

## **Eynsham Liaison Meeting – 2pm, Tuesday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2018.**

**Venue – WODC Elmfield Rooms 1 and 2**

### **Meeting Note:**

Attendees:

- Cllr Jeff Haine (JH) - WODC
- Astrid Harvey (AH) – WODC
- Cllr Peter Kelland (PK) – WODC
- Cllr Charles Mathew (CM) – OCC
- Cllr Richard Andrews (RA) – EPC
- Cllr Gordon Beech (GB) – EPC
- Cllr Dennis Stukenbroeker (DS) – EPC

### **Apologies:**

- Odele Parsons (OCC)
- Giles Hughes (WODC)
- Chris Hargraves (WODC)

### **Review minutes of Eynsham Liaison Meeting of 4<sup>th</sup> April 2018**

The minutes of the last meeting were noted as received. All detailed issues arising from a review of the minutes were noted as being addressed through the agenda of this meeting.

### **Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan**

The paper to Cabinet recommending that the Council accept the Independent Examiner's recommendation that Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan should not proceed to referendum was received and the Parish Council noted that it did not disagree with the recommendation.

RA reported that he has undertaken significant work on redrafting ENP in response to the findings of the Independent Examination and expressed an intent to seek consultant expertise to assist in finalising ENP to give it the best chance at re-examination of meeting the Basic Conditions as set out in the Regulations and being recommended for proceeding for referendum.

AH agreed that there would be merit in accessing Locality funding to finance an impartial expert to review the plan and assist in ensuring that the re-draft has comprehensively responded to the examiners recommendations. AH agreed to source contact details for Intelligent Plans – a group of former Planning Inspectors established to provide Neighbourhood Planning support and examiner services.

JH noted that the imminent adoption of the Local Plan 2011-2031 would also provide greater certainty for informing a re-examination of ENP and that this would negate the risk of any negative assessment of ENP's conformity with EU environmental regulations as ENP would be able to rely on the assessments for these of the Local Plan once it is adopted.

## **A40 Update**

The group noted receipt of a written update from Odele Parsons of 5<sup>th</sup> June on the design and business case for the A40 Science Transit Scheme. GB reiterated his concern that the outline business case has been delayed a further three months. CM advised that he will be attending a meeting on 21<sup>st</sup> June to discuss preliminary plans/design specifications for the proposed Park and Ride at Eynsham and for the bus lane.

The update note is attached at Appendix A.

## **North Eynsham Development (Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village) - Draft Area Action Plan Issues and Options Paper**

GB expressed disquiet that the 4 page AAP summary sent to EPC for comment had evolved into the 80 page Issues and Options Paper being heard at Cabinet on 13<sup>th</sup> June for approval to be put out for public consultation. He asked that future iterations of the full AAP be given to EPC to provide the greatest opportunity for input.

RA noted that EPC was not in full agreement with the content of the Issues and Options Paper but welcomed the opportunity to input and recognised that this was the earliest stage in the development of the AAP. He noted that further scrutiny needed to be given to secondary education, medical services, cemetery provision, archaeology, permeability across the A40 between the OCVG and Eynsham village. He welcomed the focus on timely and local construction and encouraged WODC to be creative and imaginative in considering the potential of the Garden Village. JH confirmed that a note from OCC elaborating on education and health matters in the Issues and Option Paper had been received and that this had been attached to the relevant Cabinet Paper and published. The note is attached at Appendix B.

RA & GB raised concern at the 4 week consultation period assigned to the Issues and Options Paper and sought an extension to the deadline for comments. The Parish Council would like to encourage public participation in the consultation. AH agreed to seek details from Planning Policy as the programme of consultation for the AAP Issues and Options Paper. JH agreed to consider an extension for the consultation from 4 weeks to 6 weeks.

## **West Eynsham Development Update**

GB enquired as to whether any further meetings between WODC and the West Eynsham site promoted had occurred since the last Strategic Development Liaison. As the relevant Officer, Chris Hargraves had given apologies for the meeting, this query could not be answered.

GB requested sight of the timetable for the development framework supplementary planning document (SPD) that will set out the key parameters within which development to the west of Eynsham must be brought forward. This timetable is attached at Appendice C

## **Polar Ventures**

GB acknowledged receipt of email exchanges in respect of the Polar application and associated footpath diversion, which included a note from Eynsham Parish Council suggesting an approach

which would make the diversion of the footpath less contentious. GB requested that a question be put to Planning as to why the Parish Council's suggestion was not passed onto Polar Ventures.

**Any Other Business**

None.

**Date of next Eynsham Liaison Meeting**

A date in September to be agreed unless the need arises for an earlier discussion. WODC to confirm final date.

## **Eynsham Liaison Meeting – 12 June 2018**

### **OCC A40 Science Transit Scheme Update – written 5 June 2017**

#### **Design update**

We are awaiting updated designs for the Eynsham park and ride site, and A40 bus priority lanes. Engagement sessions will be set up with Members and key stakeholders to talk through the designs. Sessions are likely to be late June/early July. This period of engagement will not involve public consultation.

#### **Business Case Update**

We previously reported the scheme Outline Business Case would be submitted to the Department for Transport in June 2018. The work to complete sections of the economic case have taken longer than originally programmed due to the level of detail we wish to submit for the economic, environmental, and societal appraisals, which form key elements of the case.

The revised programme aims to submit the outline business case in September 2018.

