

Report to West Oxfordshire District Council

**by Darren McCreery MA BA(Hons) MRTPI and David Spencer
BA(Hons) DipTP MRTPI**

Inspectors appointed by the Secretary of State

Date: 1 March 2023

Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)

Section 20

Report on the Examination of the Salt Cross Garden Village Area Action Plan

The Plan was submitted for examination on 10 February 2021

The examination hearings were held between 28 June and 8 July 2021

File Ref: PINS/ D3125/429/7

Contents

Abbreviations used in this report.....	3
Non-Technical Summary.....	4
Introduction.....	5
Context of the Plan.....	7
Assessment of Duty to Co-operate.....	9
Assessment of Other Aspects of Legal Compliance.....	10
Assessment of Soundness.....	14
Issue 1 – Whether the scope and purpose of the AAP, and its vision and core themes are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.....	14
Issue 2 – Whether the AAP policies relating to residential and employment land uses are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.	17
Issue 3 – Whether the AAP policies relating to movement and connectivity are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.....	22
Issue 4 – Whether the AAP policies relating to net zero carbon development, green infrastructure, and protecting and enhancing environmental assets are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.....	28
Issue 5 – Whether the policies designed to manage the spatial framework, key development principles, overall standards of design and supporting infrastructure, long term maintenance and stewardship and delivery are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy. Whether there is proportionate evidence to demonstrate that the development is likely to be viable.	39
Overall Conclusion and Recommendation.....	45
Schedule of Main Modifications.....	Appendix

Abbreviations used in this report

2004 Act	Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended)
2012 Regulations	Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) Regulations 2012
AAP	The Salt Cross Garden Village Area Action Plan
The Council	West Oxfordshire District Council
KPI	Key performance indicator
Local Plan	West Oxfordshire Local Plan
MM	Main Modification
Neighbourhood Plan	Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan
NPPF	The National Planning Policy Framework 2021
NPPG	National Planning Practice Guidance
SA	Sustainability Appraisal
SAC	Special Area of Conservation
SDA Land	Land to the west of Eynsham allocated as a Strategic Development Area
SEA	Strategic Environmental Assessment
Self-build	Custom and self-build housing as defined by the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015
SFRA	Strategic Flood Risk Assessment
Use Classes	As set out in The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 (as amended)
WMS	Written Ministerial Statement

Non-Technical Summary

This report concludes that the Salt Cross Garden Village Area Action Plan (AAP) provides an appropriate basis for the planning of the relevant part of West Oxfordshire District, provided that a number of main modifications [MMs] are made to it. West Oxfordshire District Council has specifically requested that we recommend any MMs necessary to enable the AAP to be adopted.

Following the hearings, the Council undertook further work on the evidence base on infrastructure, phasing and viability. This additional evidence was subject to consultation in March-April 2022. On completion of the further work the Council prepared schedules of proposed modifications to the AAP and, where necessary, carried out sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment of them. The MMs were subject to public consultation over a six week period between 23 September and 4 November 2022. In some cases we have amended their detailed wording in the light of consultation responses to the proposed MMs. We have recommended their inclusion in the AAP after considering the sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment and all the representations made in response to consultation.

The MMs can be summarised as follows:

- Revise Core Objective GV3 and Policy 2 in relation to net zero-carbon development to remove prescriptive detail and enable a more pragmatic approach for the necessary transition to a low carbon future;
- Amendments to Policy 9 to clarify the required contents of Biodiversity Net Gain Strategies to be submitted as part of applications for major development and to reinforce the approach of maximising on-site provision in advance of off-site enhancements so that the policy would be justified and effective;
- Substantive re-drafting of Policies 14-17 in relation to movement and connectivity to better reflect the evidence base and provide a clearer policy framework so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals, such that the modified policies would be effective and consistent with national planning policy;
- Delete Policy 27 'Key Development Principles' to remove unnecessary duplication within the AAP;
- Various amendments to Policy 30 to require the submission of a phasing plan, including a policy mechanism that enables viability to be retested where particular circumstances relating to phasing and supporting infrastructure are triggered; and
- A number of other modifications to the detailed wording of policies to ensure that the AAP is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy.

Introduction

1. This report contains our assessment of the Salt Cross Garden Village Area Action Plan (AAP) in accordance with Section 20(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) (2004 Act). It considers first whether the AAP's preparation has complied with the duty to co-operate. It then considers whether it is compliant with legal requirements and whether it is sound.
2. At paragraph 35, the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) says that, in order to be sound, a plan should be positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. Paragraph 36 of the NPPF requires these 'tests of soundness' to be applied to non-strategic policies in the AAP in a proportionate way, taking into account the extent to which they are consistent with relevant strategic policies for the area.
3. The starting point for the examination is the assumption that the Council has submitted what it considers to be a sound plan. The Salt Cross Garden Village Pre-Submission Draft Area Action Plan (August 2020) [CD1] and the Additional Modifications contained in AAP - Schedule of Minor Modifications (February 2021) [CD6] were submitted for examination together in February 2021 and are the starting basis for the examination.
4. The Pre-Submission Draft Area Action Plan is the same document that was published for consultation in August 2020. The Schedule of Minor Modifications makes a series of subsequent additional modifications suggested by the Council in order to rectify typographical, grammatical, and formatting errors and improve internal consistency within the AAP.
5. Following the conclusion of the examination hearing sessions in July 2021, gaps were identified in the AAP evidence base relating to infrastructure delivery and phasing. The Council carried out further work on the evidence base and the detailed drafting of policies relating to movement and connectivity. Following completion of this work, and our consideration of comments from interested parties in response to consultation on it, we wrote to the Council to confirm that we were content for the examination to move forward to consider MMs.
6. This report cross refers to a number of documents in the examination library¹ as maintained by the Council. The references are bracketed in the main text and relate to the numbering in the library [i.e. CD1].

¹ <https://www.westoxon.gov.uk/media/zxyamzit/aap-examination-library.pdf>

Main modifications

7. In accordance with section 20(7C) of the 2004 Act the Council requested that we should recommend any Main Modifications [MM] necessary to rectify matters that make the AAP unsound and thus incapable of being adopted. This report explains why the recommended MMs are necessary. The MMs are referenced in bold in the report in the form **MM1**, **MM2** etc, and are set out in full in the Appendix to this report.
8. Following the examination hearings, the Council prepared a schedule of proposed MMs and, where necessary, carried out sustainability appraisal and habitats regulations assessment of them. The MM schedule was subject to public consultation for six weeks. We have taken account of the consultation responses in coming to our conclusions in this report and in this light we have made some amendments to the detailed wording of the MMs and added consequential modifications.
9. None of our amendments significantly alters the modifications as published for consultation or undermines the participatory processes and sustainability appraisal/habitats regulations assessment that has been undertaken. Where necessary we have highlighted these amendments in the report.

Policies map

10. The Council must maintain an adopted policies map which illustrates geographically the application of the policies in the adopted development plan. When submitting a plan for examination, the Council is required to provide a submission policies map showing any changes to the adopted policies map that would result from the proposals in the submitted plan.
11. The policies map accompanying the West Oxfordshire Local Plan (Local Plan) does not provide detail relating to the Garden Village. Instead, the policies map cross references to the Eynsham Inset at figure 9.5e within the Local Plan. Figure 9.5e shows an indicative boundary for the Garden Village. Figure 3.2 of the AAP confirms the boundary as following the indicative one from the Local Plan, with the exception of the inclusion of land to the north [also shown on CD5].
12. No changes to the policies map itself would result as a consequence of adopting the AAP. The change to the Local Plan resulting from Figure 3.2 of the AAP is addressed under our assessment of other relevant legal requirements.

Context of the AAP

13. The AAP relates to land that lies to the north of the A40, which separates it from nearby Eynsham. It is approximately halfway between Witney and Oxford. The main characteristic of the land is that of open countryside, predominantly in agricultural use with rolling fields defined by well established hedgerows and a topography that varies more notably towards the east side. There are a number of public rights of way that currently allow the land to be crossed. Aside from agricultural, there are other uses present on the land. This includes commercial development to the south, residential properties, and an aggregate recycling facility.
14. Notwithstanding the influence of the A40, the surrounding area is rural in nature. This is reflected in the character of nearby settlements, including Eynsham, Church Hanborough and Cassington which each include Conservation Areas and concentrations of Listed Buildings within them. The land itself includes within it the Grade II Listed City Farm. The Grade II Eynsham Mill and Twelve Acre Farm are relatively close to the boundary. Eynsham Woods is within the site and is designated as local green space in the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan. The Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation (SAC) is around 2.5 kilometres to the east.
15. The Local Plan was adopted in 2018. It includes Policy OS2, which identifies the development of a self contained settlement based on garden village principles to the north of Eynsham that is to be delivered as part of the overall distribution of housing set out in Policy H1. Policy EW1 sets out more detailed policy for the comprehensive development of a free standing exemplar Garden Village that is to be led by an Area Action Plan, which is the subject of this examination.
16. The Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan (Neighbourhood Plan) also forms part of the development plan for the area. Policies ENP14 and ENP14a are of specific relevance to Salt Cross. The policies include, amongst other things, seeking to protect the character and community of Eynsham and for development at Salt Cross to come forward in a comprehensive and coordinated manner through an Area Action Plan.
17. The AAP shares a close relationship with land to the West of Eynsham that is allocated in the Local Plan as a Strategic Development Area (SDA Land) for mixed use development that is to include about 1000 houses. It is not for this examination to assess the proposals for the SDA Land. However, given the scale of growth and proximity to the AAP site it is necessary at a number of points in this report to consider the relationship between Salt Cross and the SDA Land in order to reach a conclusion on the soundness of the AAP.

18. The Council are in receipt of an undetermined application for outline planning permission that covers much of the AAP site. The focus of this examination is on the legal compliance and soundness issues associated with the AAP rather than acceptability, or otherwise, of any particular planning application. Our conclusions are reached on this basis.

Assessment of Duty to Co-operate

19. Section 20(5)(c) of the 2004 Act requires us to consider whether the Council has complied with any duty imposed on it by section 33A in respect of the AAP's preparation. The duty relates to "strategic matters" as defined in section 33A(4).
20. The Council has a shared history of co-operation with Oxford City Council on planning for housing. This includes the agreement to make provision towards Oxford City's identified housing needs that is now reflected in the requirement in the Local Plan. The new settlement that is the subject of the AAP is identified in the Local Plan as contributing towards the housing needs of Oxford City.
21. Continuing co-operation on this issue post adoption of the Local Plan is evidenced by a memorandum of co-operation between the Council and Oxford City Council [SD6]. It builds on the shared understanding about issues such as the quantum and location of housing (including affordable housing) arising from the new settlement that is the subject of the AAP. The active and ongoing nature of this co-operation is further evidenced in Oxford City's hearing statement [FS36].
22. The Council's statement of compliance [SD2] summarises the engagement that has taken place. Beyond housing, the Council have identified some other issues as genuinely strategic, including employment and transport. These are clearly areas of importance and shared interest. However, given the detailed nature of the AAP and its relevance to a relatively small part of the Council area, regarding these other issues as genuinely strategic in this context would be an overextension of the requirements of section 33A. Nevertheless, even if the duty were applied to the other issues, there is evidence of extensive engagement with relevant bodies to demonstrate that the requirements of section 33A have been fulfilled.
23. Taken as a whole, we are satisfied that where necessary the Council has engaged constructively, actively and on an on-going basis in the preparation of the AAP and that the duty to co-operate has therefore been met.

Assessment of Other Aspects of Legal Compliance

Local Development Scheme

24. The Plan has been prepared in accordance with the Council's Local Development Scheme, which has been subject to active update since 2018 to reflect updated timings for the preparation and adoption of the AAP. The last update was made in May 2021 [SD11], to include details relating to the examination timetable.

Consultation

25. Consultation on the AAP meets the requirements of the 2012 Regulations. This has been supplemented by a number of stakeholder events, including community forum meetings and a design charrette. Statutory consultation and other engagement are summarised in the submission consultation report [CD4].
26. The extent of engagement between the Council and one of the landowners within the AAP boundary was clarified in a Statement of Common Ground [WODC EXAM 01] during the Examination, as this had been the subject of discussion between the two parties. This is not a matter that puts the question of whether requirements have been met into doubt.
27. Overall, we are satisfied that consultation on the AAP and the proposed MMs has been carried out in compliance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement [SD3, SD4] and other requirements.

Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

28. The Council has carried out Sustainability Appraisal of the AAP on a continuing basis. They have prepared a report of the findings of the appraisal [CD2] and published the report and a non-technical summary [CD3] along with the AAP and other submission documents under Regulation 19 of the 2012 Regulations. An update report was published to accompany the MM consultation [CD8].
29. The 17 sustainability objectives against which options have been assessed provides a consistent basis for the appraisal. The choice of objectives is logical and clearly explained. The methodology adopted is robust. The report provides satisfactory detail on how options have evolved over time and that reasonable alternatives have been considered. Whilst scoring of individual elements is inevitably a matter of judgement, there is no evidence that leads us to conclude that any specific judgement is misplaced or lacking in the required level of objectivity.

30. Whilst rightly acknowledged as a separate process, undertaking a SEA jointly with the Sustainability Appraisal is logical given the objectives of the AAP. SEA requirements are appropriately incorporated into the reporting process and explained.
31. Potential cumulative effects linked to development of the SDA Land are considered in sufficient depth.
32. Overall, we are satisfied that the Sustainability Appraisal/SEA process undertaken complies with the necessary legal requirements and associated national guidance.

Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA)

33. The Habitats Regulations Assessment Reports [EV1, EV2] identify relevant European sites for inclusion in the HRA. Relying on work undertaken in adoption of the Local Plan as a basis for screening out most of the sites does not introduce weakness into the AAP HRA preparation process given the timeframe between adoption of the Local Plan and preparation of the AAP. The overall methodology and scoring that leads to conclusions around likely significant effects arising from policies in the AAP is robust.
34. The HRA carries out appropriate assessment of the effects on the Oxford Meadows SAC in relation to air quality. The assessment is informed by Natural England's guidance for competent authorities on assessing road traffic emissions under the Habitats Regulations. The conclusion that the AAP will not result in adverse effects on the integrity of the SAC as a result of air pollution, either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, is appropriately evidenced.
35. An update to the HRA was published to accompany the MM consultation [EV43].
36. Overall, we are satisfied that the HRA complies with the necessary legal requirements and associated national guidance.

Mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change

37. The AAP, and the development plan taken as a whole, includes policies designed to secure that the development and use of land in the local planning authority's area contributes to the mitigation of, and adaptation to, climate change. As discussed throughout this report, climate change is a central focus of the AAP.

38. The focus reflects the Council's declaration of a climate emergency in 2019 and subsequent publication of a Council Plan (2020–2024) which identifies climate action as the first of six strategic priorities.
39. The MMs adjust some of the policies relating to climate change, but do not change the central focus of the AAP.

Equality Act

40. We have had due regard to the aims expressed in S149(1) of the Equality Act 2010. This has included consideration of several matters during the examination, including housing quality and standards and accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers.

Other relevant legal requirements

41. There is a requirement in Reg 8(4) of the 2012 Regulations for new policies contained in a plan to be consistent with the adopted development plan. Consequently, a non-strategic (Part 2) plan such as the AAP must be consistent with the strategic (Part 1) plan (i.e. the Local Plan). This is the case unless the explicit intention is to supersede any policy in the strategic plan (under Reg 8(5)).
42. The AAP intends to supersede the Local Plan, in so far as it relates to the AAP area, in the following instances:
 - Figure 3.2 of the AAP updates Figure 9.5e of the Local Plan to confirm the boundary and include land to the north within it.
 - AAP Policy 16 supersedes Local Plan Policy T4 in respect of car parking standards.
 - AAP Policy 25 supersedes Local Plan Policy H5 in respect of custom and self build housing.
43. Where there are linked issues to soundness, these are discussed in more detail in the relevant part of this report. **MM1** states the fact that the AAP contains policies that are intended to supersede another policy in the adopted development plan and identifies the superseded policies. This is to meet the requirements of Regulation 8(5) of the 2012 Regulations.
44. The Plan complies with all other relevant legal requirements, including in the 2004 Act and the 2012 Regulations.

Assessment of Soundness

Main Issues

45. Taking account of all the representations, the written evidence and the discussions that took place at the examination hearings, we have identified 5 main issues upon which the soundness of the AAP depends. This report deals with these main issues and the MMs that arise. It does not respond to every point or issue raised by representors. Nor does it refer to every policy, policy criterion or written justification in the AAP.

Issue 1 – Whether the scope and purpose of the AAP, and its vision and core themes are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.

Scope and purpose of the AAP

46. The AAP sets out non-strategic policies relevant to an area identified for significant change. Policy EW1 of the Local Plan sets out the detail of what should be included in the AAP. In the justification for the policy, paragraph 9.5.49 includes a non-exhaustive list of the key issues that the AAP would aim to address. The non-exhaustive nature of the list recognises that the scope of the AAP was not confirmed at the point that the Local Plan was adopted and that a process of developing it in discussion with key stakeholders was to follow.
47. Whilst the detailed list in Policy EW1 itself cannot be ignored, neither is it correct to regard it as putting fixed parameters on the scope and detail of the AAP. Adopting an overly rigid approach would run contrary to the intention sitting behind EW1, which expected a process and body of further work and engagement being undertaken. As such, there is a question of judgement and balance to be struck between the AAP delivering on Policy EW1 and there being an appropriate degree of flexibility that reflects the process intended by the policy.
48. Within this context it is perfectly possible for a policy in the AAP to respond to a requirement in EW1 for something to be included by setting out more detailed policy or criteria to be met. This would also be consistent with Appendix 1 of the Council's Local Development Scheme [SD11] which sets out a purpose of the AAP as being to supplement the Local Plan by providing additional detail.
49. Within this context, the fact that individual policies in the AAP add more detailed requirements to EW1 of the Local Plan does not, as a matter of principle, automatically render the policy as inconsistent with the Local Plan. This does not, however, remove the requirement for AAP policies to meet the tests of soundness, including being justified by the evidence base as an appropriate strategy.

