham SDA will set out the access and movement strategy for the site to ensure that designated paths provide direct, secure and 24/7 access to the village centre, constructed to standards compatible with their purpose and have provision for ongoing maintenance.</p> <p>ENP9 - Parking The need to ensure that new development shall include appropriate parking for both residents and visitors is supported and reinforces the objectives set out in Policy T4 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan. Part D of Policy ENP 9 sets out that provision shall be made for charging of electric vehicles at each new home. Concern is raised regarding the prescriptive nature of this part of the draft policy which fails to recognise the increased cost of provision of this scale of infrastructure but, moreover, the practicalities for provision of charging points for different types and tenure of dwelling. We continue to suggest that the policy wording is amended to state:- 'In order to promote a greater role for Ultra Low Emission Vehicles, development proposals which support and encourage the use of electric vehicles will be supported'</p> <p>ENP12 - Local Green Space (LGS) Policy ENP12 continues to identify a number of areas of land proposed to be</p>	<p>prove not only acceptable but helpful in making the recommendations clear.</p> <p>The wording did allow an unintended interpretation – WODC have suggested some new wording for the policies which has been used instead.</p> <p>The policy explicitly references 7.2!</p> <p>Although developers should be looking to provide electric charging points as a plus point for their homes, the policy is intended to avoid situations where parking is provided away from any source of power or in a place where any cable would cause a hazard (across a public path for example). This is made clear by new text at 9.6 so that the 'provision' is for a suitable location not charging infrastructure and should be relatively easy to include in the initial design.</p>
--	--

designated by the Neighbourhood Plan as areas of Local Green Space (LGS). The draft policy confirms that development within any LGS shall only be permitted as part of a landscape design to enhance community enjoyment of the green space and contribute to improvement of the character, bio-diversity, appearance and overall quality or amenity value of the space.

Whilst Goldfield and Pandora are support the principle of safeguarding areas of Local Green Space and welcome the decision to remove site LGS9 (Old Railway Line) from this designation, we continue to raise concerns regarding the allocation of LGS10 (Fruitlands Wood).

LGS10 falls within the West Eynsham SDA (Local Plan Policy EW2) and it is considered premature to safeguard this area from development in advance of the preparation of a comprehensive masterplan for the site. Indeed, there is an application on LGS10 for the redevelopment of the site for 6 dwellings (LPA Ref: 16/03873). The masterplan is proposed to be developed through locally led consultation and will be informed through technical and environmental studies which will include a green infrastructure strategy. In advance of this work it is considered that the potential allocation of LGS10 would be unduly restrictive and unnecessary due to the masterplan process.

ENP13 - Trees

The revised wording for Policy ENP 13 is supported in principle to ensure the protection of existing trees and replacement planting where appropriate. Whilst there is recognition that some existing trees may not be healthy or worthy of replacement, criterion B of the policy still notes these specimens should be replaced, and practically the need to replace either on site or 'nearby' is ambiguous and in many instances likely to be out of the applicant's control. The ENP at REC 13 identifies it is the intention of the Parish to seek Tree Preservation Orders on mature trees at sites allocated as Local Green Spaces and trees located in hedgerows of fields north of the A40 and west of the village that are proposed for development in the Local Plan. It is not considered the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to demand the statutory protection of trees in these locations. Moreover, any application for development at West Eynsham SDA would be subject to a detailed arboricultural survey and impact assessment which would seek to safeguard quality trees and inform the preparation of a comprehensive masterplan.

ENP14 - Sustainable Growth

The sustainable growth of the existing village and the need to protect the character and existing community is strongly supported. Goldfield and Pandora confirm that the preparation of a comprehensive masterplan for West Eynsham SDA shall be underpinned by a series of technical and environmental studies to ensure that the relationship to the wider countryside, Chil Brook flood plain, designated heritage assets and infrastructure is fully considered.

LGS10 is exceptional in that it has protected status. The application makes clear that it only applies to the area not included in the planning application. The map will be changed so that the centre of the site is no longer green.

