

# 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 5<sup>th</sup>.

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><b>Date: 27/08/2016; ENP draft 0.9</b></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&amp;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.	<b>Date: 02/09/2016 – draft of v1.0 submitted for proof-reading</b>
<b>02 The village</b> 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"> <li>• p.3 para 1 should add that Eynsham was founded in the 11<sup>th</sup> Century and grew during medieval times up to the present day.</li> <li>• P3 para 3 photo of the scene described could be added here.</li> <li>• P3 para 4 add date of Toll bridge construction</li> <li>• P3 para 4 there is some dualling of A40 between Witney and Eynsham – could say ‘remains largely single carriageway’</li> <li>• P4, para 3 add photo of this view</li> <li>• P4, para 4 link reference to classic medieval town to Eynsham’s own earlier and medieval development</li> <li>• 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 11<sup>th</sup> century - 1914</li> </ul>	<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><b>04 Policies</b></p> <p>p6 1.1 <b>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.</b> 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><b>Date: 02/09/2016. ENP v1.0 dated 09/08/2016 – confidentially pre-released to WODC for their comments before publication</b></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><b>CF no. 4.</b></p>	<p><b>Date: 14/09/2016 - ENP v1.0</b></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>John additionally requests that the following statement be added to ENP6.7:</p> <p><b>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.</b></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><b>CF no. 5.</b></p>	<p><b>Date: 16/09/2016 - older version ENP v0.8 dated 02/06/2016</b></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!
<b>CF no. 6.</b>	<b>Date: 16/09/2016 - ENP v0.8 dated 02/06/2016</b>
Multiple comments supplied as marked-up version of the ENP	<i>Actioned where practical</i>
<b>CF no. 7.</b>	<b>Date: 19/09/2016 - ENP v1.0</b>
<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>
<b>CF no. 8.</b>	<b>Date: 25/09/2016 - ENP v1.0</b>
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.	
------------------------------------	--

<b>CF no. 9.</b>	<b>Date: 12/10/2016 - ENP v1.0, Vision and ENP 1</b>
<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>

<b>CF no. 10.</b>	<b>Date: 12/10/2016 - ENP v1.0, ENP10, ENP16, SA3</b>
<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 (&lt; 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&amp;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><b>Date: 25/09/2016 - ENP v1.0 (ENP17)</b></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><b>Date: 21/11/2016 - ENP v1.0 (ENP16)</b></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"> <li>• Integration with the existing communities, in particular Eynsham village</li> <li>• Vehicular access to any development north of the A40 shall only be made using existing junctions on the A40.</li> <li>• Planning decisions for one side of the A40 shall not be made without due consideration of the impact on residents on the other side.</li> <li>• linkage to the existing and planned extensions to the fixed public transport network or Park and Ride facilities;</li> <li>• Make provision for the re-alignment of the A40 as indicated on Diagram X</li> <li>• Creation and management of interconnected green-spaces and where necessary the enhancement of the adjacent Green Belt;</li> <li>• The long-term quality and stability of any new urban boundary;</li> <li>• Associated infrastructure improvements and flood management requirements;</li> <li>• Green transport. links (including walking, cycling and public transport) to employment areas and village centres;</li> <li>• In particular, safe and direct crossing places of the A40 shall be provided for students required to attend Bartholomew School before development begins.</li> <li>• A wide range of mixed uses and housing types, tenures and choice;</li> <li>• Delivering high design standards in the built environment and urban form;</li> <li>• Provision of adequate social and community facilities, including educational, religious and cultural, and, if necessary a neighbourhood centre</li> </ul>	
---	--

<p>CF no. 13.</p>	<p><b>Date: 04/12/2016 - ENP v1.0 (ENP17)</b></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><b>Section 2 – Eynsham as a community</b></p> <p>Add to first paragraph that Eynsham residents value the ‘rural feel’ and ‘community spirit’</p> <p><b>ENP1</b> 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>
---	---

recently) BOB/44 Sustainable Transformation Plans.

**ENP4** Include

Policy A – importance of open countryside south of GV and north of Eynsham

**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

**ENP6** Include

Policy box intro - Necessary new school facilities will be built **before or in parallel with** houses are built

**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’

Recommendation – A40 has to be improved before any new large developments take place to prevent traffic gridlock and increase in air pollution

**ENP8** include

8.1 Replace ‘segregated’ with ‘separated’

**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

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

Community Energy generation supported in ENP5.6

Rain-water harvesting will be added to ENP5.7

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

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.