50. The purpose of the AAP is to provide a policy framework that will achieve comprehensive and sustainable development of the site. The precise detail of the development is subject to further master planning, where important aspects of layout and detailed design would be established. Although the AAP is the product of engagement with a range of stakeholders, it is inevitable that involvement will continue as the master plan evolves. As such, the individual policies within the AAP should be capable of achieving sustainable development, whilst also being flexible enough to allow for the process of detailed master planning and to take account of the longer term nature of the delivery timelines involved.
51. The specific role that the AAP would play in development management is unclear from a straight reading of the plan. This was a matter that the Council helpfully clarified during the hearing sessions. The Council wish to see a comprehensive outline planning application covering all of the land within the AAP boundary, with reserved matters then coming forward relating to different parts of the site or phases of development.
52. This is understandable and would be a logical way for the planning application process at Salt Cross to move forward. However, the legal route to achieving planning permission cannot be strictly mandated in the AAP. The Council also acknowledge that they intend for the policies in the AAP to have a wider role in guiding development management decisions for the site beyond applying to the main development of the Garden Village.
53. As such, in order to be effective, the AAP must be capable of setting a clear policy framework that could be used to determine multiple planning applications of potentially differing type and scale. In light of this, in order to be sound, the language used to describe the type and scale of planning application that policies relate to needs to be clear and internally consistent. Modifications across the plan address these issues in the interests of effectiveness and ensuring that the policies are unambiguous, so it is evident how a decision maker should react. Consequently, **MM6, MM7, MM10, MM12, MM14, MM22** and **MM30** addresses this. Following consultation on the MMs we have amended **MM10** so the fourth paragraph of Policy 7 is consistent with the approach described above.

Vision and core themes

54. The AAP sets out an overarching vision for Salt Cross based around achieving 'a place to grow, a space to breathe'. The vision is aspirational but consistent with the aim in Policy EW1 of achieving comprehensive development of an exemplar Garden Village. The development trajectories and the likely timescales needed for the new community to become established bring into question whether the vision would be achieved by 2031. However, given the high level and aspirational nature of the vision, this is not a matter that impacts

on the deliverability of the AAP. To ensure the AAP is consistent with the evidence base, and therefore justified, **MM31** adjusts the indicative housing development trajectory in figure 10.1 to reflect the most up to date information contained in the Phasing Report [EV36].

55. The seven core themes that flow from the vision form the policy structure of the AAP and provide it with a logical backbone. There is line of sight to the key Town and Country Planning Association Garden City principles, adapted as necessary to suit the site specific nature of the AAP. Using the Garden City principles to guide the policy focus of the AAP, rather than including a policy requirement that they should be met, reflects what is set out in Policy EW1 of the Local Plan. The core themes have been the subject of extensive stakeholder engagement and there is clear evidence to demonstrate how they have evolved over time.
56. The Council's decision to declare a climate emergency in 2019 has also influenced the overarching approach, including putting climate action front and centre of the AAP. The AAP is generally supported by proportionate evidence of the risks associated with climate change, set within an Oxfordshire context, including the Climate Smart Garden Village report [EV19]. The assessment is appropriately fed through the process of sustainability appraisal.
57. As climate resilience and adaptation cuts across much of what the policies in the AAP seek to achieve, there is a question mark over how Policy 1 is to be applied, given its generic nature. There is also a lack of clarity on how a natural capital approach would be demonstrated in practice. To ensure the AAP is effective, **MM3** clarifies the universal nature of the matter, notably by confirming that Policy 1 would be met through compliance with all the policies in the AAP taken as a whole.

Conclusion on Issue 1

58. In conclusion on this issue, subject to the MMs identified, the scope and purpose of the AAP, and the vision and core themes are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.

Issue 2 – Whether the AAP policies relating to residential and employment land uses are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.

Residential development (Policies 20, 22, 23, 24, 25 and 26)

59. Policy EW1 of the Local Plan identifies a working assumption of the Garden Village delivering about 2200 homes. The evidence base underpinning the AAP supports this assumption but does not attempt to develop a more precise figure. This approach is reflected in Policy 22 of the AAP and is justified by the need for flexibility as the exact number of dwellings would be established through detailed master planning, which would need to accord with the AAP as a whole. For consistency with the Local Plan, **MM32** changes the reference to 'units' in Policy 22 to refer to 'homes' as this is the terminology used in Policy EW1.
60. Policy 22 requires any increase above 2200 homes to be robustly justified. The policy wording sets a high bar that is inconsistent with the general approach set out in the AAP, which advocates flexibility. It is also unclear what robust justification might look like, and therefore how a decision maker should react. For consistency and effectiveness, **MM33** addresses this issue, instead setting out a need for housing numbers exceeding 2200 homes to demonstrate accordance with the policies in the AAP and the wider development plan for the area.
61. Policy 22 repeats the requirement in Policy 30 that relates more generally to the provision of supporting infrastructure. Whilst this is strictly unnecessary, doing so does not affect the soundness of the AAP. This is subject to the change made by **MM34**, which is necessary for effectiveness to rectify an internal inconsistency by clarifying that a site-specific infrastructure delivery plan is a requirement of the AAP, rather than being optional.
62. The wording in Policy 22 relating to standards of design and housing delivery measures also replicates requirements found elsewhere in the AAP to varying degrees, notably in Policies 23, 24, 25, 26, and 30. In doing so, the wording adopts different language and, in some cases, introduces terms that are unclear and poorly defined (such as 'non-traditional housing delivery mechanisms'). This results in considerable ambiguity around what is required and a high risk of internal inconsistencies between policy requirements when they are applied to specific proposals. For effectiveness, **MM35** removes these requirements from Policy 22 in favour of relying on the policies elsewhere in the AAP.
63. Setting out an indicative mix for market and affordable housing in Policy 23 is appropriate in light of the need for flexibility for the AAP to respond to a site specific proposal. The indicative mix is supported by the evidence in the Icen Housing Strategy [EV16]. The 50% requirement for affordable housing is

consistent with Policy H3 of the Local Plan, with some flexibility built in to allow for viability considerations. Reflecting the evidence base and the co-operation with Oxford City Council that is discussed in the Duty to Cooperate section of this report, **MM36** makes an explicit reference to considering Oxford City's Housing Register when agreeing the affordable housing tenure mix at the planning application stage and is necessary for effectiveness.

64. The evidence base paints a picture about the housing affordability challenges in the local area. The wish for the AAP to promote delivery of a mixed and balanced community is also understandable and would, in principle, meet the aim of delivering sustainable development.
65. However, when considering a cap on affordable rent levels, the evidence base does not justify the requirement in Policy 23 to have regard to Oxfordshire living rent levels. This is in addition to using the nationally understood Local Housing Allowance. The Oxfordshire living rent levels are not evidenced as reflecting a nationally recognised methodology. The Icen Housing Strategy [EV16] and other evidence does not adequately explain the methodology undertaken in a way that allows for confirmation of its robustness or whether the assumptions would remain credible throughout the plan period. In the absence of adequate justification, **MM37** removes the reference to living rent levels.
66. Policy 23 also includes a requirement that affordable homes proposed as part of the overall mix of development should demonstrate 'genuine affordability'. This is a term which is undefined within the AAP itself and is not consistently defined across the evidence base. It is also not a recognised term in the NPPF or guidance. As such, the requirement to demonstrate 'genuine affordability' is not justified and is therefore removed from the AAP by **MM37**.
67. Policy 24 relating to build to rent does not require a proportion of development at Salt Cross to come forward as build to rent. It is instead designed to set policy to be applied should such proposals come forward as part of the overall development mix. It provides a reasonable basis for such considerations. To provide clarity, and therefore effectiveness, **MM38** changes a reference to the 'default requirement' for affordable housing in national guidance to a 'benchmark'.
68. Policy H5 of the Local Plan requires 5% provision of self-build for a development of the scale proposed by the AAP. A 5% requirement is also supported by Policy EW1 of the Local Plan. The inclusion within the AAP at Policy 25 of a specific policy on self-build, rather than relying on Policy H5, is justified on the grounds of providing site specific policy. This includes detail of how the self-build component should be considered as part of the overall mix of sizes and tenures at Salt Cross.

69. The need for 'at least 5%' of the total number of homes to be self-build in Policy 25 is plainly inconsistent with the flat 5% that is set out in Policy H5 and EW1 of the Local Plan. Whilst we accept that 'at least 5%' would allow for the minimum to be provided in line with the Local Plan, there is inadequate detail in the evidence base to justify the deviation in wording. In the absence of adequate justification and for consistency with local policy **MM39** reverts to the wording that is used in the Local Plan.
70. Whether including clusters of 10 or more self-build homes as part of each phase is deliverable or justified is not demonstrated by the evidence base. Such detail could only be established as part of the site specific phasing plan that would follow as part of the planning application process. Given the weakness in justification, and to ensure Policy 25 will be effective, **MM40** amends this detail to make it indicative and therefore build in flexibility.
71. The requirements in Policy 25 relating to the mix of plot types and sizes already acknowledge the need to be guided by data on the Council's Right to Build register and other available market demand information. Given the inbuilt flexibility, no modification is required to this part of the policy.
72. Following the Hearing Sessions, the Council confirmed that the Custom/self-build Design Code referred to in Policy H5 of the Local Plan has not yet been produced [WODC EXAM 06]. Regardless, the requirements relating to a self-build design code for Salt Cross in Policy 25 are justified on the grounds of ensuring a site specific response.
73. The requirements in Policy 25 relating to delivery models are currently unclear. There is deficiency in the text of the policy, which **MM41** rectifies in the interests of effectiveness.
74. Whether different elements of Policy 25 are appropriate for delivery by legal agreement or condition is a matter best left for consideration at the planning application stage. Similarly, the need for the policy to specify that a marketing strategy is to be the subject of a pre-commencement condition is not justified and would instead need a proposal specific consideration of whether the tests at paragraph 56 of the NPPF would be met. For effectiveness and consistency with national policy, **MM42** and **MM43** address these issues.
75. For legal compliance, **MM1** modifies Policy 25 to confirm the intention to supersede Policy H5 of the Local Plan. Notwithstanding that the 5% requirement is, as a result of **MM39**, consistent with Policy H5, the detail of the AAP policy differs in a number of other respects. This includes requirements relating to clustering, affordable housing provision, and housing mix. As such, it is appropriate to set out the intention to supersede Policy H5.

76. Policy 26 is designed to relate to a broad range of specialist housing needs. It does not mandate any specific provision. That would instead come forward as a result of requirements in other policies in the development plan and consideration at the planning application stage of the mix and types of housing. This overall approach in Policy 26 is justified, as the evidence base is not detailed enough to support specific levels of provision and to reflect the need for flexibility around housing mix. For effectiveness, **MM44** makes the intention of the policy clear. This includes adjusting the language in the supporting text to remove any ambiguity that suggests that there is a cap on the amount of older persons housing. For consistency with local policy **MM46** makes specific reference to gypsy and traveller housing in line with paragraph 9.5.51 of the Local Plan, which supports Policy EW1.
77. For larger developments, Policy H4 of the Local Plan looks for at least 25% of market and affordable homes to be designed to meet Building Regulations Requirement M4(2). Policy 26 would apply this standard to all homes, superseding Policy H4. The Icen Housing Strategy [EV16] applies national data to predict a total wheelchair need for around 100 homes, with potential additional considerations that could increase this figure for some affordable housing. The report states that the Council could consider requiring all dwellings to meet the M4(2) standards. However, the evidential basis of this consideration is undocumented and the requirement is not justified purely on the analysis provided in the Icen Housing Strategy [EV16].
78. As such, the requirement for all homes to meet M4(2), is inconsistent with the Local Plan and is not justified. Consequently, for consistency with local policy **MM45** removes this requirement from the AAP, along with the 5% provision of M4(3) wheelchair adaptable homes. Development proposals would instead be assessed against Policy H4 of the Local Plan.

Commercial development (Policies 18, 19, and 20)

79. Policy EW1 of the Local Plan sets out that the AAP should include details of business land in the form of a campus style science park. This is reflected in Policy 18 of the AAP and referred to as the Salt Cross Science and Technology Park.
80. The evidence base underpinning Policy 18, including details of engagement undertaken [CD4], demonstrates an understanding of business needs that is appropriate to the AAP. The Lichfield report [EV20] provides proportionate evidence relating to the science and technology park. It justifies the approach set out within the AAP of locating it on a single site, rather than dispersed throughout Salt Cross.

81. In addition to reaffirming the 'around 40ha' site area metric from EW1, Policy 18 also specifies a floorspace target of around 80,000 square metres. This is not expressed as a rigid requirement, so includes a degree of flexibility for the AAP to respond to a site specific proposal or the needs of an identified end user. The floorspace target is justified, in addition to the site area, on the grounds of providing land for associated infrastructure and activities related to the science and technology park in addition to commercial floor space. The flexibility within the wording of the policy would allow for consideration of how to balance different uses and making efficient use of land as part of later detailed master planning.
82. Policy 18 also refers to the need for a range of complementary uses such as shops, food outlets, and gyms. Understandably, the scale and detail of such uses is not set out in the policy wording. Neither does the evidence base consider potential effects on existing town centres. For consistency with national policy and clarity, **MM28** confirms that the sequential approach in the NPPF would be applied to development that is over the locally set threshold in Local Plan Policy E6. Following the MM consultation an amendment to **MM28** is made to clarify that Policy 18 signposts the need for accordance with Local Plan Policy E6, rather than setting a new requirement.
83. Policy 19 relating to small scale commercial and business space does not set out detail on the mix and location of such uses. This approach is justified by the need for such issues to be considered as part of detailed master planning and the planning application process.
84. Ensuring that good broadband provision is a feature of shared spaces across Salt Cross and individual households is an important feature of supporting the benefits of homeworking, including minimising the need to travel. Policy 20 is justified on this basis, subject to **MM29** which makes the requirement to provide ultrafast fibre to the premises broadband to every household and shared spaces subject to technical feasibility to ensure deliverability, for effectiveness.

Conclusion on Issue 2

85. In conclusion on this issue, subject to the MMs identified, the AAP is justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy in terms of the residential and commercial development that would be delivered.

Issue 3 – Whether the AAP policies relating to movement and connectivity are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.

86. The movement and connectivity section of the AAP focuses primarily on a range of requirements and issues relating to transport infrastructure and sustainable travel. There is broad acceptance that the A40, to the south of Salt Cross, already experiences severe motor vehicle congestion. This has an impact on surrounding roads and villages and the daily lives of residents and the wider community.
87. Avoiding making this situation worse is an important element of delivering sustainable development at Salt Cross and meeting the aims of Policy EW1 of the Local Plan. The AAP responds to these issues through a mix of transport infrastructure improvements and wider policy aimed at promoting active travel choices. The objectives are consistent with those set out in Paragraph 104 of the NPPF and the need for the planning system to actively manage patterns of growth, as required by Paragraph 105.
88. The evidence base demonstrates a robust understanding of the transport infrastructure challenges. The Local Model Validation Report for the Eynsham Base VISSIM Model [EV6] shows the existing state of play, with predictive forecast modelling at 2031 [EV14] considering the potential effects both with and in the absence of major development.
89. Much of the detailed evidence considers both Salt Cross and the SDA Land together. We find no fault in doing so in order to gain the fullest possible picture of the overall impact of growth on the area. Attempting to disaggregate potential effects and attribute them between the two projects would serve limited purpose.
90. As submitted, Policies 14–17 include detailed requirements relating to active and healthy travel, public transport, reducing the need to travel by car, and road connectivity and access. These policies are lengthy, in some instances running to a number of pages. Much of the detailed policy text is lifted verbatim from the Transport Strategy [EV13]. The result reads more like narrative than planning policy and is, as a consequence, confusing and ineffective. This issue is compounded by the approach of spreading specific infrastructure requirements across the policies and using inconsistent referencing.
91. In essence, Policies 14-17 are incapable of being deciphered in a way that allows them to be properly understood, so it is evident how a decision maker should react to development proposals. As such, the policies would not be effective. This is a matter which the Council acknowledged at the conclusion of

the hearings and led to them undertaking to redraft the policies as part of the further work undertaken during the pause in the examination.

92. For effectiveness, the redrafted Policies 14-17 are inserted into the AAP by **MM24** (Policy 14), **MM25** (Policy 15), **MM26** (Policy 16), and **MM27** (Policy 17).
93. Policy 13 on Key Design Principles was included in the original request for redrafting. However, considering Policy 13 in light of the changes to Policies 14 to 17 leads us to conclude that it is sound without the need for modification.

Active and Healthy Travel (Policy 14)

94. Although the intention in Policy EW1 of the Local Plan is the creation of a free standing garden village, it's physical connectivity to Eynsham itself is an important consideration in the interests of achieving sustainable development. Place making challenges arise due to the need to ensure that crossings over the A40 between Salt Cross and Eynsham for pedestrians and cyclists are safe, convenient and accessible.
95. A number of at grade crossings are proposed as part of the upgrade to the A40. The locations of these crossings would need to respond to future master planning for Salt Cross. As such, the flexibility provided by Policy 14 for at grade crossings is a sound approach.
96. In addition, there is sufficient detail in the evidence base to demonstrate that a further crossing that would be grade separated has the potential to contribute significantly towards the achievement of sustainable development and better integrate Salt Cross with Eynsham. However, such a crossing also has the potential to become costly and ineffective unless it is considered holistically alongside other crossings and the wider master plan.
97. The Mott Macdonald report [EV8] considers options for a grade separated crossing. It expresses a clear preference towards an underpass, which is reflected in the requirement in Policy 14. However, the associated technical and land ownership requirements are not developed in the level of depth necessary to demonstrate deliverability at this stage.
98. In light of these issues, to ensure that the AAP is justified and deliverable **MM24** modifies Policy 14 further to introduce a level of flexibility. Whilst it retains the requirement for a grade separated crossing, a caveat is included to allow for demonstration of lack of necessity to meet placemaking objectives or technical infeasibility. This is a reasonable approach given further technical work is required as part of subsequent master planning and planning application processes.

99. Following consultation on the MMs, an amendment to the published version of **MM24** is required to clarify that a grade separated crossing over the A40 would be in addition to at grade crossings. It also clarifies that it is the provision of an underpass that is subject to the caveats relating to placemaking objectives and technical feasibility. Other forms of grade separated crossings would still be an expectation of the policy, even if the caveats are engaged. Our further amendment to **MM24** does not significantly alter the policy and provides important clarification.
100. In relation to cycleway provision between Salt Cross and Hanborough Station, **MM24** splits this requirement between delivery within the site boundary and securing financial contributions towards off site construction. The modification is necessary for deliverability, and therefore effectiveness. Following consultation on the MMs, an amendment to the published version of **MM24** is made to clarify that the requirement relates to segregated cycleway provision. This restores the original intention behind Policy 14 that raised no soundness issues.
101. Notwithstanding the uncertainty relating to the final master plan for Salt Cross, the closure of Cuckoo Lane to through traffic and its inclusion within the walking and cycling network through the site has strong potential to improve connectivity and deliver sustainable development. In order to be effective and reflect what would be in the gift of a developer, **MM24** also clarifies that the closure would be subject to successfully achieving the necessary orders. Following consultation on the MMs the precise wording of **MM24** has been amended to remove reference to the specific term of 'stopping up' for effectiveness.

Public Transport (Policy 15)

102. The relationship between the park and ride facility and the garden village will be an important aspect of detailed master planning. The park and ride facility has strong potential for promoting public transport use, both by those living and working in the garden village and in the wider area. However, associated use also has the potential to dominate and adversely affect occupants of the garden village and undermine the intentions behind the AAP. There is also insufficient evidence that demand for the park and ride facility will give rise to the need for expansion.
103. For effectiveness, **MM25** modifies Policy 15 to require consideration of a means of expanding the park and ride, rather than simply assuming that expansion would be allowed and beneficial to the delivery of sustainable development. This modification reflects the importance of carefully balancing the needs of the park and ride with those of the garden village, as well as the evidential position described above.