The ENP is the responsibility of the Parish Council and it is simply setting out the Parish Council's intention to protect trees where it considers them to be threatened. EPC will support planning applications which properly assess and responsibly manage trees but the need to resort to TPO was demonstrated by WODC's response to the threatened loss of trees on the LGS10 site mentioned above.

<p>Criterion D of Policy ENP14 states that larger allocated sites should have approved by the LPA a masterplan and associated planning brief SPD before consideration is made of an individual proposal.</p> <p>Goldfield and Pandora agree that the development of the West Eynsham SDA should be comprehensive and led by an agreed masterplan to ensure that a comprehensive infrastructure strategy is fully considered to minimise A40 congestion and have regard to the wider context for development. The need for any individual planning application to accord with the overarching principles of the agreed masterplan is also supported and consistent with Local Plan Policy EW2.</p> <p>Reference to the 'Planning Brief' in the policy wording, however, should be amended to refer where relevant to the OCGV Area Action Plan and West Eynsham Development Framework SPD.</p> <p>Goldfield and Pandora wish to highlight that individual masterplans are appropriate for the SDA and OCGV. Whilst there is recognition of the benefit for some infrastructure to be considered holistically (e.g highways, education), any need for an overarching masterplan for both sites is unnecessary and could delay the delivery of the West Eynsham SDA due to the timescales, number of stakeholders and complexity of issues the linking of these two very different sites would create.</p> <p>The supporting text for the policy is extensive and, in some instances, considered to be unrelated to the policy content. For example, paragraph 14.9 refers to the expansion south of Chilbridge Road noting it could have an adverse impact on the setting of the village and requires an expensive crossing of the Chil Brook. No justification or evidence to corroborate this statement is provided. Additionally, paragraph 14.10 notes that due to the high housing allocation made to the sub-region, a new settlement is required as a priority. The paragraph then continues to infer that one way to ensure the timely delivery of infrastructure would be to concentrate development on the new settlement.</p> <p>The requirement for phasing the delivery of housing at Eynsham is not identified in the Policy ENP14. It is furthermore not set out as part of the Neighbourhood Plan's recommendations. As such the text does not support the principles of the draft policy or follow through as a recommendation for the Council to consider further. There is no reference to the phasing of housing delivery in favour of a new settlement in the WODC Local Plan.</p> <p>Goldfield and Pandora therefore request that any reference to the phasing of housing delivery in favour of the new settlement is deleted.</p> <p>ENP16 - New Settlements</p> <p>Policy ENP16 has been revised to focus on the delivery of new settlements proposed in the Parish. This is an amendment to the previous policy which referred specifically to development to the north of the A40 and was considered</p>	<p>The note on masterplans has been amended to make clear these are not just maps but the whole development proposal package so the reference to planning brief is superfluous.</p> <p>There was previously some text that could have been interpreted as requiring one masterplan to include both sites but this has been removed as it wasn't intended.</p> <p>The need to address the common areas of transport and (secondary) education is 14C but there is no suggestion that a common masterplan is required just that both sites must do it.</p> <p>We are doing what you recommended just previously – noting the issues and in this case there is even a note that it is a matter to be resolved by the masterplan process (which is the SDA process in this case)</p> <p>Building up infrastructure is mentioned as part of ENP 16.14 but is specific to the AAP. Given that Oxford City's unmet need is now zero, the whole of 14.10 seems superfluous and can be deleted.</p>
---	--

by the Independent Examiner to be more akin to a site allocation policy. Whilst now not site specific it is recognised, however, that the policy is intended to guide development of the Oxfordshire Cotswold Garden Village or any alternative new settlement proposal that may be pursued in the future.

Whilst this more general approach is supported, there remains some confusion in the policy and text on whether such settlements will be new separate communities or integrated with Eynsham. This in turn could lead to confusion over whether this policy would apply to the development at West Eynsham. The supporting text also includes significant reference to several design principles for any new settlement which would be better incorporated into policy or, for consistency, left to be contained within the detail of the emerging Area Action Plan if they are directly related to the OCGV. Criterion A also refers directly to the proposed Garden Village rather than a new settlement.

