

 WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL	WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL
Name and date of Committee	Development Control Committee: Monday 8 February 2021
Report Number	Agenda Item No. 4
Subject	Update report on the Outline Planning Application for Salt Cross
Wards affected	Eynsham and Cassington
Accountable officer	Joan Desmond, Principal Planner Tel: 01993 861655; Email: joan.desmond@publicagroup.uk
Summary/Purpose	To provide an update on the progress of the application with regard to technical and public representations received so far and main issues identified when considered against the pre-submission draft Area Action Plan (August 2020).
Annex	Annex I – Summary of the consultation responses received to the outline planning application
Recommendation	That the report be noted.
Corporate priorities	
Key Decision	N/A
Exempt	No

1. BACKGROUND

- 1.1. Members will be aware that an outline planning application (OPA) for the new Garden Village (Salt Cross) was submitted in July 2020. The outline application which includes the means of access (from Lower Road, Cuckoo Lane and the A40), is for a mixed-use Garden Village, comprising residential (Class C2 and C3), retail, food and drink (Use Classes A1-A5), health and community facilities (Use Classes D1-D2), hotel (C1), employment use (Use Classes B1, B2 and B8), education provision (Use Class D1), burial ground, public open space with sports pitches together with ancillary facilities, landscaping and associated infrastructure and works including pedestrian and cycle routes.

2. MAIN POINTS

- 2.1. The proposal represents development requiring an Environmental Statement and this has been provided, with a large volume of supporting information and documentation. A Development Specification and Framework Document, Illustrative masterplan,

Parameter Plans and Site-Wide Design Code document have been submitted, as well as detailed proposals for the access arrangements.

- 2.2. The garden village site is allocated in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 as a strategic location for growth to include around 2,200 homes, a 'campus style' science park and other supporting services and facilities including a new park and ride. The new park and ride is subject of a separate application being dealt with by the County Council.
- 2.3. Policy EW1 of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan applies and requires the site to be taken forward on a comprehensive basis, led by an Area Action Plan (AAP) and in accordance with key Garden Village principles. Similarly Policy ENP14a of the made Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan requires that the Garden Village should be bought forward in a comprehensive and coordinated manner through the Area Action Plan. Salt Cross has central Government support as part of the 'Locally-Led Garden Villages, Towns and Cities' programme launched in 2016. The Town and Country Planning Association (TCPA) have usefully identified the following key principles for such developments which can be applied at a range of different scales as set out below.
- 2.4. A Garden City is a holistically planned new settlement which enhances the natural environment and offers high-quality affordable housing and locally accessible work in beautiful, healthy and sociable communities. The Garden City Principles are an indivisible and interlocking framework for their delivery, and include:
 - (i) Land value capture for the benefit of the community.
 - (ii) Strong vision, leadership and community engagement.
 - (iii) Community ownership of land and long-term stewardship of assets
 - (iv) Mixed-tenure homes and housing types that are genuinely affordable.
 - (v) A wide range of local jobs in the Garden City within easy commuting distance of homes.
 - (vi) Beautifully and imaginatively designed homes with gardens, combining the best of town and country to create healthy communities, and including opportunities to grow food.
 - (vii) Development that enhances the natural environment, providing a comprehensive green infrastructure network and net biodiversity gains, and that uses zero-carbon and energy positive technology to ensure climate resilience.
 - (viii) Strong cultural, recreational and shopping facilities in walkable, vibrant, sociable neighbourhoods.
 - (ix) Integrated and accessible transport systems, with walking, cycling and public transport designed to be the most attractive forms of local transport.
- 2.5. The Committee will be aware that this is not a full report and nor is it intended to be. Its purpose is to bring Members up to speed by setting out the key elements of the application as tabled, the comments received upon it (thus far) and the areas where it departs from the AAP as currently framed. Because it is not a full report and is essentially to note there will be no public speaking at the meeting, and whilst Members are invited to ask questions there will be no opportunity for debate or voting. In any event it will be necessary to await the outcome of the AAP process before any clear recommendations and decisions can be made as it will only be when we are aware of the Inspectors findings that we will be able to test this submission against the "actual/adopted AAP" as opposed to "tabled" AAP policies as they are currently framed.