104. Similarly, although restricting direct private vehicular access between the park and ride site and garden village appears logical in terms of placemaking objectives, there may be practical limits to such restriction that would need to be addressed as part of future master planning. **MM25** makes a further modification to Policy 15 in the interests of clarifying this.
105. For effectiveness, **MM25** also makes a further modification to remove the misused and misleading word 'safeguard' from Policy 15 that serves no useful purpose as, in any event, the AAP does not formally have the effect of safeguarding land. The modified Policy 15 makes reference to provision of land along the southern boundary. However, the qualification 'as necessary' implies flexibility as part of the master planning process, rather than a stringent requirement to safeguard land using the AAP. As such, this part of the policy raises no further soundness issues.
106. Following consultation on the MMs, an amendment is made to **MM25** to clarify the requirement to significantly improve connectivity with Hanborough Station. This modification to the grammar and ordering of the paragraph improves clarity in the interests of effectiveness.

Reducing the Overall Need to Travel Including by Car (Policy 16)

107. Policy 16 sets out car parking standards that are, for development at Salt Cross only, intended to supersede Policy T4 of the Local Plan. Policy T4 requires parking in new developments to be provided in accordance with the County Council's adopted parking standards.
108. The County Council's parking standards are intended to be applied across a wider geography. They also allow for the possibility of localised standards for areas of high public transport accessibility. As such, in the absence of a specific policy in the AAP, it would be possible for the County Council to adopt their own localised standard for Salt Cross, which would then be applied in accordance with Policy T4 of the Local Plan. However, as an alternative, setting parking standards out in the AAP represents a clearer approach that will assist with master planning for the site.
109. There is also detailed evidence and modelling to demonstrate that the local road network already suffers from congestion, most notably the A40. Modelling at [EV6] in particular, provides suitably robust evidence of existing conditions. Improvements to the road network set out in the AAP aim to ensure that, as far as possible, Salt Cross does not add significantly to existing congestion. They are underpinned by predictive modelling [EV14 and EV7] that feeds into a Transport Strategy [EV13] that adequately details a strategy of using physical improvements to the road network alongside demand management to constrain car use. Maximum parking standards are a key part of this overall strategy.

110. Following the Hearing sessions, the Council provided a note [WODC EXAM 06] that cross references the relevant parts of the Transport Strategy [EV13] with the matters that should be taken into account according to paragraph 107 of the NPPF. The note provides satisfactory evidence that the Council have taken appropriate account of the matters.
111. In light of these factors, and the strength of the available evidence, clear and compelling justification exists for imposing the maximum parking standards for Salt Cross in Policy 16. As such, paragraph 108 of the NPPF is satisfied.
112. For legal compliance, **MM1** confirms that AAP Policy 16 supersedes Local Plan Policy T4 in respect of car parking standards.
113. Policy 16 seeks to reduce the risk of car dependency and minimise the need for travel. Although this objective is justified, the rationale for specifically referring to the need for evidence relating to the phasing of land uses, clusters of uses, shared use facilities, and flexible working spaces is unclear and repeats information that would naturally be produced in accordance with Policies 18 and 19, and 28 to 30. As such, the requirement is not justified. **MM26** address this concern, retaining the overall policy principle that efforts to reduce the overall need to travel should be demonstrated.
114. Policy 16 makes a reference to ensuring the efficient operation of the park and ride facility. The facility would be managed by the County Council or a body working on their behalf. As such, control of operational activities relating to the park and ride would be out of the hands of developers at Salt Cross. As the requirement is not justified, **MM26** removes it from the AAP.

Road Connectivity and Access (Policy 17)

115. Policy 17 sets out the intended vehicular access points for Salt Cross. Much of the content is justified by the evidence base and provides useful certainty. For deliverability and therefore effectiveness, some flexibility is needed in relation to the timing of completing the spine road and access from Cuckoo Lane to ensure that it is synchronised with phasing that would be considered as part of detailed master planning. **MM27** also modifies Policy 17 for this purpose and to clarify the need for the spine road to be future proofed to allow for bisection in later phases.

Conclusion on Issue 3

116. In conclusion on this issue, subject to the MMs identified, the AAP policies relating to movement and connectivity are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.

Issue 4 – Whether the AAP policies relating to net zero carbon development, zero waste, green infrastructure, and protecting and enhancing environmental assets are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.

Net zero carbon development (Policy 2)

117. Policy 2 requires development at Salt Cross to demonstrate net zero operational carbon on site. It identifies a number of detailed standards/key performance indicators (KPIs) relating to building fabric, overheating, energy efficiency, use of fossil fuels, renewable energy, and embodied carbon. The requirements go beyond the approach in Policy EH6 of the Local Plan, which do not set specific standards.
118. The Council's declaration of a climate emergency and objective for Salt Cross to serve as an exemplar, locally and nationally, in terms of moving towards net zero has heavily influenced the evolution of Policy 2. Taking an ambitious approach to net zero also achieved strong support from community and other groups.
119. Ambition on net zero is consistent with the overarching vision of the AAP, which puts climate action front and centre. Nationally, moving towards a low carbon economy is an objective of the planning system, as set out in Paragraph 8 of the NPPF, which is notably supported by Paragraphs 152 and 153. In the context of plan making, Paragraph 153 says that plans should take a proactive approach to mitigating and adapting to climate change.
120. The Net Zero Strategy² sets out the Government's wider ambition on net zero. It includes an intention to review national planning policy to make sure it contributes to climate change mitigation and adaptation as fully as possible. The outcome of this review has yet to be published. However, zero carbon building policy is clearly adjusting to respond to the challenge of meeting the legal commitment to achieve net zero by 2050 and the move is towards higher standards.
121. In light of the above, taking an ambitious approach to zero carbon building at Salt Cross is aligned with the wish for the development to be seen as an exemplar and the general direction of travel that national policy is taking. Although standards will inevitably change over time as the regulatory framework and technology evolves, ambition is also prudent in the interests of introducing an element of future proofing. This is particularly relevant in light of the delivery time frames associated with Salt Cross, the likely reductions in emissions that

²

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1033990/net-zero-strategy-beis.pdf

will be necessary over that period and the lifetime of the development, and the need to minimise costly and wasteful future retrofitting.

122. Notwithstanding the benefits of including policy on net zero building within the AAP, the detail of Policy 2 raises two soundness issues. The first is whether the building performance standards in Policy 2 are consistent with national policy in terms of their relationship with the Building Regulations. The second is whether the overall approach taken in Policy 2 is justified on the basis of the available evidence.

Consistency with national policy

123. In relation to the building performance standards in Policy 2 as they would apply to dwellings, there is a question of whether the approach is consistent with national policy. The issue arises by virtue of Paragraph 154(b) of the NPPF and the need for local requirements for the sustainability of buildings to reflect the Government's policy for national technical standards.

124. Although various Government consultations linked to the Future Homes Standard have signalled potential ways forwards, the current national planning policy relating to the endorsement of energy efficiency standards exceeding the Building Regulations remains the Written Ministerial Statement (WMS) on Plan Making dated 25 March 2015³. This is supported by the associated NPPG⁴ dated from 2019 which explains that the 2015 WMS sets out the Government's expectation that policies should not be used to set conditions on planning permissions with requirements above the equivalent of the energy requirement of Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes (approximately 20% above the 2013 Building Regulations across the build mix). The 2015 WMS remains an extant expression of national policy.

125. The KPIs and wider approach in Policy 2 would amount to additional bespoke standards. The KPIs would sit alongside Part L of the Building Regulations and the Standard Assessment Procedure that is used to demonstrate compliance with it. They do not have a direct relationship with the Building Regulations that allows a percentage above the regulations to be easily generated. However, as the conclusions of the Elementa Report [EV17] indicate, the standards in Policy 2 would amount to a significant uplift on the 2013 Building Regulations. The approach in Policy 2 therefore conflicts with national policy set out in the 2015 WMS.

126. The 2015 WMS predates a number of events, notably in this context the climate emergency declared by the Council and others, publication of more recent carbon budgets that signal the pace of change needed in order to reach net

³ <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/planning-update-march-2015>

⁴ Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 6-012-20190315

zero by 2050, and delay to the timeline in the WMS for bringing forwards the Future Homes Standard.

127. It also predates the changes to Part L of the Building Regulations which came into effect on 15 June 2022, intended to pave the way for the Future Homes and Buildings Standard in 2025⁵. In relation to residential buildings, the 2022 changes to the Building Regulations exceeds what the NPPG⁶ endorses only by exception. The WMS⁷ accompanying the 2022 changes to the Building Regulations is clear there will be no need for policies in development plans to duplicate the new overheating standard (which would be exceeded in the case of Policy 2).
128. Notwithstanding the passage of time and intervening events, the 2015 WMS remains current national policy on this matter. The future of national planning policy is open to speculation. Nevertheless, it is uncontroversial to observe that higher standards of building performance will be required in order to meet necessary reductions in carbon emissions. What is less clear is the degree to which Government policy will require those standards to be applied as part of a nationally consistent approach utilising the Building Regulations as opposed to locally specific standards applied through the planning system.
129. Section 1 of the Planning and Energy Act 2008 allows local planning authorities to include in their development plan documents reasonable requirements for development to comply with energy efficiency standards that exceed the energy requirements of the Building Regulations. This is subject to requirements being reasonable and also the stipulation at Section 5 that policies must not be inconsistent with relevant national policies.
130. In this respect, there are inconsistencies between the approach set out in Policy 2 of the AAP and the national policy position explained above relating to exceeding the Building Regulations. In light of our conclusions relating to whether the overall approach in Policy 2 is justified, we do not regard the requirements as reasonable. As a result, the Council's ability to rely on Section 1 of the Planning and Energy Act 2008 is not demonstrated.

Whether the overall approach in Policy 2 is justified

131. Taken as a whole, the AAP aims to strike a balance between achieving comprehensive and sustainable development of the site and acknowledging that the precise detail of that development is subject to future master planning and continuing discussion with a range of stakeholders. There are a number of instances in the AAP where specific standards are set, for example in relation to

⁵ <https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-statements/detail/2021-12-15/hcws495>

⁶ Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 6-012-20190315

⁷ <https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-statements/detail/2021-12-15/hcws495>

biodiversity net gain and green infrastructure. However, the approach in Policy 2 is notably more prescriptive in terms of the range and detail of the requirements and its rigidity.

132. Whether the approach in Policy 2 is an appropriate strategy, and therefore justified, is highly reliant on future master planning for Salt Cross being able to accord with the KPIs and other standards that are set out. Although a number of other studies have contributed towards the evolution of the detailed approach in Policy 2 [including EV18 and EV19], the Council identify the Elementa Report [EV17] as a primary source of evidence.
133. The report considers a series of building typologies in order to explore the cost and carbon implications of different scenarios, as well as technical feasibility. As might be expected given the absence of detailed master planning for the site, the typologies explored in the report are generic. However, this brings into question the appropriateness of the selected typologies in terms of whether they satisfactorily demonstrate how the requirements of Policy 2 could be met when applied to a future master planning exercise.
134. There is a notable absence of detailed site specific consideration to show that delivery and other challenges at Salt Cross have been identified and properly considered as part of a rounded approach. This includes more detailed consideration of the energy needs of the science and technology park and whether the standards could be realistically met by an end user.
135. The ability of the evidence base to demonstrate appropriateness is not assisted by the lack of more detailed explanation relating to how the building typologies, KPIs, and other standards were selected in preference to alternatives.
136. Unlike development plan documents that apply across wider geographical areas with various development sites, the AAP focuses on a specific location and development, with a process of detailed master planning that is to follow. There is little before us to show that the evidence base supporting Policy 2 specifically responds to these circumstances, even on a proportionate level.
137. The detailed requirements also do not reflect the evolving nature of zero carbon building policy, where standards inevitably will change in response to technological and market advancement and more stringent nationally set standards, including within the Building Regulations. Policy 2 contains little flexibility to allow for such changes, or indeed to respond to detailed master planning that will evolve over time. This brings into question whether the evidence that supports the standards justifies the approach as a sound one.
138. We appreciate that Policy 2 provides a high degree of certainty about the standards that will be applied over the lifetime of the development. However,

even judged on a proportionate basis, the evidence that underpins the prescriptive requirements lacks the necessary depth and sense of realism to show that Policy 2 represents an appropriate strategy. As such, Policy 2 is not justified.

Conclusion and modification to Policy 2 for soundness

139. There are inconsistencies between the approach in Policy 2 and national policy around exceeding the Building Regulations. We acknowledge that there are examples of plans that impose standards relating to the performance of buildings exceeding Building Regulations beyond the extent set out in the 2015 WMS. Some of these examples have been highlighted by the Council [WODC EXAM 06] and additionally in response to the proposed Main Modifications. Where the highlighted policies have been examined and adopted, they have been found sound on the basis of their own evidence base which, unlike the evidence underpinning Policy 2, was found to be robust. In addition, none of the examples provided set standards that are as prescriptive as submitted for Policy 2, and with the same degree of inflexibility.
140. Overall, the evidence base does not justify the approach in Policy 2 as an appropriate strategy, even on a proportionate basis. There is also an absence of robustness and credibility to justify departing from national standards, which leads us to conclude that Policy 2 is inconsistent with national policy.
141. In terms of resolving the soundness issues, removing Policy 2 from the AAP altogether would result in a reliance on Policy EH6 of the Local Plan. As EH6 is a reactive policy, such an outcome would not align with Policy EW1 of the Local Plan.
142. Removal of Policy 2 would also not be consistent with the overarching vision of the AAP, which puts climate action front and centre. Nor would it fully reflect the general position of the evidence base, including the Energy Plan [EV18] prepared by Oxfordshire County Council. This evidence justifies taking an ambitious approach to zero carbon building at Salt Cross, notwithstanding our position in terms of whether the specific approach in Policy 2 is justified.
143. Modifying the AAP to remove or adjust specific standards relating to energy performance caught by the 2015 WMS or making a judgement on whether other individual standards in Policy 2 could be adjusted would also not be a sound approach. This is because the standards in Policy 2 are intended to work as a coherent whole.
144. Therefore, **MM4** substitutes the wording of Policy 2 to introduce the need for an ambitious approach to the use of renewable energy, sustainable design, construction methods and energy efficiency. This is to be assessed at the

planning application stage in response to an energy statement. The modification sets out what should be included within an energy statement, including elements set out in the submitted policy but without the specific, stringent requirements which we have found are neither consistent with national policy nor justified.

145. Following consultation on the MMs, it is necessary to amend the wording of **MM4** to reaffirm and make clear that the starting point for development proposals is an alignment with the Council's ambition for net zero carbon at Salt Cross and that an ambitious approach in this regard must be demonstrated. In this context, and in light of representations on the proposed MMs, it is considered that the required content of energy statements for all major development proposals should be made clearer by reference to measurable targets and less qualification by removing phrasing such as "as appropriate" or "wherever possible". In our view, that would result in a policy that would be aspirational, but deliverable, based on the evidence before us and the parameters of national planning policy. Overall, the amendments to **MM4** would not alter the strategic intent of the policy and no one would be prejudiced by them.

146. **MM2** makes a consequential adjustment to the Core Objectives of the AAP.

Towards 'Zero Waste' Through the Circular Economy (Policy 3)

147. Embedding the concept of the 'circular economy' lies at the heart of Policy 3. The requirement for a waste strategy is a justified response, subject to **MM5** which is necessary for effectiveness to recognise there may be practical constraints to a developer embedding the concept of the circular economy, such as being unable to commit to recycling and waste disposal rates associated with occupiers of the development.

Green infrastructure (Policy 7)

148. Policy 7 covers a range of issues relating to the provision of green infrastructure. This includes the need for a green infrastructure strategy and landscaping scheme, a quantum of green infrastructure, and policy aimed at managing standards.

149. The need for a green infrastructure strategy and landscaping scheme is a justified response given the matters included in Policy EW1 (j) of the Local Plan as being for inclusion within the AAP. For effectiveness, **MM11** cross references to Policy 30 of the AAP, in recognition of the important relationship between green infrastructure and wider infrastructure delivery.

150. The requirement for 50% of the area to form the overall green infrastructure network is underpinned principally by the Eynsham Area Infrastructure Delivery Plan [EV4]. The plan relies heavily on a number of precedents to justify the metric and represents proportionate evidence.
151. In the context of the Salt Cross site surroundings and the wish to create an exemplar, the evidence base demonstrates that 50% is a reasonable and achievable target when viewed in isolation. However, there is a need for detailed master planning to look at green infrastructure in the context of wider site provision. As such, to ensure the policy will be effective a greater degree of flexibility is necessary. **MM12** addresses this issue by amending the requirement to read 'around 50%' and to clarify that private gardens and green roofs are included within the calculation. The latter point reflects the assumptions set out in the Eynsham Area Infrastructure Delivery Plan [EV4]) and is therefore necessary to ensure that the policy is justified.
152. In relation to standards, as written there is considerable ambiguity within the policy around the timing for the consideration of various standards and the role of Tables 6.1 and 6.2 in the AAP in setting them. As such, how a decision maker should respond to this part of the policy is unclear. For effectiveness, **MM12** clarifies that regard should be paid to Tables 6.1 and 6.2, also building in appropriate flexibility for this issue to respond to detailed master planning.
153. Policy 7 includes a requirement for a Building with Nature award to be achieved. Whilst the aims of the requirement are understandable, the standard is not nationally endorsed in planning policy and it is administered by a third party. As such, the appropriateness of a need for accreditation, now and over the lifetime of the plan, cannot be verified. A developer would of course be free to voluntarily achieve the standard and use that fact as evidence to support a future planning application if they wished to. However, an express requirement for it in the AAP is not justified. **MM12** therefore amends the requirement. In preference to removing it entirely from the policy, a further modification is made following consultation on the MMs to confirm that use of Building with Nature is one way that high quality may be demonstrated.
154. Management and maintenance of the green infrastructure network is addressed under Policy 31 of the AAP. Separate reference to a comprehensive management plan in Policy 7 is not justified and includes different wording that risks undermining the effectiveness of the AAP. **MM13** addresses this issue by removing the relevant paragraph and strengthening the cross reference to Policy 31 that is already included.