Finally, it is noted that the recommendations set out in REC 16 do not always align with the policy in some instances. For example, the reference to heritage assets, flood zones and bio-diversity is not identified as part of the policy text at ENP16.

Goldfield and Pandora acknowledge that improving the A40 is critical to Eynsham and the whole of West Oxfordshire. Part C of Policy ENP16 and the last paragraph of REC 16 requires vehicular access for any new settlement to be designed to minimise delays to through traffic and existing users and that all new road access to developments improves or, as a minimum does not worsen traffic congestion.

The supporting text at paragraph 16.4 refers to the need to ensure that the design of junctions in new settlements prevent the slowing of through traffic. Goldfield and Pandora as landowner and promoter for land within the West Eynsham SDA is committed to working with EPC and relevant stakeholders to fully assess the transport impacts of any new development access onto the A40. Paragraph 16.5 refers directly to the A40 and notes that various options have been proposed for road expansion or rail provision by the Neighbourhood Plan group. These goals are now set out in Appendix A. The text goes onto state that it is expected that such future use be considered in the masterplan and that if there is any prospect of an alternative highways scheme coming forward during the life of the Plan the route and land is protected.

Goldfield and Pandora would comment that it is not the remit of the Neighbourhood Plan to propose or pre-judge the future improvements to the infrastructure network without evidence to support any proposed scheme. The road network is the remit of the County Council and the LTP4 Transport Schemes such as the A40 Strategy; provision of appropriate public transport service new development and the Proposed Park & Ride.

ENP17 - Strategic Development Areas

This is a bit convoluted – actually there are some elements of ENP17 which should be applicable to the AAP and this has been noted but

this is an example of the policy - note 'including provision' so it is not exclusive to a particular location.

This is addressed by cross ref to ENP17 as mentioned above.

This is another example of raising the issues, in this case a very critical example of land use.

<p>In keeping with ENP16, this policy has been revised to remove specific reference to the Local Plan site allocation at West Eynsham but refers more generically to Strategic Development Areas and general principles concerned with vehicular access, heritage assets, natural environment and community infrastructure. The supporting text to the policy does however refer to the need to carefully consider the landscaping of Chil Brook and any negative impact of major works such as river-crossings or roads, a direct reference to the West Eynsham SDA. It also goes onto reference a linear park concept and requirements for land within an SDA to be considered as a possible future burial ground. The wording and supporting text of Policy ENP17 therefore does need some further co-ordination to ensure that it is consistent with Local Plan Policy EW2.</p> <p>Whilst attempting to be a generic policy, the Neighbourhood Plan at Page 50, furthermore, includes a map which is identified as an indicative concept for a Linear Park. Whilst it does not identify the boundary of the West Eynsham SDA it does identify land to the west of the village, the possible location of a school, green space allotments, burial ground and the identification of W1 development north of Chilbridge Road. This map is unnecessary and inconsistent with the site allocation policy in the Local Plan so should be removed to avoid confusion. Goldfield and Pandora generally support the principles set out in ENP 17 to guide development of an SDA which address transport infrastructure and the need (i) for new development to principally only connect to existing main roads through limited access points and (ii) to avoid harm to heritage assets, connectivity, green infrastructure education provision and facilities.</p> <p>In terms of the supporting text, Goldfield and Pandora furthermore support the need at paragraph 17.2 to ensure that access to strategic development areas should aim to minimise adverse impact on roads around the village. The need for access proposals to be justified by traffic modelling in support of a masterplan and to encourage consolidation of existing nearby junctions to minimise delays to both through and local traffic is also welcomed.</p> <p>Whilst not included in Policy ENP17, the Neighbourhood Plan includes a series of specific recommendations at REC 17 which seek to identify local aspirations for the development of an SDA. Recommendation A refers to the need for phasing in connection with the development of two large scale developments taking place at the same time. The WOLP does not include any restriction on the phasing of site allocations in Eynsham and it is inconsistent for the Neighbourhood Plan to propose recommendations to this effect. Goldfield and Pandora object to any statement which refers to the potential for phasing the delivery of development at Eynsham in favour of a new settlement as alluded to in ENP16.</p> <p>Recommendation B seeks to ensure that large scale development is planned alongside any other construction activity with regards to major infrastructure and</p>	<p>It refers to SDA scale developments</p> <p>The only 'locational' reference is in 17.8 where the Chil Brook is used as an example of a significant water-course.</p> <p>Text following 17.13 make clear that REC17 includes PC aspirations that will guide their 'collaborative engagement' and includes the Linear Park concept (taken from the SDA issues paper) as one example. The map will be removed as it contains too many contentious details and isn't really necessary</p> <p>EPC does consider that phasing should be looked at as much for the difficulties that would be caused to developers as to residents. There is nothing that indicates favouring either of the large developments – there was in the introduction and in 14.10 but these have been removed now that the local plan is adopted.</p>
---	--