## **ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX TO AGENDA ITEM NO. 6, RELATING TO PARAGRAPHS 6.183 TO 6.194**

### **Education, health care and other community infrastructure**

- 6.183 The AAP has a key role to play in ensuring that appropriate education and health care facilities are provided as well as other wider 'community' or 'social' infrastructure such as community space, sports and recreation facilities, libraries etc.
- 6.184 In terms of primary education, we know from early discussions with Oxfordshire County Council that the nearest existing primary school in Eynsham is essentially 'at capacity' [taking into account already permitted housing](#) and that the increase in children associated with the proposed garden village and also the planned extension to the west of Eynsham, means that additional primary spaces will need to be made available. The mix of housing will influence the resulting pupil generation from the developments, a number of other factors, such as the need for pupil places generated from other smaller developments in the Eynsham area will also influence how education is provided.
- 6.185 There are a number of ways in which this can be achieved but the County Council's initial view is that the garden village (subject to further evidence) may be required as a maximum to accommodate two new primary schools each with [up to](#) two forms of entry (including nursery provision). This represents an optimal school size and would provide sufficient capacity to absorb the additional pupil numbers generated by the development. It would also help to reduce the distance some pupils would need to travel, compared to a single, larger primary school. [This will need to be reviewed once the population estimates are confirmed. If no more than three forms of entry in capacity will be required in total, there could be an option to have one three-form entry school instead of one or both of the schools being smaller than two form entry.](#)
- 6.186 In terms of secondary education, again we know from early discussions with the County Council that the level of planned growth at Eynsham will exceed available capacity at the nearest secondary school - Bartholomew School.
- 6.187 The garden village provides an opportunity to deliver additional capacity with one option being the provision of an [additional site for the school – perhaps for a](#) separate sixth form facility which would release additional capacity/space at the existing school site to expand from 7 forms of entry (around 210 pupils per year) to 9 forms of entry (around 270 pupils per year).
- 6.188 Further discussions will take place between key stakeholders as part of the AAP process to determine the most appropriate primary and secondary school solutions including any detailed site requirements. Secondary provision (type and location) in particular needs to be considered in light of planned strategic growth to the west of Eynsham.
- 6.189 In addition to the provision of adequate school places, the development of the garden village will need to ensure there is enough capacity available in terms of primary healthcare provision. There is an established medical centre in Eynsham which has a branch surgery at Long Hanborough. As of 1<sup>st</sup> January 2018 the list size of the two surgeries was 13,916 and available capacity is likely to be exceeded by the level of planned growth around Eynsham.

## ADDENDUM TO APPENDIX TO AGENDA ITEM NO. 6, RELATING TO PARAGRAPHS 6.183 TO 6.194

- 6.190 We will explore through the AAP process the most appropriate solution in consultation with key stakeholders including the existing medical centre and the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group (OCCG).
- 6.191 One potential option might be to provide a new healthcare facility within the garden village which could provide the opportunity not only for primary care (GP services) but potentially some other supporting uses. However if this led to the closure of any existing facility, it would reduce the convenience enjoyed by some existing patients.
- 6.192 In addition to additional education and healthcare provision, the garden village has the potential to deliver or contribute towards a range of other supporting community facilities (community space, libraries, cultural, arts etc) that could be independent of or part of other social infrastructure provision such as education facilities.
- 6.193 Alongside the AAP the Council will commission an Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) for the Eynsham area to help identify in more detail the infrastructure that is needed to support planned growth. This will be informed by discussions with key providers and relevant evidence and analysis (e.g. population forecasts, existing capacity) and will draw on existing information including the aspirations identified in the submission draft Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan.
- 6.194 Consideration will also be given to the need for a health impact assessment which could potentially be undertaken as part of any sustainability appraisal of the AAP or on a standalone basis for example in support of any planning application for the site. A health impact assessment essentially helps to identify the potential effects a development might have on the health and well-being of different groups of people.

### Consultation Question 29 – Education, healthcare and community infrastructure

29a) Do you have any initial thoughts on the potential provision of two new primary schools (~~both each up to~~ 2 forms of entry) within the garden village site? Do you think this would be preferable to a single, larger primary school site?

29b) In terms of secondary provision, would you support the provision of a ~~separate sixth form facility~~ second site for Bartholomew School within the garden village to free up additional capacity at the main school site in Eynsham? If not, why not?

29c) Do you have any other suggestions as to how additional pupil places at primary and secondary school levels could be provided?

29d) Would you support in principle the provision of a new healthcare facility within the garden village? If not, why not?

29e) What other forms of community / social infrastructure should the garden village be looking to provide or contribute towards?

Document	Feb-18	Mar-18	Apr-18	May-18	Jun-18	Jul-18	Aug-18	Sep-18	Oct-18	Nov-18	Dec-18	Jan-19	Feb-19	Mar-19	Apr-19	May-19	Jun-19	Jul-19	Aug-19	Sep-19	Oct-19	
West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031	FMM			IR	A																	
Oxfordshire Cotswolds Garden Village Area Action Plan (AAP)					IC			IC				FC		S		H		IR			A	
West Eynsham Development Framework SPD					IC			FC			A											
North Witney Development Framework SPD							IC				FC			A								
East Chipping Norton Development Framework SPD							IC				FC			A								
East Witney Development Framework SPD							IC				FC			A								
Developer Contributions SPD								IC				FC			A							
Green Infrastructure SPD								IC				FC			A							
Key: FM= Further Main Modifications; IC = Informal Consultation; FC = Formal Consultation; S = Submission; H = Hearings; IR = Inspector's Report; A = Adoption																						