Biodiversity net gain (Policy 9)

155. Achievement of a percentage net gain in biodiversity would be consistent with paragraph 179 of the NPPF relating to pursuing opportunities for securing measurable net gains. Biodiversity enhancements, including arrangements for future maintenance, are also amongst the specific purposes of the AAP set out in Policy EW1 of the Local Plan. A more specific approach than the area wide requirement of Policy EH3 of the Local Plan requiring an overall net gain in biodiversity is justified in principle given the strength of policy support.
156. The requirement for an overall biodiversity net gain of 25% in Policy 9 is ambitious and would exceed the minimum 10% target introduced by the Environment Act 2021. However, the evidence base [EV28, EV29 & EV35] demonstrates a good understanding of the ecological conditions of the land within the AAP boundary. We are also satisfied that the requirement is achievable given the baseline condition of the land and allowing for the margin for error that is evidenced. The 25% requirement in Policy 9 is therefore justified. For effectiveness and consistency with national policy, **MM15** updates and futureproofs the metric that is to be used as part of the net gain calculation.
157. The net gain scenarios produced show that much of the requirement could be met on site and acknowledges that would be likely to bring the greatest benefits to the local ecosystem. Policy 9 makes provision for off site net gains, either directly by the developer or by financial contribution. Both of these outcomes would be deliverable as part of the development management process and are justified to provide clarity on the options available where on site provision has been exhausted. The evidence base demonstrates with the appropriate degree of certainty that there are opportunities for off site provision within proximity to the site [EV29]. Given the strength of evidence to demonstrate that on site gains would offer maximum benefit to the local ecosystem, **MM16** strengthens this presumption in the interests of ensuring that Policy 9 is aligned with the evidence base, and is therefore justified.
158. The matters that an applicant for planning permission should include within a net gain strategy are scattered throughout Policy 9. As a result, a reader cannot ascertain the extent of the requirement with the requisite level of ease. This brings into question how a decision maker should react to development proposals when the policy is being considered and therefore its effectiveness. **MM17** resolves this issue.
159. We initially identified the first paragraph of Policy 9 for 'possible removal' in [INSP18]. Following further consideration, the first paragraph was not felt to raise soundness issues. As such, its removal was not included within **MM15-MM17**.

Water environment (Policy 10)

160. Policy 10 is broad in scope, covering a wide range of water related issues. This includes flood risk, sustainable drainage, water demand and efficiency, waste water and water quality. The policy is underpinned by a number of site specific studies [EV24, EV25, EV33].
161. In relation to flood risk, the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) [EV24] was updated in response to comments from the Environment Agency (EA), who have in turn indicated that they are satisfied that their recommendations are reflected within the AAP. The SFRA considers flood risks associated with both Salt Cross and the SDA Land. In relation to Salt Cross, there are areas within the site that are located within Flood Zones 2 or 3 and wider flood risks from other sources that are considered within the SFRA. Notwithstanding the areas of flood sensitivity, there is proportionate evidence to confirm that the expectation within the AAP that development could be sequentially designed to be located within Flood Zone 1 is reasonable. The expectation within the policy also has a suitable degree of flexibility to allow for detailed flood risk assessment to respond to specific layouts, vulnerability of uses, and (if necessary) application of the exception test set out in the NPPF.
162. For consistency with national policy **MM19** makes reference to assessment of cumulative flood risks on the areas beyond the site and in combination effects arising from Salt Cross and other projects (such as development on the SDA Land). This modification brings the policy into line with paragraph 167 of the NPPF in relation to ensuring that flood risk is not increased elsewhere.
163. The Sustainable Drainage Strategy [EV25] assesses the opportunities and constraints for sustainable drainage systems (SuDS) across the site. There is no clear evidence that SuDS would be inappropriate. As such, the expectation in Policy 10 is consistent with national policy in paragraph 169 of the NPPF.
164. Requiring a SuDS methodology to be agreed upfront with the Local Planning Authority goes beyond the limited instances where pre application consultation is legally required⁸. Whilst it may be desirable, the requirement is unjustified. **MM20** removes this part of the policy.
165. In relation to wastewater, without upgrade to local treatment facilities, there is a question mark over the capacity to handle additional cumulative demand created by growth at scale in the area, including the development at Salt Cross.
166. Capacity questions related to the cumulative effect of development are best addressed by strategic policies, as set out in Paragraph 20 of the NPPF. This

⁸ Paragraph: 010 Reference ID: 20-010-20150326

allows a more holistic view of the issue to be taken. In this case that would be through the relatively recent adoption of the Local Plan, and any necessary revisions to it in the future.

167. Nevertheless, the Water Quality Impact Assessment [EV33] examines this, and the wider issue of water quality. It considers Salt Cross, in addition to wider growth in the area. The assessment is an update on previous documents and led to the Environment Agency removing an initial objection [FS16] and confirming that the growth associated with Salt Cross does not present any significant concern in relation to water quality deterioration.
168. The need to resolve capacity issues has the potential to affect the deliverability of development at Salt Cross, particularly in relation to timing. The Phasing Report [EV36] considers this issue and identifies the need for further modelling work, with the involvement of Thames Water and various site promoters. This is to be expected given the scale of development and the need for more detailed master planning to take place. The lack of firmer solutions about the nature and timing of necessary network reinforcement introduces a weakness into the phasing assumptions. However, there is enough evidence to demonstrate a reasonable likelihood of solutions coming forward. As such, this issue does not bring into question the deliverability of the AAP and the profiled trajectory which would see sustained higher rates of delivery from 2029 onwards.
169. Policy 10 responds to the issue of capacity by placing a requirement on a developer to produce a local strategy for wastewater and water quality. This is a proportionate and justified policy requirement, subject to **MM21** which recognises that the local water company would also play a role in addressing water capacity issues for effectiveness.
170. There is a degree of overlap between Policy 10 and Policy 7, which is also intended to cover blue infrastructure. The general requirement to show an ambitious approach to the water environment is justified. For the same reasons set out in relation to Policy 7, the requirement to achieve accreditation with the Building with Nature Standards is not justified. However, use of the standards is one way that high quality may be demonstrated. **MM18** therefore makes a similar modification to **MM12** in respect of the Building with Nature Standards, as well as adjusting an undefined acronym, for consistency and clarity and therefore effectiveness.

Conserving and enhancing the historic environment (Policy 12)

171. Policy 12 provides a logical and appropriate basis for considering effects on heritage assets, key views, and other aspects of historic importance identified in the evidence base. It includes the necessary flexibility for specific effects to be considered in response to a detailed proposal as part of the planning application

process. For effectiveness, **MM23** modifies the AAP to reflect the updated status of Tilgarsley medieval deserted village as known archaeology. This reflects the evidence base [EV22].

Conclusion on Issue 4

172. In conclusion on this issue, subject to the MMs identified, the AAP policies relating to net zero carbon development, green infrastructure, and protecting and enhancing environmental assets are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy.

Issue 5 – Whether the policies designed to manage the spatial framework, key development principles, overall standards of design and supporting infrastructure, long term maintenance and stewardship and delivery are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy. Whether there is proportionate evidence to demonstrate that the development likely to be viable.

The spatial framework, key development principles, and design requirements (Policies 6, 27, 28, and 29)

173. Policy 28 of the AAP sets out detail on land uses and layout that, coupled with the Spatial Framework Plan at figure 11.6, are intended to capture the fundamental building blocks of development at Salt Cross.
174. The role that the Spatial Framework Plan is to have in the determination of planning applications lacks clarity. It is referred to as 'illustrative' at a number of points. Yet Policy 28 requires a comprehensive detailed masterplan for Salt Cross to reflect its 'key elements'. The Spatial Framework Plan results from extensive community and other engagement undertaken by the Council. It reflects the aspirations that the community have for Salt Cross and is therefore a positive and progressive tool likely to assist in the delivery of sustainable development.
175. This should be balanced against the need for an appropriate degree of flexibility to allow a detailed masterplan to come forward, in accordance with the Policies in the AAP as a whole. As such, a firm presumption that the Spatial Framework Plan should be followed would not be justified. As currently presented, how a decision maker should regard the plan when reacting to development proposals is open to question, along therefore with the effectiveness of the policy.
176. To ensure that Policy 28 is justified and effective, **MM49** addresses this issue by setting out upfront in the justification for Policy 28 the role of the Spatial Framework Plan and its supporting text as an illustrative tool that should be taken into account when drawing up a detailed masterplan for Salt Cross.
177. For consistency with national policy, **MM48** modifies supporting text in the AAP to reflect the current position relating to Use Classes.
178. Some of the requirements relating to land use and layout in Policy 28 repeat what is said in other policies in the AAP and in Policy EW1 of the Local Plan. Whilst this is not strictly necessary, doing so is logical in the context of what Policy 28 aims to achieve in the interests of completeness. As such, its purpose is clear.

179. Policy 27 sets out key development principles for Salt Cross. It mostly requires accordance with other policies in the AAP but often utilises different language or attempts to summarise the policies. The reasoning behind the selection of some of the key principles, and exclusion of others, is unclear from the evidence base. The justification for Policy 27 is not therefore demonstrated and the degree of repetition is such that it carries a high risk of introducing internal inconsistency into the AAP. Given the lack of justification and for effectiveness **MM47** removes Policy 27.
180. Policy 29 puts achievement of a high quality, innovative, and inclusive approach to design at the heart of development at Salt Cross. The key design principles embed this principle, but also build in an appropriate degree of flexibility.
181. As currently drafted, the first paragraph of Policy 29 misrepresents the roles of the Local Plan, Neighbourhood Plan, NPPF, National Design Guide, and best practice would play in the determination of any planning application. As the text serves a limited purpose, **MM50** deletes it from the AAP for consistency with national and local policy.
182. For consistency with national policy **MM50** also modifies Policy 29 to make reference to the National Model Design Code and update the language in light of changes made to the NPPF in July 2021.
183. For effectiveness **MM51** modifies the AAP to remove a cross reference to policy in the Neighbourhood Plan that repeats a requirement using different language.
184. Providing high quality play space and opportunities for healthy, active play will assist with embedding healthy place shaping principles into development at Salt Cross. As it is not nationally recognised planning policy or guidance, accordance with Sport England design principles cannot be strictly mandated. However, for effectiveness, **MM9** ensures that the design principles are paid appropriate regard.

Timing and Provision of supporting infrastructure and viability (Policy 30)

185. A central purpose of the AAP is to provide a policy framework for ensuring that essential infrastructure will be there when it is needed. This function is expressed in Policy EW1 of the Local Plan. This issue is of importance, both in terms of delivering the quality of development required by Policy EW1 and also managing potential effects on existing communities.
186. The policies throughout the AAP set out a range of infrastructure needs to support the overall level of development identified for Salt Cross. The key requirements are included in Appendix 5. The Eynsham Area Infrastructure

Delivery Plan [EV4] pulls together infrastructure requirements from across the evidence base and feeds into Appendix 5 and gives it coherence. Whilst infrastructure needs may change over time in response to detailed master planning, Appendix 5 is suitably comprehensive for the purpose that the AAP is intended to serve.

187. The Garden Village Phasing Report [EV36] considers the dependencies between development at Salt Cross and delivery of the key infrastructure components in Appendix 5. Whilst designed with flexibility in mind, the assumptions relating to the stages of development provide a logical basis for considering infrastructure needs at different points in the evolution of Salt Cross as a place over time. The assumptions are carried forward to set out indicative phasing arrangements with trigger points linked to each stage. The Phasing Report therefore provides proportionate evidence of deliverability.
188. The purpose of the Phasing Report is to demonstrate one possible sequence of delivery. Actual delivery, along with phasing and trigger points for providing specific infrastructure enhancements, would be determined as part of detailed master planning. Policy 30, and the requirement for an infrastructure delivery plan would play a key role in this regard.
189. The wish that a number of parties have to see the AAP contain concrete requirements and timings for delivery of infrastructure is understandable. However, such an approach would not be effective given the need for detailed master planning to take place and the depth of the current evidence relating to deliverability across all sources of infrastructure. The flexibility created by Policy 30 is therefore sound, subject to **MM52** and **MM53** which make the role of future phasing and delivery mechanisms clearer in the interests of effectiveness and deliverability.
190. In light of the wider plans for growth in the area, including on the SDA Land, there is a question mark about how the costs of infrastructure would be appropriately apportioned between projects. This issue is acknowledged in the Phasing Report but not evidenced in the level of depth that allows all the shared infrastructure needs and levels of apportionment to be identified. Given the scale of development proposed at Salt Cross and in the wider area, it is unsurprising that shared infrastructure needs arise. Due to the time scales for delivery and the need for projects to evolve over time, there are also limits to which the AAP can usefully address this issue as it would inevitably be the subject of future negotiation. The policy framework in the AAP, including the requirements of Policy 30, would not prevent such negotiations from taking place.
191. Paragraph 34 of the NPPF states that the cumulative costs of contributions (including affordable housing) and infrastructure requirements arising from

development plan policy should not undermine the deliverability of the Plan. On submission, the plan was accompanied by a Viability Appraisal [EV34] which demonstrated, including through sensitivity testing, that in nearly all scenarios, development of the garden village could be achieved in line with development plan policies and other costs to an extent that would generate a residual land value appreciably above the existing use plus a premium and therefore would be viable. Judgements need to be applied on what would be a suitably incentivised benchmark land value to release the site. In the case of Salt Cross, which is a large rural greenfield site, which was allocated in the Local Plan at a specific location for a specific housing need, we are of the view that there needs to be a degree of pragmatism on the site value benchmark. As such we find the viability appraisal for the AAP to be reasonable on this critical aspect and has not significantly, if at all, understated the benchmark land value.

192. Whilst there are inevitably differences over individual values and inputs used, we have nonetheless found for the purposes of plan-making that the core inputs into the viability appraisal were rational and reasonably cautious. This includes the inputs on housing mix, infrastructure costs, separate planning obligation costs, contingencies and the inclusion of a 20% developer profit on the market homes. On the whole we find the Viability Appraisal has been prepared in accordance with NPPF paragraphs 34 and 58 and the related guidance⁹.
193. In light of the additional work required on phasing described above, a further review of the viability evidence has been undertaken, including further cost sensitivity analysis [EV39-42]. This has been subject to the further opportunity for comment prior to the consultation on the MMs. Whilst there are residual concerns about the allowances made for financing costs over the lifetime of the construction given early infrastructure delivery and the degree to which lower quartile construction costs reflect the design quality sought for the garden village, we remain satisfied that the cumulative impact of policy contributions would not render the plan undeliverable. In respect of the issue of volatility in costs, this is to some degree addressed by the sensitivity analysis undertaken.
194. We have given particular regard to the assessment in EV38 that the first two phases of development are profiled to deliver nearly half the required infrastructure compared to approximately delivery of a third of the housing. In our view, this is not out of sync with other large-scale greenfield allocations that similarly require appreciable upfront investment to create sustainable communities consistent with NPPF paragraph 73. Whilst we recognise there is a risk around financing costs, this should also incentivise later build-out rates to recoup the investment, given the significant housing demand. Ultimately, viability assessment is time-sensitive and further work on detailed phasing is likely to further influence consideration of viability.

⁹ NPPG paragraphs 10-002-20190509 and 10-005-20180724

195. It is also acknowledged in the evidence base, notably in the Phasing Report [EV36], that the costs of some of the infrastructure would need to be apportioned between the major developments that are planned for the locality, in particular the SDA Land. Levels of apportionment would be subject to later negotiation as the projects evolve. It is not necessary for soundness, and would be impractical, for the AAP to contain any specificity on cost apportionment.
196. The Revised Cost plan (EV38) says that infrastructure requirements, such as the A40 underpass, are subject to apportionment of costs between different projects, specifically development of the SDA Land. As such apportionment would be subject to later negotiation they can only be regarded as indicative. Whilst this clearly has the potential to introduce cost variance into the assessment of viability, this is unavoidable given the different stages that projects are at in their planning. Overall, we are satisfied that the viability assessment is proportionate in this regard.
197. Our conclusions in relation to the evidence supporting Policy 2 brings into question the robustness of the 5-7% capital cost uplift in the viability assessment. The modified version of Policy 2 would allow an energy statement to be developed and brought forward alongside detailed master planning for the site. This will allow cost to be considered at that time. As such, there is proportionate evidence of viability on this aspect.
198. In summary, whilst there is a proportionate evidence base to demonstrate for the purposes of plan-making that the plan's proposals for the garden village would be deliverable, we recognise viability remains a particular issue going forward given the need for further detailed master planning and phasing work. Accordingly, **MM54** would appropriately reflect this in Policy 30, providing some flexibility for further viability assessment, and is therefore necessary for effectiveness and to ensure delivery.

Long term maintenance, stewardship, and social integration (Policy 31 and Policy 5)

199. Long term maintenance and stewardship of Salt Cross is an issue that would be considered in more depth as detailed proposals evolve. Requiring this matter to be considered early in the process is justified by the objectives for Salt Cross. The evidence base underpinning the AAP considers options for maintenance and stewardship. However, it is not robust enough to justify the bias towards the community land trust model that is currently expressed in Policy 31. For flexibility, and therefore effectiveness, **MM55** removes the specific reference to this, putting the community land trust model on an equal footing to the other options that should be explored as part of the Community Management and Maintenance Plan that is required under the policy.

200. The requirement for a funded Community Development Officer in Policy 5 is justified on the grounds of the scale of development proposed at Salt Cross and its proximity to existing communities, in the interests of social integration. The likely development timelines for Salt Cross, would mean that the need for and nature of a Community Development Officer would evolve over time. Similar needs may also arise in relation to development of the SDA Land, giving rise to questions around fair apportionment of funding requirements. For effectiveness, **MM8** recognises these issues.

Conclusion on Issue 5

201. In conclusion on this issue, subject to the MMs identified, the AAP policies to manage the spatial framework, key development principles, overall standards of design and supporting infrastructure, long term maintenance and stewardship and delivery are justified, effective, and consistent with national and local policy. There is also proportionate evidence to demonstrate that the development is likely to be viable.

Overall Conclusion and Recommendation

202. The AAP has a number of deficiencies in respect of soundness for the reasons set out above. This means that we recommend non-adoption of it as submitted, in accordance with Section 20(7A) of the 2004 Act. These deficiencies have been explained in the main issues set out above.

203. The Council has requested that we recommend modifications to make the AAP sound and capable of adoption. We conclude that the duty to cooperate has been met and that, with the recommended MMs set out in the Appendix, the AAP satisfies the requirements referred to in Section 20(5)(a) of the 2004 Act and is sound.

Darren McCreery & David Spencer

Inspectors

This report is accompanied by an Appendix containing the MMs.