highways to maximise the mutual benefit of both developments. The recommendation identifies the A40 as an obvious area of potential conflict and one where there is a need to minimise junctions and consequent traffic delays should construction occur to the north and south without co-ordinating access points.

Goldfield and Pandora acknowledge and support the need for the access to any large-scale development proposal to have due regard to the impact on the A40. In the current absence of receipt of the traffic model from Oxford County Council, and as a result, detailed transport assessment and modelling of all access options to the north and south of the A40 it is important that the policy retains necessary flexibility to appropriately and comprehensively consider all access options when junctions to main roads are proposed.

Recommendations H and I are intrinsically linked to the West Eynsham SDA and seek to restrict development of the SDA south of the Chil Brook and questions the need for the creation of a link road from the A40 to the western extent of the village. No evidence is provided to support this recommendation and the content does not align with Local Plan Policy EW2. We have concerns that this effectively pre-judges the outcome of the future Supplementary Planning Document. The SPD process for any SDA is a more appropriate framework upon which to determine the key principles that can and should be taken forward.

Appendix A - Major Infrastructure Goals

This new appendix sets out the Parish Council's recommendations or intentions for planned major infrastructure within Eynsham, notably the Park and Ride and A40 bus lanes. The recommendations recognise the need for (i) developer funding for improvement of access to/from the A40, (ii) employment and the Park & Ride, (iii) air and noise pollution adjacent to the A40 to be monitored, (iv) enough safe and well-designed paths crossing busy roads and (v) consideration of the impact of new 'infrastructure' buildings on the landscape.

Paragraph A3 confirms that the Parish Council will seek to encourage rationalisation of the junctions on the A40 associated with residential, business and the Park & Ride development as part of the masterplan or AAP process. We understand that an application for the Park & Ride is due to be submitted next year and therefore is likely to precede the making of the Neighbourhood Plan or any forthcoming planning applications at either the Garden Village or SDA. To support the intentions of the Parish it will therefore be important to ensure that any application for the Park & Ride junction onto the A40 does not preclude the ability to deliver an access from this junction into the SDA at a future date. Goldfield and Pandora therefore support the recommendation in Appendix A to ensure that as part of the ongoing work in connection with the preparation of the AAP and SPD an open dialogue is maintained between key stakeholders including the Parish, OCC and WODC to ensure that the goals and aspirations for

Unfortunately that is outside the ENP remit, much as we sympathise.

The text now makes clear the concern relates to a bypass style road rather than a through road in general which is part of the adopted local plan.