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)

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

'segregation' is the term used in this context See [SUSTRANS](#) article.

Imposing restricted or resident parking is not a matter for the NP

It is fully covered in ENP9 recommendations A and B.

<p><b>ENP10</b> 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><b>ENP11</b> 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><b>ENP14</b> 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><b>Date: Dec 2016 - ENP v1.1 .</b></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><b>Date 06/12/2016 v1.0?</b></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	
CF no. 17.	
<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 metric<sup>1</sup> and the environment bank biodiversity impact calculator<sup>2</sup>.</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><b>Policy ENP4 Green Infrastructure – creating a setting for new developments.</b></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><b>Policy ENP5 Sustainability: Climate Change</b></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><b>Policy ENP9 Parking</b></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><b>ENP17 Development of a western extension to the village.</b></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"> <li>· Providing a new footpath with landscaping through the new development to link into existing rights of way or other green spaces.</li> <li>· Restoring a neglected hedgerow or create new ones.</li> <li>· 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.</li> </ul>	<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"> <li>· Using native plants in landscaping schemes for better nectar and seed sources for bees and birds.</li> <li>· Incorporating swift boxes or bat boxes into the design of new buildings.</li> <li>· Think about how lighting can be best managed to encourage wildlife.</li> <li>· Adding a green roof to new buildings.</li> </ul> <p>You may also want to consider enhancing your local area in other ways, for example by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· 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.</li> <li>· Assessing needs for accessible green space and setting out proposals to address any deficiencies or enhance provision.</li> <li>· Identifying green areas of particular importance for special protection through Local Green Space designation (see <a href="#">Planning Practice Guidance on this</a>).</li> <li>· 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).</li> <li>· Planting additional street trees.</li> <li>· 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.</li> <li>· Restoring neglected environmental features (e.g. coppicing a prominent hedge that is in poor condition or clearing away an eyesore).</li> </ul>	<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 <b>does</b> include the potential OCGV Site.</p> <p>Current wording is correct – by not specifying any range of sizes it applies to <b>all</b> 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>ENP2 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>ENP3: 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>ENP4. 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>ENP5: 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 <b><i>schools, employment and other</i></b> facilities <b><i>without the use of a private car.</i></b>” 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 <b><i>phrases</i></b> but they do want to see the <b><i>issue</i></b> 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 &amp; 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"> <li>• The developments demand for water supply and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met</li> <li>• The developments demand for Sewage Treatment and network infrastructure both on and off site and can it be met</li> <li>• The surface water drainage requirements and flood risk of the development both on and off site and can it be met</li> </ul> <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 &amp; 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 &amp; 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"> <li>substantial flood risk, not mentioned in the EOI (see Environment Agency online flood risk map, which is reinforced by local knowledge);</li> <li>destruction of existing business and employment (notably a David Einig Contracting site, in which substantial amounts of money have been invested);</li> <li>destruction of nationally and internationally important habitat and wildlife (“Site of European Importance” for rare plants, for example);</li> <li>prevention of extraction of gravel between the southern end of Lower Road and the westward A40;</li> <li>interference with the setting of Grade II listed buildings</li> </ul> <p><b>Page 5:</b> ". . . 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><b>Page 6 ENV4:</b> "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><b>ENV5:</b> "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><b>ENV8:</b> ". . . 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><b>Page 7 1.4:</b> ". . the WODC target of 50% affordable housing shall be adhered to."  <b>Comment.</b> Wishful thinking? Developers will undoubtedly put pressure on the council to reduce the allocation.</p> <p><b>Page 10 ENP2 Design A:</b> 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><b>3.1:</b> "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." <b>Comment:</b> Is this a realistic demand, and does it also apply to existing inhabitants?</p> <p><b>3.5</b> "Allotments shall have a water supply on-site . . ."  <b>Comment:</b> More water stress?</p> <p><b>3.7</b> "A new village burial ground is urgently required." <b>Comment:</b> 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><b>4.1</b> Re: a 'green' setting for the Village: "It should also be recognised that increasing biodiversity is a good thing . . ." <b>Comment:</b> 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><b>5.7</b> "Electric vehicles . . ." <b>Comment:</b> 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><b>6.8</b> "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><b>Comment 1:</b> I thought the pupils were all supposed to be walking to school.</p> <p><b>Comment 2:</b> 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><b>Comment 3:</b> This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing.</p> <p><b>7.3</b> "Heavy construction traffic causes more distress to residents than private cars." <b>Comment:</b> 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><b>7.4</b> "Any new Link Roads between main routes . . . should . . . be provided with a combined cycleway and pedestrian path along its full length." <b>Comment:</b> 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 . . ." <b>Comment:</b> The new residents will love this (as will the existing ones). Alzheimer's here we come.</p> <p><b>10.2</b> "Some employment land has remained unsold or unlet for a considerable period, often because an unreasonable price has been placed on it."</p> <p><b>Comment 1:</b> 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><b>Comment 2:</b> Why would prices go down if demand is going to go up?</p> <p><b>ENP 11 C Retail:</b> "Redevelopment of the Spar site to improve both retail and housing provision will be supported." <b>Comment:</b> 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 <b>not</b> 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><b>14.13</b> “Science Park . . . would be in full accord with Eynsham’s aspiration to become part of the Oxford Knowledge Spine”. <b>Comment:</b> 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><b>15.3</b> “Parking is a problem in Eynsham.” <b>Comment:</b> 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><b>ENP16 North of the A40 A</b> “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><b>Comment:</b> So not so separate after all.</p> <p>ENP16 B “. . . provision of landscape separation”. <b>Comment:</b> This will reduce the area for Garden Village housing.</p> <p><b>Page 30</b> “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><b>Comment:</b> 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><b>16.3</b> “The A40 . . . should not have extra junctions, roundabouts or traffic lights to slow down this arterial route . . .” <b>Comment:</b> 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?