- 2.6. Following two previous rounds of public consultation in 2018 and 2019, the pre-submission draft AAP was formally published for a final period of consultation from 28 August – 23 October 2020. Representations were received from 60 individuals and organisations and at the time of writing, it is anticipated that the AAP will be submitted around the end of January. The AAP sets out a vision for the garden village, supported by a series of core objectives, policies and delivery framework. In accordance with the Local Plan, the AAP once adopted will form the policy basis for the determination of the outline planning application.

Consultations and representations

- 2.7. A summary of the consultation responses received to the outline planning application is attached as [Annex I](#). These highlight some gaps in the information submitted which the applicant is seeking to address and identifies areas of concern relating to the application, a brief summary of which are detailed below in this report.
- 2.8. In terms of representations, 87 objection letters, six letters of support and 20 representations providing general comments have been received. Representations have been received from various organisations including Eynsham Planning Improvement Campaign (EPIC), Members of GreenTea, Woodland Trust, Wildlife Trust and Eynsham Road Runners.

Main Issues

- 2.9. Table I provides a brief summary of the OPA proposals, as distinct from the pre-submission draft AAP proposals. As can be seen from Table I, there are a number of differences between the OPA proposals and the draft AAP proposals. The key differences relate to the fact that the OPA covers a much smaller site area, although the Applicant controls more land within the AAP boundary than is included within the OPA and only seeks permission for part of the employment allocation:

Table 1. Summary comparison of the OPA proposals with the emerging AAP proposals		
Major components	Emerging AAP	OPA
Site area	220 ha	153.84 ha*
Homes	Around 2,200 (C2 and C3)	2,200 (C2 and C3)
Employment	Around 40 ha - 80,000 m ² (B1a and B1b)	Up to 57,000 m ² (B1, B2 and B8)
Retail, food and drink, and ancillary uses	No floor space thresholds fixed	Up to 4,000 m ² (A1-A5, with ancillary B1)
Other commercial	-	Up to 100 bed hotel (C1)
Community	No floor space thresholds fixed	Up to 1,650 m ² (D1 and D2)
Park and ride	8 ha - 850 spaces	-
Energy smart hub	-	Up to 3,000 m ² (Sui generis)
School sites	Minimum 7.89 ha (D1)	Up to 8 ha (D1)
Primary health care	No floor space thresholds fixed	Up to 1,100 m ²
Green infrastructure**	Minimum 40 ha (at OPA stage)	Approximately 50 ha (at OPA stage)
Burial ground	No area threshold fixed	Up to 1 ha
Notes: 1) All references to Use Classes above are as per the Pre-submission Draft AAP and July 2020 OPA, which predate Use Classes changes as of the 1st of September 2020. 2) [*] The Applicant controls approximately 182.64 ha. 3) [**] Green and blue infrastructure areas identified at the OPA stage only.		

2.10. The key areas of difference between the OPA and pre-submission draft AAP at this point in time are:

- **The requirement for a comprehensive masterplan** – exclusion of land in OPA.
- **Quantum and Mix of Housing** – Queries over provision of custom and self-build housing, specialist housing and failure to meet required Building Regulations Requirements.
- **Employment provision and other commercial development** – Policy requirements unmet
- **Biodiversity Net Gain** – Inadequate net gain
- **Net Zero Carbon Development** - OPA proposes a much lower set of standards than required by the pre-submission draft AAP.
- **Green Infrastructure** - Unclear whether the submitted landscape parameter plan meets the minimum quantitative requirements for specified green infrastructure types as set out in the AAP but more importantly fails to demonstrate how the proposed landscaping measures will mitigate the impact of the development on the landscape and meet the Garden Village principles as set out in the AAP
- **Design Considerations** – Need to satisfy design requirements of the AAP with development expected to achieve a high quality, innovative and inclusive approach to design which is consistent with garden village principles and draws on key references as appropriate including the National Design Guide, the West Oxfordshire Local Plan and Design Guide, the AAP, the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan and best practice. AAP also requires residential development proposals to be in accordance with ‘Building for a Healthy Life’ or equivalent principles.
- **Provision of Supporting Infrastructure** – Details yet to be resolved
- **Long-term stewardship and maintenance** – Details yet to be resolved.
- **Relationship of the OPA to the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan** – Consideration to be given to the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan (ENP) as this forms part of the statutory development plan.