Outside of the NP itself, EPC continues to lobby OCC for rationalisation of junctions, including the minimisation of anything that impedes traffic flow.

major infrastructure are considered, underpinned by technical evidence and used to determine those matters that can and should be taken forward in the development of a new settlement and the SDA.	
---	--

CF no. 63. Environment Agency	
<p>Thank you for consulting the Environment Agency on your draft plan for Reg 14 consultation for the Eynsham neighbourhood plan. We regret that at present, the Thames Area Sustainable Places team is unable to review this consultation. This is due to resourcing issues within the team, a high development management workload and an increasing volume of neighbourhood planning consultations. We have had to prioritise our limited resource, and must focus on influencing plans where the environmental risks and opportunities are highest. For the purposes of neighbourhood planning, we have assessed those authorities who have “up to date” local plans (plans adopted since 2012, or which have been confirmed as being compliant with the National Planning Policy Framework) as being of lower risk. We understand that the West Oxfordshire local plan was adopted in September 2018. At this time, therefore, we are unable to make any detailed input on neighbourhood plans being prepared within this local authority area.</p>	

<p>After the previous comments were included in an updated version of the ENP, WODC were asked if there were any remaining issues which caused them concern as we look to them to support the ENP which we want to be helpful as they implement the Local Plan which features so much development in the Neighbourhood Area. This is WODC's response</p>	
<p>I've been through your revised plan and my informal comments are attached. I'm pleased to see you've taken on board a number of comments I made previously and a large number of the policies read well.</p> <p>There are some issues I remain particularly concerned about however including:</p> <p>The concept of requiring a masterplan for all larger schemes of 100 or more dwellings. Whilst I understand the sentiment, the fact is the Local Plan requires West Eynsham to be led by a masterplan and the garden village by the AAP. I am therefore not quite sure what the NDP is seeking to achieve with this requirement. Is it aimed towards other speculative</p>	<p>The Neighbourhood Plan has had to do a lot of catch-up as the allocation of houses to the Neighbourhood Area rose from 250 to 3200 and there are parts of the plan which would have been written rather differently if the allocation was that large at the start. None the less the ENP is coherent and there is a definition of the masterplan concept with most subsequent mentions referenced back to</p>

schemes on non-allocated sites? There is also some inconsistency and overlap about this issue throughout the plan which is a little hard to follow. If you want all schemes of more than 100 dwellings to be accompanied by a masterplan this should be stated once (e.g. in the design or housing policy) with a brief explanation/justification in the supporting text. It doesn't then need to be repeated throughout the plan.

The use of set distances to facilities e.g. convenience retailing. Again I understand the idea behind this which is essentially to ensure new development is sustainably located in terms of walking and cycling. Perfectly good idea and consistent with national and local policy. However, the use of set distances (albeit now with a degree more flexibility) I think is simply too prescriptive.

Policies ENP14, 16 and 17. I still think there is a lot of overlap here and the policies should be combined into one as per my previous suggestion. Alternatively, at most two policies, one for the garden village and one for west Eynsham. The policy/policies should then set out the key aims/aspirations and requirements for each site but not be too prescriptive. A simple example of this is the current requirement for a green buffer at the garden village. That is the sort of issue that the AAP will address based on evidence including landscape and heritage impact assessments. I personally don't think the NDP can be getting to that level of detail unless there is robust evidence to back it up.

As always these are only my opinions and you do have the advice from IPE which you may be content to rely on. As the plan stands however, I would have to raise the concerns outlined above if I was responding to the Reg 16 final version of the plan.

I hope my comments are helpful and I'm happy of course to discuss further in the new year.

it. It can be argued that emphasis on masterplans to ensure proper co-ordination across larger sites is less relevant given that most development will take place on an SDA or AAP site but the masterplan is seen as an important mechanism for capturing important local matters at the design stage and ensuring they are implemented during development.

It is a matter of professional judgement whether numerical guidelines are a helpful clarification or simply inappropriate in a NP. On balance, we have opted for clarity appropriate to our 'compact' village.

The comment against the first paragraph is entirely applicable here.

This seems fair enough and we don't see these as more than a reasonable difference of approach.

It is noted that many elements of the ENP have found their way into SDA and AAP Issues papers which is exactly as it should be and bodes well for close working between Parish and District as these developments are implemented.