**SA3.6** “Landowners . . . would have to sell at well below free-market rates (as

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>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. <b>Comment:</b> 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><b>A Vision for Eynsham 2031</b> 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 <b>ENV2 – Design</b> 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 <b>ENV6 – Economy; industry, commerce, and retail</b>, 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 <b>ENV8 – a new Garden Village style settlement</b> 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><b>Draft Neighbourhood Plan policies</b>  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.</p> <p><b>Policy ENP1 – Housing</b> Please see correspondence dated 28th October 2016.  <b>Policy ENP2 – Design</b> Please see correspondence dated 28th October 2016.  <b>Policy ENP3 – Community Facilities</b> 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 locally. Whilst the consortium supports the principle of a mutually beneficial</p>	<p>EFSG's approach to being 'too prescriptive' is already explained in FAQ Appendix</p> <p><b>Q. Why have so many policies which are prescriptive; what about market-forces?</b></p> <p><b>A</b> 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.</p> <p>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. <b>But we also include:</b></p> <p><b>Q. Why do you include 'get-outs' like the 'except where...' comments?</b></p> <p><b>A.</b> 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.</p> <p>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 this unusual situation of co-location by sharing some facilities where this is mutually</p>
---	---

<p>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><b>Policy ENP3a – Health Care Facilities</b> 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><b>Policy ENP6 – Education</b> The consortium agrees with the principle of contributing to the expansion or new building of educational facilities. Nevertheless criterion A &amp; 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><b>Policy EN14 - Sustainable Growth</b> 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><b>Policy EN16 – North of the A40</b> The consortium supports Policy ENP16 in its safeguarding of the area north of the A40 for at least 2200 residential units and</p>	<p>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>
---	---



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 Council.

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>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 appears AFTER the box finishes</p>	<p>Formatting will have to be checked after edit is finished</p>

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.

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 represented on the ENP team but the responsibility for ensuring education

Agreed, section amended

<p>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 input as Highway Authority.</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>
---	--

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'



<p>CF no. 24.</p> <p><i>1.7 Development should be within reasonable walking distance of the Village Centre (see Note B), to ensure the village feel is retained.</i></p> <p>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.</p> <p>Additionally - a larger development could provide self-supporting infrastructure and not be solely reliant on existing services.</p> <p><i>Definition of 'Paths' box following ENP1</i> - 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.</p> <p><b>ENP5D</b> 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.”</p> <p><b>ENP7A:</b> 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.</p> <p>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.”</p> <p><b>ENP 7B:</b> 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.</p> <p><b>ENP7.4:</b> Need to carefully consider the function of new roads which helps</p>	<p>ENP1.9, 10 and 11 provide flexibility in this policy. 1.7 added '<i>normally</i>' 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.</p> <p>Note B makes it clear that a new 'centre' creates a new set of rules but with similar dimensions to achieve 'village' proportions</p> <p>removed upgraded “<i>to bridleway</i>” to prevent this anomaly.</p> <p>Change policy wording; ENP5.7 now says 'of at least 7kW (=32A @ 230V) capacity' and reference NPPF 35.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Emergency access is definitely required (and would be provided through Chilbridge Road for any western development).</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Note will be made of OCC LTP4 as the mechanism for ensuring implementation of the policy</p> <p>Helpful suggestion to improve wording, Manual for Streets was in ENP7.5 but now added to policy ENP7B</p>
---	--