Appendix – Schedule of Main Modifications

General		
Main Modification Reference	Policy/Paragraph Reference	Main Modification
MM1	New paragraph (to be inserted after paragraph 1.6)	<p>Insert new paragraph after existing paragraph 1.6 as follows:</p> <p><u>In relation to the land within the identified boundary of the AAP, the AAP is intended to amend the following in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan -</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Figure 3.2 of the AAP updates Figure 9.5e of the Local Plan to confirm the boundary of the Garden Village Strategic Location for Growth and include land to the north within it.</u> • <u>AAP Policy 25 supersedes Local Plan Policy H5 in respect of custom and self build housing.</u> • <u>AAP Policy 16 supersedes Local Plan Policy T4 in respect of car parking standards.</u>

Core Objectives		
Main Modification Reference	Policy/Paragraph Reference	Main Modification
MM2	Core objective GV3	<p>Amend core objective GV3 as follows:</p> <p>To design buildings fit for the future, mitigating the impact of Salt Cross on climate change by achieving net zero-carbon development through ultra-low energy fabric and 100% use of low and zero-carbon energy, with no reliance on fossil fuels <u>wherever possible</u>.</p>

Climate Action		
Main Modification Reference	Policy/Paragraph Reference	Main Modification
MM3	<p>Policy 1 – Climate Resilience and Adaptation</p> <p>Paragraph 5.25</p>	<p>Amend Policy 1 as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals at Salt Cross will be required to adopt and demonstrate a 'natural capital' based approach which positively exploits the site's environmental characteristics and opportunities to ensure climate resilience and adaptation.</p> <p>Building use, design, siting, orientation and layout will be required to demonstrate resilience resilient to the future impacts of climate change including increased temperatures, wind speeds and changes in rainfall patterns and intensity.</p> <p>Key design decisions must will be guided by consideration of three core elements: flexibility, durability and adaptability.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 5.25 as follows:</p>

		<p><u>Through compliance with the policies in the AAP taken as a whole, development</u> Development proposals at Salt Cross will be required to demonstrate that these and other opportunities to achieve climate resilience through the protection and enhancement of the site's natural capital have been fully explored and exploited as fully as possible.</p>
MM4	Policy 2 - Net Zero Carbon Development	<p>Replace Policy 2 as follows:</p> <p>Proposals for development at Salt Cross will be required to demonstrate net zero operational carbon on-site through ultra-low energy fabric specification, low carbon technologies and on-site renewable energy generation. An energy strategy will be required with outline and detailed planning submissions, reconfirmed pre-commencement, validated pre-occupation and monitoring post-completion demonstrating alignment with this policy.</p> <p><i>Building Fabric</i></p> <p>Proposals will need to use ultra-low energy fabric to achieve the KPI for space heating demand of <15 kWh/m2.yr, demonstrated through predicted energy modelling. This should be carried out as part of any</p>

		<p>detailed planning submission, reconfirmed pre-commencement, validated pre-occupation and monitored post completion.</p> <p><i>Overheating</i></p> <p>Thermal comfort and the risk of overheating should be given full consideration in the earliest stages of design to ensure passive design measures are prioritised over the use of more energy intensive alternatives such as mechanical cooling. At outline planning stage, overheating should be mitigated through appropriate orientation and massing and at the detailed planning stage, a modelling sample proportionate to development density will be required to demonstrate full compliance with CIBSE TM59 for residential and TM52 for non-residential development, addressing overheating in units considered at highest risk. Overheating calculations should be carried out as part of the detailed planning submission and reconfirmed pre-commencement.</p> <p><i>Energy Efficiency</i></p> <p>Energy budgets (EUI targets) must be demonstrated using predicted energy modelling. The following KPI targets will apply:</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Residential <35 kwh/m2.yr</p> <p>Office <55 kwh/m2.yr</p> <p>Research labs <55-240 kwh/m2.yr*</p> <p>Retail <80 kwh/m2.yr</p> <p>Community space (e.g. health care) <100 kwh/m2.yr</p> <p>Sports and Leisure <80 kwh/m2.yr</p> <p>School <65 kwh/m2.yr</p> <p>To ensure best practice, an accurate method of predictive energy modelling, agreed in consultation with the District Council, will be required for a cross-section of building typologies (e.g. using Passive House Planning Package – PHPP or CIBSE TM45 or equivalent). This modelling should be carried out with the intention of meeting the target EUIs as part of the detailed planning submission, be reconfirmed pre-commencement, validated pre-occupation and monitored post-completion.</p> <p><i>Fossil Fuels</i></p>
--	--	---

		<p>The development will be expected to be fossil-fuel free. Fossil fuels, such as oil and natural gas should not be used to provide space heating, hot water or used for cooking.</p> <p><i>Zero Operational Carbon Balance</i></p> <p>100% of the energy consumption required by buildings on-site should be generated using on-site renewables, for example through Solar PV. The quantum of proposed renewable energy for the whole site (outline planning) and each phase (detailed planning) should be shown in kWh/yr. The amount of renewable energy should equal or exceed the total energy demand for the development in order to achieve net zero operational carbon as a whole.</p> <p>The energy strategy should state the total kWh/yr of energy consumption of the buildings on the site and the total kWh/yr of energy generation by renewables to show that the zero-carbon operational balance is met. An explanation should be given as to how these figures have been calculated.</p> <p>Renewable energy contribution calculations should be carried out as part of the outline and detailed planning submissions, be reconfirmed pre-commencement, validated pre-occupation and monitored post-completion.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>A detailed low- and zero-carbon viability assessment should be carried out in support of the energy strategy detailing the selection of on-site low- and zero-carbon energy technologies.</p> <p><i>Embodied carbon</i></p> <p>Development proposals will need to demonstrate attempts to reduce embodied carbon to meet the following KPI:</p> <p>< 500 kg CO₂/m² Upfront embodied carbon emissions (Building Life Cycle Stages A1-A5). Includes Substructure, Superstructure, MEP, Facade & Internal Finishes.</p> <p>As part of the submission of any planning application, a report should be prepared which demonstrates the calculation of the expected upfront embodied carbon of buildings. Full lifecycle modelling is encouraged.</p> <p>Embodied carbon calculations should be carried out as part of the outline and detailed planning submission, be reconfirmed pre-commencement, and validated pre-occupation.</p>
--	--	---

		<p><i>Measurement and verification</i></p> <p>Applicants should confirm the metering, monitoring and reporting strategy as part of the detailed planning application. Post-occupancy energy monitoring should be carried out every year for the first five years of use of each building to understand the energy consumption of the development in use. The results should be stored centrally and shared between developers, design teams and contractors on site.</p> <p><u>Proposals for development at will be required to align with the District Council's ambition for achieving net zero carbon at Salt Cross. An ambitious approach must be demonstrated to the use of renewable energy, sustainable design and construction methods, with a high level of energy efficiency in new buildings. An energy statement will be required for all major development, which should demonstrate the following:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Low energy use – minimising the amount of energy consumed including in relation to building fabric performance. The use of ultra-low energy building fabric, appropriate and measurable targets for space-heating demand and energy use intensity (EUI) targets for different land-uses;</u>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Thermal comfort – thermal comfort and the risk of overheating in the earliest stages of design, including the use of passive design measures and the use of overheating modelling;</u> • <u>Low and zero carbon energy supply – maximising the use of on-site renewable energy and minimising the use of fossil fuels to zero;</u> • <u>Embodied carbon – reducing the impact of construction by minimising the amount of upfront embodied carbon emissions including appropriate embodied carbon targets. A calculation of the expected upfront embodied carbon of buildings and full lifecycle modelling;</u> • <u>Measurement and verification – appropriate arrangements for measuring and publicly reporting on the ‘in-use’ energy consumption of the different land-uses at Salt Cross post-construction (e.g. for a period of 5-years).</u>
MM5	Policy 3 – Towards ‘Zero Waste’ Through the Circular Economy	<p>Amend the first paragraph of Policy 3 as follows:</p> <p><u>So far as practicable, proposals</u> Proposals for development at Salt Cross will be required to embed the concept of the ‘circular economy’ and demonstrate a commitment towards reducing waste, increasing material re-use and recycling and minimising the amount of waste sent for disposal.</p>

MM6	Policy 3 – Towards ‘Zero Waste’ Through the Circular Economy	<p>Amend the second paragraph of Policy 3 as follows:</p> <p>‘In support of any outline planning application for the whole garden village site and any major* reserved matters or other detailed applications, a A waste strategy will be required demonstrating to demonstrate how the core components of the circular economy have been taken into account through appropriate design and construction solutions and opportunities to effectively manage waste on or near site.</p> <p>This will include consideration of the potential use of advanced waste collection systems such as URS.</p> <p>*Defined as 10 or more residential units or 1,000m² or more for non-residential development.’</p>

Healthy Place Shaping		
Main Modification Reference	Policy/Paragraph Reference	Main Modification
MM7	Policy 4 – Adopting Healthy Place Shaping Principles	<p>Amend the final paragraph of Policy 4 as follows:</p> <p>A Rapid Health Impact Assessment (HIA) will be required to accompany the outline planning application and any planning application for major development at the garden village, aligned with the emerging Oxfordshire HIA methodology and toolkit, to fully identify the needs of everyone (including vulnerable and excluded groups) in how they will live and work, access and use all types of infrastructure, services and networks. The HIA should include details of implementation and monitoring.</p>
MM8	Policy 5 – Social Integration, Interaction and Inclusion	<p>Amend the final paragraph of Policy 5 as follows:</p> <p>The appointment of a Community Development Officer will be needed early in the development stage of Salt Cross to empower and support the emerging community through an asset based community development (ABCD) approach** and, if required, to help in the co-production of local strategies, such as a community development strategy, cultural wellbeing strategy and public arts strategy. This role will be secured and funded as</p>

		<p>appropriate through a planning condition or legal agreement <u>proportionate to the needs of the development as they evolve over time.</u></p>
<p>MM9</p>	<p>Policy 6 – Providing Opportunities for Healthy Active Play, Leisure and Lifestyles</p>	<p>Amend the second paragraph of Policy 6 as follows:</p> <p>Opportunities for healthy active play, leisure and lifestyles will need to be provided in accordance with paying appropriate regard to Sport England’s Active Design Principles and Play England’s ‘Design Principles for Successful Play’, and, in particular:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Meet the needs generated by the development, complementing existing nearby provision b) Be based on up to date assessments of local need, and c) Deliver good quality multi-purpose provision that is flexible, adaptable, safe, social and inclusive

MM10	Policy 7 – Green Infrastructure	<p>Amend the first paragraph of Policy 7 as follows:</p> <p>The planning, design and delivery of Salt Cross will be underpinned by a comprehensive approach to the provision, maintenance and long term management of a high quality network of green and blue infrastructure, through the submission, for approval, of a Green Infrastructure Strategy with the outline planning application for the garden settlement. The strategy will also be expected to set out the governance and funding mechanisms and the maintenance plans for each element of the green infrastructure.</p> <p>Amend the fourth paragraph of Policy 7 as follows:</p> <p>The outline planning application for Development at the garden village will need to be accompanied by a landscaping scheme which identifies how the existing landscape within and around the site has been assessed and how it informs the new community and its green infrastructure network, including long distance views to Wytham Wood and Church Hanborough spire, the treatment of 'water features', network of hedgerows, trees and woodland, historic environment and assets. All structural landscaping schemes should include a detailed phasing and management plan.</p>
------	---------------------------------	--

MM11	Policy 7 – Green Infrastructure	<p>Insert new second paragraph into Policy 7 as follows:</p> <p><u>The Green Infrastructure Strategy should be prepared in the context of the overall site-specific Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) required under Policy 30 – Provision of Supporting Infrastructure.</u></p>
MM12	Policy 7 – Green Infrastructure	<p>Amend the third paragraph of Policy 7 as follows:</p> <p>An ambitious approach to green and blue infrastructure provision is expected for Salt Cross, with the requirement for around 50% (including private gardens and green roofs) of the area to form the overall green infrastructure network, and for the accessibility Accessibility and quality standards and minimum quantitative standards for specific green infrastructure types to be met at the outline planning application stage, as set out in will be agreed as part of applications for major development, paying regard to Tables 6.1 and 6.2. Achievement of high quality will need to be demonstrated, which may be through the use of the Building with Nature standards. As an exemplary development is proposed, 'Full Award Accreditation – Excellent' will need to be achieved.</p>

<p>MM13</p>	<p>Policy 7 – Green Infrastructure</p>	<p>Delete the fifth paragraph and amend the sixth paragraph of Policy 7 as follows:</p> <p>Given the significance of the green infrastructure network, its long term management and maintenance (at least 30 years), to national standards of excellence, needs to be secured. A comprehensive management plan is especially important for the strategic scale green infrastructure, particularly the Biodiverse Country Park.</p> <p>Stewardship and maintenance arrangements for the GI network will therefore need to be addressed as part of any Community Management and Maintenance Plan (CMMP) or equivalent, submitted in accordance with Policy 31 – Long-Term Maintenance and Stewardship.</p>
<p>MM14</p>	<p>Policy 8 – Enabling Healthy Food Choices</p>	<p>Amend the second paragraph of Policy 8 as follows:</p> <p>A food strategy should accompany the outline planning application, setting set out the overall approach to food growing and consumption at the garden village making use of current good practice³³, including: an assessment of suitable areas for food growing; consideration of approaches to achieve a diversity of food outlets; and the approach to incorporating edible plants within the public realm.</p>

Protecting and Enhancing Environmental Assets		
Main Modification Reference	Policy/Paragraph Reference	Main Modification
MM15	Policy 9 – Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>Amend the second paragraph of Policy 9 as follows:</p> <p>Development at Salt Cross will be required to demonstrate an overall biodiversity net gain of 25%. This will be measured using the DEFRA Biodiversity Metric Version 2.0 (or subsequent updated versions) <u>(as may be amended and in force at the time of the application)</u>.</p>
MM16	Policy 9 – Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>Amend the third paragraph of Policy 9 as follows:</p> <p>The main focus of this biodiversity net gain approach will be the garden village site itself through <u>maximising opportunities for</u> on-site mitigation and enhancement and then off-site enhancements will be sought to make up the total number of biodiversity units required to deliver the full 25%.</p> <p>The remaining part of the third paragraph which relates to off-site net gain, to be moved to the end of the policy along with the existing fifth paragraph and amended to read as follows:</p>

		<p>... and then off-site enhancements will be sought <u>Whilst the presumption is that net gain will be delivered on-site, where required</u> to make up the total number of biodiversity units required to deliver <u>to the full 25%, off-site enhancements will be sought.</u></p> <p>An <u>In particular, an</u> appropriate financial payment will be sought by the District Council for the delivery of off-site biodiversity net gain (via an off-site delivery provider) and this will be used to meet the aims and objectives of nearby Conservation Target Areas (CTAs), the restoration and enhancement of designated sites, the delivery of a Nature Recovery Network, the restoration of priority habitats and species, and/or the creation of new Green Infrastructure within the local area.</p>
MM17	Policy 9 – Biodiversity Net Gain	<p>Amend paragraphs 6 – 9 of Policy 9 as follows:</p> <p>Any application should be supported by a Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy or equivalent with a Biodiversity Impact Map, Biodiversity Proposals Map, a full copy of any net gain metric calculations (not a summary), a justification that all the principles within the Good Practice Principles and associated Practical Guide have been met and an indication of how the delivery of on-site net gain will be implemented, managed and monitored. All assumptions applied within the metric must be explicit (e.g. how proposed habitats might look, use of green roofs) within the strategy.</p>

		<p>The complete details of all off-site delivery of biodiversity net gain, where the developer takes responsibility for this rather than making a financial contribution to a recognised delivery provider, shall be incorporated into the strategy, including implementation, management and monitoring for a minimum period of 30 years, and details of how this will be audited.</p> <p>An 'As Built' final biodiversity net gain report will be required to provide a complete audit of the delivery of on-site habitats included in the net gain calculations.</p> <p>A Biodiversity Mitigation, Compensation, Monitoring and Management Framework, detailing all the mitigation requirements for the development and incorporating details of compensation, including strategies for farmland birds and rare arable wildflowers, the basic details of a monitoring strategy and indications of habitat and species management requirements, is also required as part of any outline application to provide details that can be used by subsequent reserved matters applications to ensure that they are fully compliant with all the necessary mitigation and compensation measures for biodiversity.</p> <p><u>A Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy shall be submitted with applications for major development that includes:</u></p>
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. <u>A full copy of any net gain metric calculations (not a summary);</u> ii. <u>Assumptions made within the metric and explicit reasons for these (e.g. how proposed habitats might look, use of green roofs);</u> iii. <u>Consideration of the principles within the Good Practice Principles and associated Practical Guide;</u> iv. <u>Outline of the design process, including aims and objectives, justifications for the types of habitats that have been incorporated, site context, ecological networks, and species conservation;</u> v. <u>Biodiversity Impact Map and Biodiversity Proposals Plan (drawings and GIS map layers of where the habitats are located before and after development so that they can be easily recognised when compared to the habitats recorded in the metric, i.e. clearly labelled, numbered and categorised);</u> vi. <u>An indication of how the delivery of on-site net gain will be implemented, including of habitat protection, creation, restoration, enhancement (e.g. based on phasing plans);</u> vii. <u>Complete details of all off-site delivery of biodiversity net gain, where the developer takes responsibility for this rather than making a financial contribution to a recognised delivery provider, including implementation, management and monitoring for a minimum period of 30 years, and details of how this will be audited;</u> viii. <u>Proposals for management and monitoring of biodiversity net gain outcomes over at least the 30-year period; and</u> ix. <u>A commitment to the production and submission of an 'As Built' final biodiversity net gain report to provide a complete audit of</u>
--	--	--

		<p><u>the delivery of on-site habitats included in the net gain calculations.</u></p>
<p>MM18</p>	<p>Policy 10 – Water Environment</p> <p>Paragraph 7.78</p>	<p>Amend the first and second paragraphs of Policy 10 as follows:</p> <p>An ambitious approach to the water environment is expected for the Garden Village and its surrounding catchment, adopting a sustainable integrated management of water that fully incorporates high quality green and blue infrastructure. Achievement of this high quality will need to may be demonstrated through the use of the Building with Nature standards.; at the design stage of development, a Design Award accreditation will be required, and in the following stages the delivery of exemplary Green and Blue Infrastructure will be required through the Full Award – Excellent accreditation.</p> <p>In terms of flood risk, the OCGV development at Salt Cross will be required to be sequentially designed to avoid areas at high flood risk from all potential sources of flooding and reduce surrounding flood risk, particularly through the use of natural flood management techniques. The potential impact of climate change will need to be fully assessed, in accordance with Environment Agency’s guidance on flood risk and climate change allowances. Built development will need to be located outside the 70% climate change fluvial flood extent. All major planning applications should be accompanied by:</p>

		<p>Delete paragraph 7.78 as follows:</p> <p>Building with Nature (see Section 6 – Healthy Place Shaping) recognises the relationship between the water environment and development and includes water as a key theme, with a commitment to: improve water quality on site and in the wider area; reduce the risk of flooding; and manage water naturally for maximum benefit.</p>
MM19	Policy 10 – Water Environment	<p>Amend criterion a) of Policy 10 as follows:</p> <p>a) a detailed Flood Risk Assessment, including <u>appropriate consideration of cumulative impact and</u>, where required by the Lead Local Flood Authority and the Environment Agency, detailed modelling of any ordinary watercourses on the site using the most up to date model data to define the Flood Zones and model the effect of climate change;</p>