3. REASONS

3.1. To update Members on the key issues emerging from the initial consultation and consideration of the application prior to examination of the AAP which will form the basis for the formal determination of the application once adopted.

4. BACKGROUND PAPERS

4.1. Planning application no. 20/01734/OUT and the pre-submission Area Action Plan.

20/01734/OUT - Outline application with means of access for a mixed-use Garden Village, comprising residential, retail, food and drink, health and community facilities, hotel, class B1, B2 and B8 employment uses, education provision, burial ground, public open space with sports pitches together with ancillary facilities, landscaping and associated infrastructure and works.

Consultee	Date	Comment
SGN (gas distribution)	16/07/20	No Comment
Thames Valley Police - Crime Prevention	22/07/20	No Objection
WODC – ENV Health	22/07/20	No objection in principle to this development
Natural England	31/07/20	NO OBJECTION Natural England considers that the proposed development will not have significant adverse impacts on designates sites.
WODC - Strategic Housing and Development	29/07/20	At this stage, I am unable to comment further on the affordable housing provision
WODC – Arts	04/08/20	No Objection – Seeks contribution towards Public Art Projects
Thames Water	05/08/20	Waste Water, Sewage Treatment & Clean Water Identified Inability for the capacity in the current infrastructure – Conditions recommended
NHS Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	13/08/20	Objects unless there is additional investment through developer contributions in expanding local primary medical care capacity.
Environment Agency	24/08/20	Objection – Additional Information requested for Water Quality, Flood Risk Assessment
Environmental Health – Contamination	08/09/20	No objection however concerned with gaps in data and further information requested. Conditions requested
Environmental Health – Noise & Sound	09/09/20	No objection
Parish – North Leigh	11.09.20	Objection
Lower Windrush Valley Project – OCC	22.09.20	No Objection
Parish - Eynsham	22/10/20	Objection – Climate

Consultee	Date	Comment
		Healthy Place Shaping Protecting and Enhancing Environmental Assets Movement and Connectivity Enterprise, Innovation and Productivity Meeting Current and Future Housing Needs Building a strong, vibrant and sustainable community
Parish – Hanborough	29/10/20	Objection - to substantial parts albeit that we remain supportive of the proposal to have a garden village in the chosen location.
WODC – Climate Change	02/11/20	Unfortunately I cannot approve the outline Energy Strategy as submitted due to the fact this is lacking sufficient information and details to allow for an adequate assessment and review to be completed.
Parish – Freeland	18/11/20	Objection - The Parish Council are deeply concerned that the premature submission of this application, in advance of the Area Action Plan and in spite of the “parallel tracking” approach, has resulted in substantive and damaging areas of non-compliance between the Plan and the planning application.
WODC Policy	20.11.20	Whilst there is a clear need to accelerate housing delivery and create new job opportunities in this location, Policy EW1 of the adopted Local Plan is explicit that development in this location should be comprehensive and led by an Area Action Plan (AAP). Fundamental differences between the OPA and pre-submission draft AAP at this point in time. The requirement for a comprehensive masterplan Quantum and Mix of Housing Employment provision and other commercial development Biodiversity Net Gain Net Zero Carbon Development Green Infrastructure Design Considerations Provision of Supporting Infrastructure Long term stewardship and maintenance Relationship of the OPA to the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan

Consultee	Date	Comment
Oxfordshire County Council	11.12.20	<p>Further work is required to overcome the Transport, Property (School response) and Local Lead Flood Authority objections detailed in the officer responses below.</p> <p>Transport – Objection Education – No Objection Subject to contribution Archaeology – No Objection subject to condition Minerals and Waste – No Objection Waste Management -No objection subject contributions Landscape Green Infrastructure - Right intentions but more needs to be done to meet the aspirations and requirements for an exemplar development. Lead Local Flood Authority – Objection Extra Care Housing - No objection subject contributions Climate change & energy – No Objection Property School Sites – Objection Property Non School Sites - No objection subject contributions</p>

Non Statutory representations

Objection – 87

Support – 6

General – 20

Representations include

EPIC

Members of GreenTea

Woodland Trust

Wildlife Trust

Eynsham Road Runners

Key Themes include

- Affect on local ecology
- Highways
- Neighbourliness
- Design and layout
- Landscape Impact
- Affordable Housing
- Climate Change
- Infrastructure
- Flooding Drainage
- Application issues