<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><b>ENP9.7:</b> 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><b>ENP14D:</b> 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><b>ENP14.7:</b> 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><b>ENP14C:</b> 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><b>ENP15F:</b> 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><b>ENP16:</b> 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><b>ENP16B:</b> It may be helpful to be more specific about what specific types of impacts this policy is aiming to address.</p> <p><b>ENP16.4 :</b> Extensive traffic modelling will be required to establish the highway measures to serve new developments, including access arrangements that are appropriate.</p> <p><b>ENP16.6:</b> 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:  <a href="https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20064/conservation/876/oxford_views_study">https://www.oxford.gov.uk/info/20064/conservation/876/oxford_views_study</a></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 &amp; 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"> <li>• 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)</li> <li>• 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)</li> </ul>	<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>
--	--

- 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)

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.

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.

**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.

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

This has been explicitly mentioned in the justification for walkability of new developments

Lifetime homes are included in ENP1 although without the explicit reasoning suggested here

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.

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>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><b>CF no. 27. OxLEP</b></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"> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> <li>• 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;</li> </ul>	
---	--

<p><b>CF no. 28. Environment Agency</b></p> <p>Flood Zones 2 &amp; 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><b>Main Rivers</b> 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><b>Eynsham Garden Village</b> We would welcome opportunities for early engagement with regards to the Eynsham Garden Village proposals.</p> <p><b>Neighbourhood Planning Advice</b> 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><a href="http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf">http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20140328084622/http://cdn.environment-agency.gov.uk/LIT_6524_7da381.pdf</a></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><b>2.1 Map 1</b> – ‘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><b>Policies ENP1 and ENP8</b>, 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.

**CONCLUSION**

4.1 Berkeley welcomes the EFSG’s recognition that the land west of Eynsham is suitable for a strategic allocation.

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.

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

While we clearly disagree about numbers, we are putting forward what we are sure can be delivered.

We look forward to working with Berkeley to make these fine words, with which we agree, a reality!

**CF no. 30.**

**Policy ENP1 - Housing**

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.

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.

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

This is a valid point which will improve the flexibility but not dilute the ENP.

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.

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 25<sup>th</sup> 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 Plan<sup>1</sup> 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 Report<sup>2</sup> 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 Report<sup>3</sup> 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 Report<sup>4</sup> 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><b>Garden Village Proposals</b></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><b>Policy ENP1 - Criterion D</b> 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"> <li>• ENP16 'North of the A40';</li> <li>• ENP17 'Development of a western extension to the village'; and</li> </ul>	No changes are requested.

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ENP14 'Sustainable Growth'.</li> </ul> <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 <b>at the same time</b>.</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.	
<p>CF no. 37.</p> <p>I agree with two of your "important points"</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• not building south of Chilbridge Road (plenty of people walk there regularly and building on it is likely to increase flood risk)</li> <li>• planning for Eynsham, Tilgarsly, Barnard Gate and the A40 should be considered together (isn't that the point of having a plan?)</li> </ul> <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>
<p>CF no. 38.</p> <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"> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• 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.</li> <li>• Given the parameters described by OCC and WODC I am in broad agreement with the content and direction of the draft Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan.</li> <li>• I support the proposals for the 15 Local Green Spaces indicated in the draft Neighbourhood Plan</li> <li>• 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</li> </ul>	<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:  <a href="http://www.rics.org/uk/join/member-accreditations-list/dispute-resolution-service/drs-products/neighbourhood-planning-independent-examiner-referral-service-npiers/">http://www.rics.org/uk/join/member-accreditations-list/dispute-resolution-service/drs-products/neighbourhood-planning-independent-examiner-referral-service-npiers/</a></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><b>CF no. 46. Dovehouse Close residents petition</b></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"> <li>1) preserve the Play Area and Green Space</li> <li>2) protect the Trees along the whole of the northern boundary of the School site</li> <li>3) there should be no traffic to the former School site through Dovehouse Close.</li> </ol>	<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 <a href="https://admin.eynsham.org.uk/variable/organisation/173/attachments/LGS-4-checklist.pdf">https://admin.eynsham.org.uk/variable/organisation/173/attachments/LGS-4-checklist.pdf</a>.</p>