MM20	Policy 10 – Water Environment	<p>Amend criterion d) of Policy 10 as follows:</p> <p>d) an exemplar sustainable drainage system (SuDS), as part of a comprehensive SuDS strategy, making extensive use of diverse SuDS features to provide multifunctional benefits, in particular achieving net biodiversity gain, and giving details of delivery, future management and maintenance.</p> <p>Using a methodology first agreed in writing by the local planning authority, the The SuDS features will need to be informed by up to date information obtained through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i) Infiltration testing;ii) Groundwater monitoring;iii) Contaminated land surveys;iv) Local data and watercourse survey to calculate greenfield run-off rates for sub-catchment areas; andv) An outline drainage strategy to include an assessment of storage volumes.
------	-------------------------------	---

MM21	Policy 10 – Water Environment	<p>Amend the final paragraph of Policy 10 as follows:</p> <p>For wastewater and water quality, a focused local strategy is required to be undertaken and submitted with the outline planning application, <u>will be required</u> based on an assessment of the wastewater network capacity, highway drainage systems, water quality conditions and flood risk, including impact on the receiving River Thames. The strategy should be prepared in the context of the site-wide Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) required by Policy 30 and set out details of a comprehensive waste water conveyance and treatment solution <u>consider appropriate waste water conveyance and treatment solutions including</u> for the Garden Village, the phasing of new waste water and highway drainage infrastructure and measures to ensure there will not be an adverse impact in <u>on</u> water quality or an increase in the risk of sewer flooding as a result of waste water flows from the development. Opportunities should be taken to improve water quality, including through the use of SuDS, to ensure the discharge of clean water into watercourses.</p>
MM22	Policy 11 – Environmental Assets	<p>Amend the second paragraph of Policy 11 as follows:</p> <p>The following reports are particularly important and will be required to accompany the outline planning application: <u>for major development:</u></p>

<p>MM23</p>	<p>Policy 12 – Conserving and Enhancing the Historic Environment of Salt Cross</p> <p>Paragraph 7.134</p> <p>Paragraph 7.145</p> <p>Paragraph 7.147</p> <p>GV16</p>	<p>Add a new penultimate bullet point to Policy 12 as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Retention of Tilgarsley, its spatial relationship along with other key elements of its setting that contribute to its heritage significance;</u> <p>Amend paragraph 7.134 as follows:</p> <p>There are sixteen non-designated assets identified in the LUC Study, including a number of historic pathways/ tracks/ roads and hedgerows that are historically important and the suggested remains of a deserted medieval village known as Tilgarsley which was purportedly depopulated during the Black Death and abandoned by 1349.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.145 as follows:</p> <p>A total of 16 non-designated assets have been identified within the garden village site including a number of historic pathways/ tracks/ roads and hedgerows, the site of a Bronze Age Barrow Complex recorded at New Wintles Farm, an area of cropmarks to the west of New Wintles Farm and in the north-west area of the site, a substantial hollow way leads to an area of earthworks (banks and hollows) and soilmarks, suggested to form</p>
-------------	---	--

		<p>forming the remains of the deserted medieval village at Tilgarsley, which was purportedly depopulated during the Black Death and abandoned by 1349. The remains identified here are thought to comprise a village green surrounded on all sides by houses, accessed via a hollow way.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 7.147 as follows:</p> <p>The gravel deposits recorded within the eastern half of the site are a known focus for settlement, as indicated by the recorded prehistoric and early medieval activity. In the west of the site, many of the fields have been reorganised and amalgamated and as such, there is a good potential for former field boundaries and other low value medieval and post-medieval agricultural features.</p> <p>Opportunities: It will be critical for a programme of archaeological work to evaluate the significance of these assets and to inform a mitigation strategy. The possible Tilgarsley medieval deserted village and its hollow way and earthwork remains could potentially be of high value, although not currently designated, and may require preservation in-situ. Assuming that preservation in-situ is required, then the area including this asset could be demarcated as strategic open land, in which no ground intrusive work, vehicular movement, etc. is permitted.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Remains of lesser value may be 'preserved by record'. Depending on their value this could entail full excavation and recording or an archaeological watching brief. Any programme of work would also be designed to clarify the potential for any hitherto unknown heritage assets and the evidence of the past environments of the site which may be high given the recorded presence of alluvial deposits and river terrace gravels.</p> <p>Amend GV16 as follows:</p> <p>To fully address and capitalise on the constraints and opportunities presented by heritage assets including the listed buildings at City Farm and the suspected site of the former medieval village of Tilgarsley.</p>
--	--	--

Movement and Connectivity		
Main Modification Reference	Policy/Paragraph Reference	Main Modification
MM24	Policy 14 – Active and Healthy Travel	<p>Replace Policy 14 as follows:</p> <p>Walking and cycling routes must be coherent, direct, safe and attractive, whilst being inclusive and wide enough to accommodate people with disabilities and young children. Routes must be multi-purpose, providing access to services and facilities including schools and public transport, as well as serving leisure needs.</p> <p>There must be multiple suitable access points for walking and cycling into the site, which connect to a coherent internal (and external) pedestrian and cycle network including to the proposed improvements to walking and cycling routes along the A40.</p> <p>Existing public rights of way and cycle routes must be retained and enhanced to improve accessibility for all, both within and in the vicinity of the Garden Village. New roads crossing existing rights of way shall be minimised but where this is necessary, appropriate crossings must be provided.</p>

		<p>New routes must be created both within and in the vicinity of the site to provide safe and convenient connections to key services and facilities including schools.</p> <p>A grade-separated crossing (underpass) shall be provided between the Garden Village and Eynsham. The Salt Cross and West Eynsham Strategic Development Area developers will need to cover the design and construction costs of the underpass, with costs reasonably apportioned.</p> <p>Segregated cycle and pedestrian provision via Lower Road to Hanborough Station shall be provided, with segregated facilities for cyclists and pedestrians also the preference within the Garden Village.</p> <p>The concept of 'school streets' will be promoted, including along Cuckoo Lane and on other roads linking to the schools. Cuckoo Lane will be closed to through traffic whilst ensuring properties at the southern end are accessible.</p> <p>Specific cycle and pedestrian zones will be included within the masterplan such that access for motor vehicles will be restricted at certain times (or at all times) to specific streets, or networks of streets.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>The spine road through the Garden Village must be designed with a strong sense of place, where pedestrians and cyclists have a safe presence. Traffic calming measures and a 20mph speed limit across the whole Garden Village site should be introduced. It is important to ensure that the spine road does not lead to severance and divide the Garden Village, and adequate crossing points for pedestrians and cyclists must be provided.</p> <p>Improvements of existing routes into Eynsham e.g. to ensure safe connections from the new underpass must be provided.</p> <p>Evidence of safe routes to school must be provided and shall include crossing points on routes to school; school signage; barriers; zig zag 'keep clear' markings at crucial crossing points outside the school; appropriate roads/pavement/verge design; and appropriate highway parking provision which must be inline and not head-on parking. Where a site is provided for e.g. a 2FE school but initially only a 1FE school is to be built, the pupil drop requirements will be for the maximum potential size of the site i.e. 2FE or 3FE.</p> <p>Planning permission will not be granted for development that compromises the delivery of these pedestrian and cycle improvements.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Planning permission will only be granted for new roads within or serving Salt Cross if they are based on low vehicle speeds and are designed to prioritise pedestrian and cycle movements, and easy access to public transport.</p> <p>Cycle parking</p> <p>Ample cycle parking must be provided at appropriate points around the development, including provision for electric bikes and bike/ electric bike hire. Cycle parking must be provided in accordance with the minimum standards below:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Residential cycle parking: 1 bed – at least 2 spaces per dwelling 2 bed – at least 3 spaces per dwelling 3+ bed – at least 4 spaces per dwelling • Employment cycle parking (covered): 1 space per 50m² • Retail cycle parking: 1 space per 75m² (gross internal area) <p>Residential: If a garage is suitably sized then it can be considered as secure cycle storage. Where no garage is available then secure, enclosed cycle</p>
--	--	---

		<p>parking must be provided. This is likely to be in a rear garden in the form of a specific cycle store or garden shed. Convenient access will be required to the cycle storage area without the need to go through the house. Alternatively, cycle storage could be provided to the front of the house, designed as part of the house facade design. Residential areas should include provision of at least a 13A power supply for charging electric bikes although consideration will be needed for the provision of a higher power supply where necessary e.g. for charging cargo bikes.</p> <p>Apartments: Communal cycle storage must be in close proximity to the entrance of the apartment block for convenience and security. This could comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Communal ground floor storage within the building, with secure external access and positioned in a well-overlooked area.• Communal separate secure covered cycle store which should be suitably lit. <p>Employment sites: Facilities must be provided to support sustainable travel including appropriate provision of lockers, showers and changing facilities.</p> <p>Financial contributions towards off-site cycle parking provision will be required including at Hanborough Station, Eynsham Park & Ride, Eynsham Village Centre and Oxford City Centre.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Schools: Covered cycle parking must be provided, which is future proofed for expansion. For the Primary School: 1 space per 5 pupils plus 1 space per 3 staff. For the Secondary School: 1 space per pupil plus 1 space per 3 staff. Entrances must be provided at various points around the school sites with excellent and safe access for all users including deliveries and school buses. Access for vehicles must be possible via a continuous circular route. The design of the school site shall accord with OCC requirements and standards for schools.</p> <p>A40 infrastructure improvements for pedestrians and cyclists</p> <p>S106 planning obligations will be required to secure financial contributions towards cycle and walking infrastructure including the B4044 cycle route and improvements to be delivered as part of the A40 Corridor improvements. Specifically, the following will be provided along the A40 to support walking and cycling to/from the Garden Village, and the internal network of routes within Salt Cross must link into these:</p> <p>Pedestrian and cycle crossings on A40</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A40/ Witney Road signalised junction: Upgraded pedestrian and cycle crossing.• Crossing near Spareacre Lane: A new signalised crossing.
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">● Crossing near Hanborough Road: A new signalised crossing <p>Improved pedestrian/cycle provision at A40 junctions</p> <p>To improve provision for pedestrians and cyclists at junctions along the A40 in the vicinity of Eynsham, junction reconfiguration and improvements will be provided at the following locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● A40/Cuckoo Lane ● A40/Witney Road● Esso petrol station entry/egress● Eynsham Roundabout● A40/Cassington Signals● Horsemere Lane: closure to traffic with access maintained for equestrians, pedestrians and cyclists <p>Upgraded A40 footway/cycleway</p> <p>Upgraded shared use footways and cycleways will be provided along the A40 as part of the A40 Corridor improvements ensuring that a continuous route is provided between Witney, Eynsham Park & Ride and Oxford.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>A40 Duke's Cut Bridge works</p> <p>The A40 Corridor improvements will involve widening and/or strengthening these structures to enable the delivery of improved footway/cycleway provision. A new foot/cycle path connection from the A40 to the National Cycle Network (Route 5) along the canal towpath will also be delivered in the vicinity of the structures.</p> <p>Speed limit</p> <p>The speed limit along the A40 in the vicinity of Eynsham will be reduced from the National Speed Limit to a maximum of 50 mph.</p> <p>Smart Technology: Provision of infrastructure to enable the smart, real-time monitoring of the take up of sustainable transport modes and car use must be provided within the Garden Village and on roads in the vicinity of the site.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Precise mapping of utilities' infrastructure to support long term maintenance must be provided within the Garden Village and as part of the A40 Corridor improvements.</p> <p><u>The development of Salt Cross should make walking and cycling the most attractive forms of local transport, supported by an extensive network of high quality walking and cycling routes both on and off-site. These shall include:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>- The southern section of the Lower Road segregated cycle route in the eastern part of the development.</u><u>- Improved crossing facilities of the A40. In addition to at grade crossings, this shall include a grade separated crossing. The grade separated crossing shall be an underpass unless it is clearly demonstrated that the crossing is not necessary to meet placemaking objectives or cannot be delivered due to technical feasibility.</u><u>- A spine road design that ensures a safe and attractive environment for walking and cycling and minimises severance of the site.</u><u>- Subject to the necessary order(s), Cuckoo Lane closed to through traffic and incorporated into the walking and cycling network of the site.</u><u>- Improvements to existing connections including to Freeland, Long Hanborough and Eynsham for walking and cycling.</u>
--	--	--

		<p><u>Any masterplan for the Garden Village site must include specific cycle and pedestrian zones such that access for motor vehicles will be restricted at certain times (or at all times) to specific streets, or networks of streets. Evidence of safe routes to school will also be required.</u></p> <p><u>Ample cycle parking must be provided at suitably accessible locations around the site (including provision for electric bikes and bike/electric bike hire) in accordance with the following minimum standards:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• Residential cycle parking:</u> <p><u>1 bed – at least 2 spaces per dwelling</u></p> <p><u>2 bed – at least 3 spaces per dwelling</u></p> <p><u>3+ bed – at least 4 spaces per dwelling</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• Employment cycle parking (covered): 1 space per 50m²</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• Retail cycle parking: 1 space per 75m² (gross internal area)</u>
--	--	--

		<p><u>Financial contributions towards off-site cycle parking provision will be required including at Hanborough Station, Eynsham Park & Ride, Eynsham Village Centre and Oxford City Centre.</u></p> <p><u>Financial contributions will also be required in respect of the B4044 cycle route and the segregated cycle route connection from the northern boundary of the Garden Village to Hanborough Station.</u></p> <p><u>Development of the Garden Village must demonstrate effective integration with the walking and cycling elements of the A40 corridor improvements. As these will be forward funded through HIF, S106 planning obligations will be required to secure financial contributions towards repayment of HIF which has enabled their early delivery.</u></p> <p><u>Provision of infrastructure to enable the smart, real-time monitoring of the take up of sustainable transport modes and car use must be provided within the Garden Village and on roads in the vicinity of the site.</u></p>
--	--	---

MM25	Policy 15 – Public Transport	<p>Replace Policy 15 as follows:</p> <p>An integrated and innovative approach must be taken to public transport to facilitate high bus and rail patronage.</p> <p>The Sustainable Transport Hub (centred on a new Park & Ride site) and supporting A40 infrastructure developments must be integrated in the Garden Village design, with a focus on pedestrian and cycle connectivity, whilst restricting private vehicular access to the Park & Ride site from the Garden Village.</p> <p>Connections to Hanborough Station must be significantly improved and take account of the Masterplan being developed for the station. Consideration must be given to a new entrance from Lower Road south of the railway, with a focus on bus, pedestrian and cycling accessibility.</p> <p>Development must ensure provision of high quality, comfortable and fully accessible bus stops. If bus stops are located further than 400 metres from dwellings due to a higher frequency service being provided, appropriate provisions must in place that enable the elderly and less mobile to still reach a bus stop easily.</p>
------	------------------------------	---

		<p>Financial contributions will be required for the improvement of A40 corridor bus services between Carterton, Witney, Oxford and the Eastern Arc, including a bus service (3 buses per hour) through the Garden Village itself.</p> <p>The planning application for the Park & Ride includes an 850 space car park, whilst the Local Plan Policy allows for 1,000 spaces. Consideration should therefore be given to accommodating means for future expansion of the site.</p> <p>A40 corridor</p> <p>S106 planning obligations will be required to secure financial contributions towards the A40 Corridor infrastructure schemes and the required repayment of the HIF funding secured to facilitate the delivery of these schemes ahead of the receipt of S106 funding. S106 contributions will be required from developers at Salt Cross and other development sites proposed along the A40 corridor.</p> <p>Specifically, the following will be provided by S106 funding:</p>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• A40 Eastbound bus lanes: Between Eynsham Park & Ride and Wolvercote roundabout (including widening and/ or strengthening works to the bridge structures at Duke's Cut).• A40 Westbound bus lanes: Between Eynsham Park & Ride and Duke's Cut Bridges.• Adjustments to A40 junctions and the provision of bus gates to give priority to buses joining the general traffic lane where continuous bus lanes cannot be provided.• Improved bus stop provision. <p>Land will be safeguarded along the southern boundary of the Garden Village to support widening of the A40 to accommodate the bus lanes and shared foot/ cycle paths.</p> <p>Rail improvements</p> <p>Financial contributions towards the North Cotswold Line Transformation will be required from developers at Salt Cross and other strategic development sites proposed along the A40 corridor that will benefit from improved rail accessibility in West Oxfordshire.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Specifically, there will be a focus on the development of Hanborough as a transport hub (as part of the wider infrastructure and service upgrade proposed for the North Cotswold Line). Details regarding the enhancement of Hanborough Station will be set out in a Station Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document, but is likely to include: a station building; provision of a second platform; an accessible footbridge with lifts; new seating and waiting facilities; a secure cycle hub; new bus stops and waiting shelters; high quality real time bus and train service information; and additional car parking.</p> <p><u>An integrated and innovative approach must be taken in relation to public transport to facilitate high levels of bus and rail use.</u></p> <p><u>The Garden Village design must be integrated with the Sustainable Transport Hub (centred on a new Park & Ride site) and supporting A40 infrastructure developments, with consideration given to accommodating means for future expansion of the Park and Ride site. There will be a focus on pedestrian and cycle connectivity, with private vehicular access to the Park & Ride site from the Garden Village to be restricted, wherever possible.</u></p> <p><u>Development must ensure the provision of high quality, fully accessible bus stops in suitable locations across the site and financial contributions will be required for the improvement of A40 corridor bus services</u></p>
--	--	---

		<p><u>between Carterton, Witney, Oxford and the Eastern Arc, including a bus service through the Garden Village itself.</u></p> <p><u>Development of the Garden Village must demonstrate effective integration with the public transport elements of the A40 corridor improvements. As these will be forward funded through HIF, S106 planning obligations will be required to secure financial contributions towards repayment of HIF which has enabled their early delivery.</u></p> <p><u>To facilitate the widening of the A40 in order to accommodate bus lanes and shared foot/cycle paths, any comprehensive masterplan prepared in accordance with AAP Policy 28, must make provision for land along the southern boundary of the Garden Village as necessary.</u></p> <p><u>Connections to Hanborough Station must be significantly improved, with a focus on bus, pedestrian and cycling accessibility and consideration to be given to a new entrance from Lower Road south of the railway.</u></p> <p><u>Financial contributions will be required towards improvements at Hanborough Station which will be set out in a masterplan for the station, reflecting its increasing importance as a key transport hub forming part of the wider infrastructure and service upgrade proposed for the North Cotswold Line.</u></p>
--	--	---

MM26	Policy 16 - Reducing the Overall Need to Travel Including by Car	<p>Replace Policy 16 as follows:</p> <p>Robust evidence must be provided to demonstrate that all reasonable efforts have been made to reduce the overall need to travel to include as a minimum:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the overall mix of different land uses which are appropriately phased;• the provision of 'clusters' of complimentary mixed use development;• shared use facilities; and• the provision of flexible working spaces within residential and employment areas, including within individual houses. <p>Full fibre broadband and considerations for 5G provision must be implemented early in the development; the site, including every property within Salt Cross, must be fitted with the necessary infrastructure to enable the provision of Ultrafast Fibre to premises' broadband and to assets such as street lights and traffic lights which will provide important connectivity in public spaces. There should also be flexibility in the ducting to future proof additional connectivity.</p>
------	--	---

		<p>Car Parking</p> <p>The physical provision of car parking is a key tool in influencing travel behaviour and reducing dependency on the private car, alongside other demand management measures and the provision of more sustainable travel options. Applications for development must therefore be supported by:</p> <p>A Spatial Car Parking Management Plan setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• The areas of the site that will be car free development (minimum 15% of total dwellings).• Site wide demand management measures including Car Free Zones.• Details of how future technological development will be included and provided for e.g. parking sensors in business areas to monitor car parking occupancy/ usage; digital mapping of all parking spaces to facilitate repurposing.• An indication as to how land used for car parking could cost effectively be converted to other uses (such as open space) as demand reduces.• Parking restrictions — including any Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) required within Salt Cross and the wider Eynsham area. This will include
--	--	--

		<p>any restrictions that may be required to discourage displaced parking to the Park & Ride.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• On and off site principles of car parking for local centre land uses and schools including kerbside management and provision of drop-off zones.• Measures for discouraging driving to the Park & Ride from Salt Cross. <p>Each subsequent Phase/Parcel of the development shall provide a Detailed Car Parking Management Plan which will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Take all reasonable opportunities to provide private car parking at the lowest reasonable levels• Make use of current, and where appropriate anticipated, technological developments.• Account for both current and anticipated travel behaviours in the design proposals, as well as enabling adaptation for emergency planning.• So far as is possible, integrate car parking into the street design and allow for cost effective conversion, particularly for private areas.• Provide for appropriate levels of EV charging within each parking area; EV charging points must be provided at the following locations within the Garden Village:
--	--	--

		<p>—All residential properties with a parking space</p> <p>—50% of non-allocated parking spaces</p> <p>—25% of non-residential development parking spaces</p> <p>Charging points in non-allocated spaces must be located conveniently for residents with no longer than a 5 minute walk (approximately 500 metres) from any property with non-allocated parking and their nearest EV charging point. To future proof developments and reduce longer term costs, all non-allocated parking areas should include appropriate cable provision to prepare for increased demand in the future.</p> <p>The absolute maximum car parking provision shall be 1 space per 60 m² of employment space with residential provision as below:</p> <p>1 bed units — 0.75 non-allocated per property</p> <p>2 & 3 bed units — 1 off-street bay per property</p> <p>4+ bed units — 1 off-street bay per property plus the equivalent of 1 non-allocated bay per property</p> <p>Electric Vehicle charging</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Future increases in energy demand must be anticipated and measures delivered to ensure sufficient electrical capacity within Salt Cross for the long term, including potential implications for street lighting and Alternative Fuels Infrastructure Regulations 2017 and the Open Charge Point Protocol (OCPP) or agreed alternative standard. EV charger units for non-allocated parking should be managed by a professional contractor with demonstrable experience and appropriate maintenance to ensure that EV chargers remain functional.</p> <p>Travel Demand Management</p> <p>Car clubs and a bike hire scheme should be established at accessible locations throughout the Garden Village, with robust arrangements in place for long-term management.</p> <p>Proposals will be required to demonstrate the use of innovation to enable residents and employees to plan their journeys by means other than the car.</p> <p>TDM measures should be implemented to encourage sustainable travel, including car sharing. This should include residents of Eynsham Village and the West Eynsham Strategic Development Area where their wider involvement improves the viability of initiatives.</p>
--	--	---

		<p>Incentivised travel initiatives including public transport discounts and bike vouchers should be provided.</p> <p>A Framework (site-wide) Travel Plan and subsidiary Travel plans will be required to cover all residential areas, schools, employment sites and mixed use areas. The Travel Plans must include robust monitoring programmes and be linked to the Transport Assessment. Achieving trip generation and mode split targets will be incentivised and secured through planning conditions.</p> <p>School Travel Plans will be required that will include the provision of pupil drop-off parking spaces. The number required will need to be agreed with OCC, based on the developers' evidence-based assessment of the school's requirements.</p> <p>An effective monitoring approach will be required, utilising smart technologies which should be set out in an Innovation Plan and linked into the Framework Travel Plan. Monitoring data will need to be provided to the Council directly via an Application Programming Interface (API) to enable live, integrated monitoring of travel patterns and Travel Plan targets. This will include specific monitoring of the School Travel Plan.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Proposals will be required to demonstrate versatility in the Garden Village strategy/ design to allow for the implementation of other demand management measures beyond those that have been explored in the AAP, where they are deemed effective in reducing private use and improving inclusivity.</p> <p><u>The design of the Garden Village must seek to reduce the overall need to travel, particularly by car, with robust evidence required that all reasonable efforts have been made.</u></p> <p><u>Development at Salt Cross must be supported by innovative travel demand measures including, but not limited to, the establishment of car clubs and bike hire schemes at accessible locations, car sharing and incentivised travel initiatives including public transport discounts and bike vouchers.</u></p> <p><u>A Framework (site-wide) Travel Plan and subsidiary Travel plans linked to a Transport Assessment (TA) will be required to cover all residential areas, schools, employment sites and mixed use areas, with trip generation and mode split targets incentivised and secured through the planning process. Proposals for effective monitoring utilising smart technologies should be set out in an Innovation Plan.</u></p>
--	--	---

		<p><u>A Spatial Car Parking Management Plan will be required to address site-wide considerations including the use of parking restrictions and car-free zones, areas of car-free development (minimum 15% of total dwellings) kerbside management and provision of drop-off zones, use of technologies (e.g. to monitor and map usage) and the potential to re-purpose parking to other uses as demand reduces.</u></p> <p><u>A Detailed Car Parking Management Plan will be required for each subsequent phase. This must take all reasonable opportunities to reduce the amount of private car parking, make use of and account for, current and anticipated technological changes and travel behaviours as well as enabling adaptation for emergency planning. So far as is possible, car parking should be integrated into the street design and allow for cost effective conversion, particularly for private areas.</u></p> <p><u>The following maximum car parking standards will apply:</u></p> <p><u>Residential</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><u>• 1 bed units – 0.75 non-allocated per property</u><u>• 2 & 3 bed units – 1 off-street bay per property</u>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>4+ bed units – 1 off-street bay per property plus the equivalent of 1 non-allocated bay per property</u> <p><u>Office and Research and Development Space (Use Classes E(g) (i) and E(g) (ii))</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>1 space per 60 m² of employment space</u> <p><u>Other Commercial, Business and Service Uses</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Parking for other supporting land uses will be determined through transport evidence supporting the relevant application and should represent the lowest level capable of efficiently serving those uses.</u> <p><u>Electric Vehicle (EV) charging points must be provided as follows (or as determined in any subsequent government guidance or legislation):</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>All residential properties with a parking space</u>• <u>50% of non-allocated parking spaces</u>
--	--	--

		<p><u>• 25% of non-residential development parking spaces</u></p> <p><u>Charging points in non-allocated spaces must be located conveniently for residents with no longer than a 5 minute walk (approximately 500 metres) from any property with non-allocated parking and their nearest EV charging point. To future proof developments and reduce longer term costs, all non-allocated parking areas should include appropriate cable provision to prepare for increased future demand.</u></p>
MM27	Policy 17 - Road Connectivity and Access	<p>Replace Policy 17 as follows:</p> <p>The principal vehicular access points for Salt Cross will comprise:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new roundabout (the 'Western Development Roundabout') located on the A40 to the west of the proposed Park & Ride access junction. Additional junctions on the A40 will not be permitted as this would impact on traffic flow and congestion, and would undermine the benefits of the A40 corridor improvements. • A new junction with Lower Road which will form the eastern access point for the spine road through the Garden Village.

		<p>Additional highway infrastructure to be provided will include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• A spine road through the site, accessed from the 'Western Development Roundabout' on the A40, west of the Park & Ride access junction. This should be a through road in at least the early phases of development although the route should be future proofed to enable it to be bisected (allowing for walk, cycle and bus access only) in future years if traffic conditions on the external road network enable this. The mechanism (triggers and a long stop) for the contribution beyond build out of the site will be needed, as will innovative infrastructure to enable monitoring of those triggers. An Innovation Plan will be needed for the site, which will include details of how monitoring will be undertaken using smarter technologies, how innovations within the development site will be future proofed and what innovations will be integrated into the design and build, to be funded by the development.• Signalisation of the A4095/ Lower Road junction.• Measures to deter through traffic travelling between the A40 and A4095 via Cuckoo Lane and Freeland village. A change in priority on Cuckoo Lane to discourage traffic routing through Freeland village must be provided and technologies to support monitoring of the effectiveness of this will be required. <p>All new infrastructure should be connected in real time to traffic management.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Section 106 planning obligations will be required to secure financial contributions towards the A40 Corridor infrastructure schemes and the required repayment of the HIF funding secured to facilitate the delivery of these schemes ahead of the receipt of S106 funding. S106 contributions for these schemes will be required from developers at Salt Cross and other sites proposed along the A40 corridor. Specifically, Section 106 contributions will be required towards the following highway schemes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Extension of the existing A40 dualling (between Witney and the new Park & Ride access junction).• Improvements to the Lower Road/ A40 roundabout.• Highway and junction capacity improvements along the A40 as part of the A40 Corridor improvements.• Provision of enhanced facilities at the proposed Eynsham Park & Ride. <p>Development proposals must be aligned and integrated with the A40 Corridor Strategy and proposed A40 Corridor improvements along the A40, in addition to other infrastructure improvements in the wider area. Construction and phasing of the development must be co-ordinated with other works on the A40. The number of houses that can be accessed via a single road link should comply with OCC's 'Residential Road Design Guide (2003) – Second Edition (2015)'</p>
--	--	---

		<p>All planning applications submitted for the Garden Village must include a Construction & Logistics Plan in order to minimise and mitigate the impact of construction traffic.</p> <p>All commercial uses at the Garden Village must be supported by a Delivery and Servicing Plan to reduce and mitigate the impact of deliveries on the local road network e.g. through freight consolidation. This must be submitted and agreed as part of the full planning application. For residential areas, deliveries and servicing must be covered within the Travel Plan, with appropriate targets set.</p> <p>Planning conditions/ planning obligations will be used to secure the measures identified through the Construction & Logistics Plan and Delivery and Servicing Plan, and the targets included within them.</p> <p>Any laybys impacted by proposed access arrangements must be mitigated/ relocated with any associated costs of doing this funded by the Salt Cross/ West Eynsham SDA developments as appropriate.</p> <p>Permission for development will only be granted where the Council is satisfied that the impact on the local and strategic road network and</p>
--	--	--

		<p>density of the development would be acceptable and does not compromise the delivery and benefits of the A40 Corridor improvements.</p> <p>Planning applications for built development must be accompanied by details of how proposed development will help facilitate the delivery of transport improvements and mitigation measures.</p> <p>First occupation of Salt Cross (unless car free) will not be permitted until completion of the A40 bus lanes, and completion of the junction improvements at Pear Tree roundabout. Car free development close to the A40/ Park & Ride would however be considered in advance.</p> <p>Mitigation measures must be implemented in accordance with an agreed phasing of development, with full implementation prior to occupation of the final development phase.</p> <p><u>The principal vehicular access points for Salt Cross to be funded by the development will comprise:</u></p> <p><u>• A new roundabout (the 'Western Development Roundabout') located on the A40 to the west of the proposed Park & Ride access junction; and</u></p>
--	--	--

		<p><u>• A new junction with Lower Road which will form the eastern access point for the spine road through the Garden Village.</u></p> <p><u>Additional junctions onto the A40 to those above will not be permitted.</u></p> <p><u>Any laybys impacted by proposed access arrangements must be mitigated/ relocated, with any associated costs to be funded on a proportionate basis as necessary.</u></p> <p><u>Additional highway infrastructure to be provided will include:</u></p> <p><u>• A spine road through the site, accessed from the 'Western Development Roundabout' and connecting to Lower Road, enabling direct and indirect access to all areas of built development within the garden village. The spine road will need to be completed at an early phase of development as access via Cuckoo Lane to the Garden Village will be limited in later phases. The route should be future proofed to enable it to be bisected in future years (allowing for walking and cycling access only);</u></p>
--	--	---

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• <u>Signalisation of the A4095/ Lower Road junction; and</u>• <u>Measures to deter through traffic travelling between the A40 and A4095 via Cuckoo Lane and Freeland village.</u> <p><u>Planning applications must be accompanied by details of how proposed development will help facilitate the delivery of transport improvements and mitigation measures and permission will only be granted where the Council is satisfied that the impact on the local and strategic road network, including the A34, would be acceptable and does not compromise the delivery and benefits of the A40 Corridor improvements.</u></p> <p><u>Mitigation measures must be implemented in accordance with an agreed phasing of development, with full implementation prior to occupation of the final development phase.</u></p> <p><u>All new infrastructure should be connected in real-time to traffic management and the number of houses that can be accessed via a single road link should comply with OCC's 'Street Design Guide'.</u></p>
--	--	--

		<p><u>Development of the Garden Village must demonstrate effective integration with the A40 corridor improvements including increased highway capacity and additional junctions/reconfiguration. As these will be forward funded through HIF, S106 planning obligations will be required to secure financial contributions towards repayment of HIF which has enabled their early delivery.</u></p> <p><u>All planning applications submitted for the Garden Village must include a Construction & Logistics Plan with commercial uses to be supported by a Delivery and Servicing Plan. Planning conditions/planning obligations will be used to secure any agreed measures/targets.</u></p>
--	--	---

Enterprise, Innovation and Productivity		
Main Modification Reference	Policy/Paragraph Reference	Main Modification
MM28	Policy 18 – Salt Cross Science and Technology Park	<p>Amend the third paragraph of Policy 18 as follows:</p> <p>The campus will include a range of integrated and accessible complementary uses such as shops, coffee shops / restaurants, gym and crèche. <u>The potential impacts of any larger complementary uses over 500m² net sales floorspace (either individually or cumulatively) on the viability of nearby local centres including Eynsham, should be assessed in accordance with Local Plan Policy E6.</u></p>
MM29	Policy 20 – Homeworking	<p>Amend the third paragraph of Policy 20 as follows:</p> <p><u>Unless justified on the grounds of technical feasibility,</u> Every <u>every</u> household and shared space will be supported by all necessary infrastructure to enable the provision of Ultrafast Fibre to the Premises (FttP) broadband.</p>

MM30	Policy 21 – Employment Skills and Training	<p>Amend the first paragraph of Policy 21 as follows:</p> <p>Any outline planning application or subsequent application for major development Applications for major development at Salt Cross will be required to be supported by a Community Employment Plan (CEP) to ensure that local people are able to benefit from training and job opportunities arising from the development.</p>
------	--	--

Meeting current and future housing needs																																
Main Modification Reference	Policy/Paragraph Reference	Proposed Main Modification																														
MM31	Figure 10.1	<p>Replace Figure 10.1 with the following indicative trajectory:</p> <table border="1"> <caption>Indicative Trajectory Data</caption> <thead> <tr> <th>Year</th> <th>Value</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr><td>2026</td><td>50</td></tr> <tr><td>2027</td><td>70</td></tr> <tr><td>2028</td><td>135</td></tr> <tr><td>2029</td><td>160</td></tr> <tr><td>2030</td><td>180</td></tr> <tr><td>2031</td><td>195</td></tr> <tr><td>2032</td><td>195</td></tr> <tr><td>2033</td><td>210</td></tr> <tr><td>2034</td><td>210</td></tr> <tr><td>2035</td><td>210</td></tr> <tr><td>2036</td><td>195</td></tr> <tr><td>2037</td><td>180</td></tr> <tr><td>2038</td><td>135</td></tr> <tr><td>2039</td><td>75</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Year	Value	2026	50	2027	70	2028	135	2029	160	2030	180	2031	195	2032	195	2033	210	2034	210	2035	210	2036	195	2037	180	2038	135	2039	75
Year	Value																															
2026	50																															
2027	70																															
2028	135																															
2029	160																															
2030	180																															
2031	195																															
2032	195																															
2033	210																															
2034	210																															
2035	210																															
2036	195																															
2037	180																															
2038	135																															
2039	75																															

MM32	Policy 22 - Housing Delivery	<p>Amend the first paragraph of Policy 22 as follows:</p> <p>The total number of new homes expected to be delivered within the boundary of Salt Cross as defined in the AAP is 2,200 units homes in line with the working assumption contained in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031.</p>
MM33	Policy 22 - Housing Delivery	<p>Amend the second paragraph of Policy 22 as follows:</p> <p>This is not however a maximum 'ceiling' to development and may be exceeded. Any increase over and above this indicative quantum will need to be robustly justified having regard to <u>if it is demonstrated to accord with</u> the overall vision, core objectives and relevant policies set out in the AAP and relevant policies of the West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 and Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan.</p>
MM34	Policy 22 - Housing Delivery	<p>Amend the third paragraph of Policy 22 as follows:</p> <p>The delivery of new homes will be phased in accordance with the provision of supporting infrastructure, drawing from the Eynsham Area Infrastructure</p>

		<p>Delivery Plan (IDP) and any the site-specific IDP as appropriate (see also Policy 30 – Provision of Supporting Infrastructure)</p>
<p>MM35</p>	<p>Policy 22 - Housing Delivery</p>	<p>Delete the fourth paragraph of Policy 22 as follows:</p> <p>Residential development proposals at Salt Cross will be expected to demonstrate exemplary design standards alongside a commitment to the acceleration of housing delivery. This should be in the form of a housing delivery statement (or equivalent) which includes consideration of the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Timely provision of supporting infrastructure, in particular social and community infrastructure such as schools, meeting spaces and transport; — A diversity of housing including a range of different housing products, types, tenures and styles within each phase of development; — The use of Modern Methods of Construction (MMC); — ‘Non traditional’ housing delivery mechanisms including community led housing and custom/self build; — The potential to support multiple sales outlets at different locations within the development scheme, as part of each phase; — Integration of affordable housing within development phases; – Catering for different specialist market segments, such as build to rent; elderly persons accommodation, student/ graduate and employer linked housing.