## List of Respondents

ID number	Name	Address	e-mail	
CF no. 1.	Sarah Couch	74 Acre End Street.		
CF no. 2.	Angie Titchen			
CF no. 3.	WODC			
CF no. 4.	Prof. John Dowling			
CF no. 5.	Oxfordshire County Council –	Amanda Jacobs e-mail covering note to a comprehensive review of ENP		
CF no. 6.	Oxfordshire County Council	Amanda Jacob & others		
CF no. 7.	Judith Luna (edited)			
CF no. 8.	Richard Andrews	EFSG		
CF no. 9.	Nick and Kirstie Hutton	5 Orchard Close		883706
CF no. 10.	Nigel Pearce	1 City Farm, Eynsham, OX29 4YA	barnrocks@yahoo.co.uk	880442
CF no. 11.	Ian Dunstall	39 Witney Road	Ian.dunstall@btinternet.com	
CF no. 12.	Vincent Goodstadt			
CF no. 13.	Angie Titchen	84 Evans Road, Eynsham, OX29 4QS	<a href="mailto:a.titchen@ulster.ac.uk">a.titchen@ulster.ac.uk</a>	
CF no. 14.	Sarah Couch	74 Acre End Street.		
CF no. 15.	Neil Bailey	49 Hazeldene Close, Eynsham OX29 4AD	<a href="mailto:nbailey@earthwatch.org.uk">nbailey@earthwatch.org.uk</a>	
CF no. 16.	Larry Poole			
CF no. 17.	Natural England			
CF no. 18.	Summary of public feedback.	From 80+ responses collected at 5 <sup>th</sup> October 2016 public consultation open day.	Summarised by Angie Tichen, Nina Turner, Sandy Hellig for EFSG.	
CF no. 19.	Thames Water			

CF no. 20.	Nigel Pearce	City Farm		
CF no. 21.	Savills	Representing OCGV consortium		
CF no. 22.	<b>Cllr. Peter Emery</b>			
CF no. 23.	OCC.	Education and Archaeology		
CF no. 24.	OCC Transport.			
CF no. 25.	Historic England			
CF no. 26.	OCC Public Health.			
CF no. 27.	OxLEP			
CF no. 28.	Environment Agency			
CF no. 29.	Berkeley Strategic Land			
CF no. 30.	Gladman Developments			
CF no. 31.	OCC Property			
CF no. 32.	Oxford City Council			
CF no. 33.	Jansons/Goldfield Estates			
CF no. 34.	Denise McKemey		<a href="mailto:dkmckemey@hotmail.co.uk">&lt;dkmckemey@hotmail.co.uk&gt;</a>	
CF no. 35.	Cesca Maurice Williams		<a href="mailto:cescamw@gmail.com">&lt;cescamw@gmail.com&gt;</a>	
CF no. 36.	Carl Tysom	Old Witney Road	<a href="mailto:ctysom@googlemail.com">&lt;ctysom@googlemail.com&gt;</a>	
CF no. 37.	Nick Goodwin	56 Acre End Street		
CF no. 38.	Tony Bovey		<a href="mailto:tony.bovey48@gmail.com">&lt;tony.bovey48@gmail.com&gt;</a>	
CF no. 39.	Martin Groves		<a href="mailto:drmaringroves@gmail.com">drmaringroves@gmail.com</a>	

CF no. 40.	Anna Colyer	Hollybush House, Station Road	annaonleave@gmail.com	
CF no. 41.	WODC			
CF no. 42.	Cllr Charles Mathew	On behalf of Stanton Harcourt PC		
CF no. 43.	Historic England	Consultation on SA Scoping report		
CF no. 44.	Natural England	Consultation on SA Scoping report		
CF no. 45.	Environment Agency	Consultation on SA Scoping report		
CF no. 46.	Dovehouse Close residents	Petition – c/o Prof. John Dowling	dowling126@yahoo.co.uk	