MM36	Policy 23 - Housing Mix	<p>Amend the seventh paragraph of Policy 23 as follows:</p> <p>This indicative mix provides a guide only and in determining proposals, the Council will take into account other relevant factors including the profile of need revealed by the <u>West Oxfordshire District Council's Housing Register and Oxford City Council's Housing Register</u>, taking account of not just the overall needs profile but relative priority needs.</p>
MM37	Policy 23 - Housing Mix	<p>Amend the penultimate paragraph of Policy 23 as follows:</p> <p>Affordable homes proposed as part of the overall mix of development should demonstrate 'genuine affordability'. Affordable rent should be set having regard to the living rents identified in Table 10.2 and capped at no higher than the Local Housing Allowance (LHA) limits set out in Table 10.2 (and any subsequent updates).</p>
MM38	Policy 24 - Build to Rent	<p>Amend the fifth paragraph of Policy 24 as follows:</p> <p>It is anticipated that the proportion of affordable housing provided as part of any Build to Rent scheme will accord with the default requirement <u>benchmark</u> set out in national policy/guidance – currently 20%.</p>

MM39	Policy 25 - Custom and Self-Build Housing	<p>Amend the first paragraph of Policy 25 as follows:</p> <p>To ensure that Salt Cross provides opportunities for community-led housing and individuals to build or commission their own homes, at least 5% of the total number of homes will be set aside as serviced plots for the purposes of custom and self-build housing. Serviced plots must be provided in line with the definitions in the Self-build and Custom Housebuilding Act 2015 (as amended by the Housing and Planning Act 2016) Section 1(A1) and (A2).</p>
------	---	---

<p>MM40</p>	<p>Policy 25 - Custom and Self-Build Housing</p> <p>Paragraph 10.71</p>	<p>Amend the third paragraph of Policy 25 as follows:</p> <p>Serviced plots will be expected to be provided <u>As an indicative guide serviced plots will be encouraged</u> in clusters of 10 or more homes, included as part of each phase of development across the garden village as a whole and set out in a Phasing Plan.</p> <p>Paragraph 10.71 to be amended as follows:</p> <p>The Council expects that <u>will encourage</u> custom and self-build plots will to be delivered as an element of each phase of Salt Cross to ensure a phased supply of serviced plots comes forward to address both current and future demands. The proportion and mix of such plots and the broad locations for each phase will be agreed at the outset having regard to demand.</p>
<p>MM41</p>	<p>Policy 25 - Custom and Self-Build Housing</p>	<p>Amend the fifth paragraph of Policy 25 as follows:</p> <p>A range of Custom and Self Build housing delivery models to be supported, <u>shall be considered</u> including those which can deliver affordable homes and require some form of discount, subsidy or equity/land ownership being held by a third party such as a Registered Provider or a Community Land</p>

		Trust. Where such serviced plots are provided as affordable homes they will be required to remain affordable in perpetuity and will count towards the overall affordable housing requirement for the Garden Village.
MM42	Policy 25 - Custom and Self-Build Housing	<p>Amend the seventh paragraph of Policy 25 as follows:</p> <p>Serviced plots must be marketed at a fair market price which reflects the form and type of custom and self-build housing to be provided, for a period of 12 months, in line with a marketing strategy agreed as part of any <u>planning permission</u> which must to be agreed with the Council prior to the commencement of the development. If suitable purchasers have not come forward at the end of this 12 month period then plots may remain on the market or be built out by the developer for market housing.</p>
MM43	Policy 25 - Custom and Self-Build Housing	<p>Delete the final paragraph of Policy 25 as follows:</p> <p>The Council will seek to secure the implementation of this policy through a Section 106 legal agreement or, where appropriate, planning conditions.</p>

MM44	Policy 26 - Specialist Housing Needs Paragraph 10.90	<p>Amend the first paragraph of Policy 26 as follows:</p> <p>As part of the overall type and mix of housing opportunities at Salt Cross, the District Council will encourage provision should to be made for specialist housing to meet identified needs including, but not limited to, the needs of older people and persons with disabilities as well as opportunities for communal housing and housing linked to key employers and educational institutions.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 10.90 as follows:</p> <p><u>The West Oxfordshire Local Plan 2031 suggests that in order to achieve the current Oxfordshire average of 133 units of older persons housing per 1,000 population, an additional 1,891 new properties would need to be provided in West Oxfordshire in the period 2011 – 2031 (95 per year) rising to 2,588 new properties (129 per year) to achieve the current national average of 170 units per 1,000 population.</u> The AAP housing strategy suggests that given the projected changes in the number of older people living in Eynsham, there is likely to be a requirement for specialist housing options moving forward, including 147 units of 'housing with support' development (i.e. retirement/ sheltered housing) up to 42 housing with care units (extra-care housing/enhanced sheltered housing) and 70 care home bedspaces. <u>This is however a point in time assessment and</u></p>
------	---	--

		<u>should not be construed as a 'cap' or 'ceiling' to the number of specialist housing units that may come forward in the Eynsham area.</u>
MM45	Policy 26 - Specialist Housing Needs	<p>Delete the second paragraph of Policy 26 as follows:</p> <p>All new homes at Salt Cross will be designed to meet Building Regulations Requirement M4 (2) – accessible and adaptable dwellings unless it be robustly demonstrated that achieving the standard is not practical (e.g. where level site access cannot be achieved) or viable. 5% of new homes will be designed to meet Building Regulations Requirement M4 (3) – wheelchair adaptability.</p>
MM46	Policy 26 - Specialist Housing Needs	<p>Further amend the first paragraph of Policy 26 in line with MM44 above as follows:</p> <p>As part of the overall type and mix of housing opportunities at Salt Cross, <u>the District Council will encourage</u> provision should to be made for specialist housing to meet identified needs including, but not limited to, the needs of older people and persons with disabilities as well as opportunities for communal housing, <u>travelling communities</u> and housing linked to key employers and educational institutions.</p>

		<p>Also amend the penultimate paragraph of Policy 26 as follows:</p> <p>Proposals for education and employment-linked housing <u>as well as accommodation for travelling communities</u> will be supported as part of the overall mix of housing at Salt Cross. Any such proposals should be located in an accessible location in terms of available services and facilities including public transport.</p>
--	--	---

Building a Strong, Vibrant and Sustainable Community		
Main Modification Reference	Policy/Paragraph Reference	Main Modification
MM47	Policy 27 - Key Development Principles	<p>Delete Policy 27 as follows:</p> <p>All development proposals at Salt Cross must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> — Be consistent with the vision and core objectives of the AAP together with the TCPA garden city principles set out in Figure 2.3; — Accord with and not prejudice the delivery of, any agreed overall masterplan for the garden village site; — Demonstrate a high quality standard of design that contributes to a distinct sense of place in accordance with Policy 29; — Be designed to be resilient to, and mitigate against climate change in accordance with Policies 1 and 2 in particular; — Encourage behavioural change away from the private car, towards active travel and public transport in accordance with Policies 13, 14 and 15 in particular;

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">— Be designed to embed the principles of community safety, cohesion and inclusivity in accordance with Policies 4 and 5 in particular;— Demonstrate high levels of digital connectivity in accordance with Policy 20;— Be supported by appropriate and timely investment in infrastructure to facilitate inclusive place-making, in accordance with Policy 30;— Make efficient use of land and resources including the use of higher-density development in suitable, accessible locations;— Be durable and sustainable over the whole lifetime of the development, not just in the short term in accordance with Policies 1 and 29 in particular; and— Contribute to the health and well-being of all in accordance with Policies 4-8 in particular.
--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Part B (B2, B8) including industrial, storage and distribution;</u> • <u>Part C (C1, C2, C3, C4) including hotels, residential institutions, dwellinghouses and houses in multiple occupation;</u> • <u>Part E – commercial, business and service such as offices, research and development, shops, cafes/restaurants, financial services and indoor sport and recreation; and</u> • <u>Part F (F1, F2) including learning and non-residential institutions such as schools and local community uses such as community halls, meeting spaces and small-scale shops.</u> <p>Amend Table 11.1 as follows:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1048 842 2027 1378"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1048 842 1375 916">Land Use</th> <th data-bbox="1375 842 1704 916">Quantum/size</th> <th data-bbox="1704 842 2027 916">Commentary</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1048 916 1375 1378">Residential (C3, C2)</td> <td data-bbox="1375 916 1704 1378">About 2,200 units of varying densities.</td> <td data-bbox="1704 916 2027 1378">As outlined earlier, Salt Cross is expected to accommodate around 2,200 new homes although this is not an exact, fixed figure and should not be treated as such. The majority of new homes are expected to be in the form of</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Land Use	Quantum/size	Commentary	Residential (C3, C2)	About 2,200 units of varying densities.	As outlined earlier, Salt Cross is expected to accommodate around 2,200 new homes although this is not an exact, fixed figure and should not be treated as such. The majority of new homes are expected to be in the form of
Land Use	Quantum/size	Commentary						
Residential (C3, C2)	About 2,200 units of varying densities.	As outlined earlier, Salt Cross is expected to accommodate around 2,200 new homes although this is not an exact, fixed figure and should not be treated as such. The majority of new homes are expected to be in the form of						

				<p>'mainstream' housing (C3a) but it is likely that a proportion of other forms of housing including 'supported living' (e.g. C3(b) and C2 uses) will come forward, in line with Policy 26 – Meeting Specialist Housing Needs.</p>
		<p>Employment (B1(a) B1(b)) (E)</p>	<p>About 40 hectares including around 80,000m² of floorspace within Salt Cross Science and Technology Park and other opportunities across the site including within village/ neighbourhood centres.</p>	<p>As outlined earlier, a core element of Salt Cross is the creation of a large-scale Science and Technology Park to the west of Cuckoo Lane. This is expected to be accommodated on around 40 hectares of land and include around 80,000m² of floorspace – thereby allowing for extensive green and blue infrastructure to create a highly attractive place to work. Other, smaller-</p>

				scale employment space is expected to come forward as part of any village or neighbourhood centre which will include a mixture of different uses including potentially some flexible B-class E-class floorspace.
		Sustainable Transport hub	8ha	A sustainable transport hub to the west of Cuckoo Lane including park and ride comprising 850 car parking spaces for Park & Ride users, cycle parking spaces and electric vehicle charging points.
		Education (D1) (F1)	A primary school site of 3.01 ha to accommodate either a new 2-form or 3-form	Development at Salt Cross will increase the number of families and school age

			<p>entry primary school (depending on arrangements made in respect of the West Eynsham SDA).</p> <p>A secondary school site of 4.88 ha intended as a 'satellite' for Bartholomew school in Eynsham.</p>	<p>children within Eynsham Parish. To accommodate this, a 3.01 ha site will be provided which is large enough to cater for a 2-form entry or 3-form entry primary school. The size of the school will be determined by decisions made in respect of the West Eynsham SDA. In addition, the cumulative impact of planned growth in the Eynsham area including the West Eynsham SDA means that additional provision needs to be made for secondary school pupils and as such, a 4.88 ha site will be provided within Salt Cross to accommodate a secondary school facility. This is likely to</p>
--	--	--	---	---

				<p>form a satellite facility to Bartholomew School which would then operate on a split-site basis. There are a number of options as to how this could be provided (e.g. separate sixth form, separate upper school, or separate lower school). The decision will be taken by the academy trust, based on educational grounds, alongside ensuring sufficiency of school places, and may evolve over time.</p>
		<p>Other community uses</p>	<p>A mixture of different community uses, the size and mix of which will be determined at a later date through detailed/reserved matters planning applications.</p>	<p>In addition to two new schools, Salt Cross is expected to provide a range of other community buildings/spaces including for example crèches, day nurseries,</p>

				<p>day centres, halls and potentially a place or places of worship. The Eynsham Area IDP identifies a potential need for around 385 m² of floorspace for culture and the arts and around 1,056 m² for community meeting space. There is also the potential to create space for primary health care – depending on future decisions regarding any expansion/ re-location of the Eynsham medical practice. In this respect, the Eynsham Area IDP identifies that Salt Cross generates a need for an additional 460m² of primary care floorspace.</p>
--	--	--	--	---

		<p>Green and Blue Infrastructure (GI)</p>	<p>Extensive green and blue infrastructure including, but not limited to, at least 40 hectares of formal parks and gardens, amenity green space, natural and semi-natural green space, outdoor sports, allotments, community orchards, play areas and other outdoor provision (e.g. multi-use games areas, extreme sports, events, festivals and activities spaces etc.)</p>	<p>The Eynsham Area IDP identifies the need for a minimum of 40 hectares of certain green infrastructure components including formal parks and gardens, amenity green space, natural and semi-natural green space, outdoor sports, allotments, community orchards, play areas and other outdoor provision (e.g. multi-use games areas, extreme sport sports, pop up events and festivals) This excludes a range of other potential forms of GI within the garden village which will come forward additionally including, but not limited to, nature reserves, private gardens, drainage</p>
--	--	---	--	---

				<p>infrastructure, verges and incidental open space; stand-off corridors and on-plot landscaping. There is also the opportunity to provide additional burial space for which there is an identified need in the Eynsham area.</p>
		<p>Commercial uses (A1–A5) <u>(E, F2, Sui Generis)</u></p>	<p>A mixture of different commercial uses, the size and mix of which will be determined at a later date through detailed/ reserved matters planning applications.</p>	<p>Development at Salt Cross is expected to include a range of small-scale commercial uses falling within the A1–A5 <u>E, F2 and Sui Generis</u> use classes including for example shops, cafes, professional services and public houses. These are expected to be located within the main village centre and within individual</p>

				<p>neighbourhood centres as part of a mix of different uses to create interest and activity throughout the day. At this stage, we do not consider it appropriate for the AAP to stipulate the amount of land or floorspace expected to come forward for commercial uses as this will evolve in response to a number of factors including market demand and changing trends e.g. retail habits and online shopping.</p>
<p>MM49</p>	<p>Policy 28 - Land uses and layout – the spatial framework</p> <p>New paragraph (to be inserted after Paragraph 11.9)</p>	<p>Amend the tenth paragraph of Policy 28 as follows:</p> <p>A comprehensive, detailed masterplan will be required at the outline planning application stage, reflecting the key elements that takes account of the illustrative Spatial Framework Plan at Figure 11.6 including and includes consideration of:</p>		

	<p>Paragraph 11.14</p> <p>Paragraph 11.15</p> <p>Paragraph 11.16</p>	<p>Add new paragraph after existing paragraph 11.9 as follows:</p> <p><u>It is expected that the detailed layout of Salt Cross will follow a comprehensive masterplan agreed as part of the planning application process. The following pages of the AAP set out detail on layout that should be regarded as illustrative but should also be taken into account as part of drawing up the masterplan (in accordance with Policy 28).</u></p> <p>Amend paragraph 11.14 as follows:</p> <p>As well as guiding the amount and mix of different uses at Salt Cross, the AAP has a key role to play in terms of determining guiding how those uses are distributed across the site. Whilst the AAP does not get down to the detailed level of a masterplan, it does provide a clear indication of what is expected at Salt Cross, in the form of an 'Illustrative Spatial Framework.'</p> <p>Amend paragraph 11.15 as follows:</p>
--	--	--

		<p>This includes key connections and points of access, the main areas of 'built development' (housing, jobs, schools etc.) and the main areas of 'undeveloped' green and blue spaces. The advantage of such an approach is that it provides certainty provides an appropriate level of certainty to the local community and other stakeholders but is sufficiently flexible so as to not inhibit the more detailed masterplanning process undertaken by the site promoter.</p> <p>Delete paragraph 11.16 as follows:</p> <p>Essentially the two processes are complementary, with the AAP illustrative Spatial Framework setting the overall parameters within which any more detailed masterplan needs to come forward.</p>
MM50	<p>Policy 29 – Design Requirements</p> <p>Paragraph 11.50</p> <p>Paragraph 11.60</p>	<p>Amend the first paragraph of Policy 29 as follows:</p> <p>Development at Salt Cross will be 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.</p>

	<p>Figure 11.12</p>	<p>Amend the eleventh paragraph of Policy 29 as follows:</p> <p>The design rationale for development at Salt Cross should be set out in a comprehensive masterplan supported by a site-wide design code and design and access statement. This must be consistent with the key design principles above and other relevant considerations including the National Design Guide <u>and National Model Design Code</u>.</p> <p>Amend paragraph 11.50 as follows:</p> <p>At the national level, the importance of achieving well-designed <u>and beautiful</u> places is embedded in the NPPF which in itself is illustrated through the National Design Guide <u>and National Model Design Code</u> which sets out the characteristics of well-designed places and demonstrates what good design means in practice. The guide is based around 10 characteristics which work together to create physical character, nurture and sustain a sense of community and address environmental issues affecting climate. The ten characteristics are:</p> <p>Amend paragraph 11.60 as follows:</p>
--	---------------------	---

		<p>Any masterplan and design code will need to be consistent with these key principles as well as the National Design Guide <u>and National Model Design Code</u>, the West Oxfordshire Local Plan, the West Oxfordshire Design Guide and the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Amend the first box of Figure 11.12 as follows:</p> <p>NPPF and National Design Guide <u>and National Model Design Code - design guides or codes should be consistent with the principles in the National Guide and Code</u> —establishes high level design principles including the 10 characteristics of well-designed places</p>
--	--	--

MM51	Policy 29 – Design Requirements	<p>Delete the tenth paragraph of Policy 29 as follows:</p> <p>Building for a Healthy Life (BHL)</p> <p>In accordance with the Eynsham Neighbourhood Plan, residential development proposals will be expected to comply with Building for a Healthy Life – the latest edition of Building for Life 12 (BfL12) or equivalent principles unless it can be demonstrated that these cannot be achieved or are being met in an alternative way.</p>
MM52	Policy 30 – Provision of Supporting Infrastructure	<p>Amend the third paragraph of Policy 30 as follows:</p> <p>The site-specific IDP should be based on <u>include consideration of</u> the identified requirements set out in the Eynsham Area Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP). <u>A phasing plan must also be included covering the lifetime of the development.</u></p>

MM53	Policy 30 – Provision of Supporting Infrastructure	<p>Delete fourth paragraph of Policy 30 as follows:</p> <p>Appropriate mechanisms including the use of planning obligations and planning conditions will be used to secure an appropriate package of improvements for the long-term benefit of the local community.</p>
MM54	Policy 30 – Provision of Supporting Infrastructure	<p>Add new fourth paragraph into Policy 30 as follows:</p> <p><u>The phasing plan may include triggers and particular circumstances that would justify the need for a viability assessment of the cumulative effects of all policies in the AAP. This must be subject to robust evidence being presented by an applicant. Consideration of such evidence will balance the need to not compromise sustainable development with ensuring that all policies are realistic and will not undermine deliverability of the development.</u></p>

MM55	Policy 31 – Long Term Maintenance and Stewardship	<p>Delete the second paragraph and amend the third paragraph of policy 31 as follows:</p> <p>Development proposals at Salt Cross must be supported by robust, cost-effective and transparent maintenance and stewardship arrangements including appropriate financing arrangements and management responsibilities in perpetuity.</p> <p>This is anticipated to take the form of a new, independent body – the Salt Cross Garden Village Trust – with interim measures to be put in place as appropriate to support the early phases of development.</p> <p>This and other suitable Suitable options should be explored through the submission of a Community Management and Maintenance Plan (CMMP) or equivalent which will be required in support of any outline and where appropriate, detailed planning applications.</p> <p>This must include consideration of appropriate governance arrangements and demonstrate flexibility to adapt to changing circumstances throughout the life of the development phase and beyond.</p>
------	---	---