

Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031

Examination Hearings

December 2014

Statement of Common Ground (as amended)

Between

Cherwell District Council and Oxfordshire County Council (supersedes SOCG PM 19)

(Amendments to paragraphs 3.15, 3.22 & 3.23. New paragraph 3.15a.
Deletions ~~struck through in double~~. New text double underlined).

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Statement has been prepared by Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) and Cherwell District Council (CDC) in response to the proposed modifications to the Cherwell Local Plan on which both parties agree. This statement focuses on matters relating to strategic transport, education, infrastructure and other County-wide issues.
- 1.2 All issues of substance raised by Oxfordshire County Council in relation to the proposed modifications to the Cherwell Local Plan have now been resolved. In particular, both parties recognise that with the different timetables for the preparation of the Local Plan and the Local Transport Plan (LTP), there is a need for on-going joint working and engagement to maintain an up to date and current Infrastructure Development Plan through the full life of the Local Plan. This includes new mechanisms being put in place to support the required level of joint working.
- 1.3 This Statement is provided without prejudice to other matters of detail that parties may wish to raise during the hearings.

2. Background

- 2.1 Both Councils have a long history of working effectively together. Since June 2014, both Councils have worked jointly on a number of matters of shared interest:
 - i. Development of an agreed Countywide process for addressing any unmet need arising from the Oxfordshire SHMA 2014;
 - ii. County-wide work on addressing infrastructure needs:

- iii. Cherwell District Council / Oxfordshire County Council / Highways Agency work on Strategic Route Network (SRN) and Transport modelling from June 2014 onwards
- iv. Cherwell District Council / Oxfordshire County Council /Aylesbury Vale District Council / Buckinghamshire County Council Statement of Common Ground concerning impact of growth on the A41 corridor;
- v. Development of the draft Banbury and Bicester Masterplans;
- vi. Development of the Masterplan for the NW Bicester Development Area;
- vii. Liaison on development of the next Local Transport Plan (LTP4);
- viii. Monthly bilateral meetings and weekly catch-up meetings;
- x. Creation and enactment of the Oxfordshire Growth Board (formerly SPIP) through each Councils formal processes;
- xi. Joint working on providing for the housing needs of older people in the County / providing for the ageing population.

2.2 By working collaboratively the two Councils have made positive progress and identified the strategic infrastructure required over the life of the Local Plan, arising from the additional growth proposed in the Local Plan Modifications, which will inform the draft Local Transport Plan (LTP4) due to go out to consultation in February 2015 and which will inform future iterations of the Area Strategies included within LTP4.

2.3 Sufficient investment is planned in the initial plan period to 2021 to confirm its deliverability. The County has undertaken further assessment of the specific infrastructure required as a result of the proposed Modifications which confirms the need for additional infrastructure in the later period of the Local Plan. The Councils will work together to secure funding for these schemes.

2.4 The County commissioned additional transport assessments including:

- In the early summer to use the newly developed Oxfordshire Strategic Model to assess the impact of the proposed modifications growth across the district and in particular in the Upper Heyford area. In addition, work to rebuild the Banbury model was brought forward and the Bicester model was updated. In mid-August an interim transport note was released on the broad impacts. Further assessment was required to test the impact of the final Main Modifications numbers and to start to investigate the mitigation measures required over and above those already identified within the Local Plan Submission document of January 2014.

- Between August and October 2014 to assess the impact of growth on the local network to determine the necessary mitigation measures by testing up to 2031. This work looked at the issues on the transport network in more detail and started to test the mitigation measures likely to be required. (Ref INF07PM to INF11PM inclusive).
- Between October and November 2014 on-going modelling to identify transport infrastructure triggered by the mid-point in the Local Plan period. Confirmation of preferred options will follow through the Local Transport Plan process, in particular the Area Strategies due for consultation in February 2015. The LTP will be the subject of SEA. Final scheme design will follow the Area Strategies and be subject to SEA and Habitats Assessment.

2.5 Following the publication of the proposed Local Plan Modifications, OCC has also carried out revised population forecasts to predict primary and secondary pupil generation over the plan period. This has identified;-

- For Banbury, an additional 2,200 secondary school places, to be met through a mix of the expansion of existing secondary schools and a new secondary facility/ies. Both Councils' preference is for a site in the east / north-east of the town. An initial assessment of potential sites was carried out in September 2014 leading to land being safeguarded in two locations as indicated in the proposed Modifications. The County Council will continue to work with local education providers to secure sufficient places as the needs of the town evolve over the plan period.

2.6 The IDP will be updated at the earliest opportunity following the approval of LTP4.

Matters on which the parties agree

3.0 All issues of substance raised by Oxfordshire County Council in relation to earlier versions of the local plan to June 2014 have been resolved as detailed in the June 2014 Statement of Common Ground (SoCG) between the two Councils.

Countywide Cooperation/Duty to Co-operate to meet Oxford's Unmet Need

3.1 Mod 29 commits Cherwell Council to a partial review of the Local Plan within 2 years of its adoption and explains that *'Joint work will need to comprehensively consider how spatial options could be supported by necessary infrastructure and integrated approach to the delivery of housing, jobs and services'*. It is agreed that there is no need for a strategic review of the Green Belt as part of the Cherwell Local Plan and that Cherwell District can meet its own objectively assessed housing needs.

3.2 All the Oxfordshire Councils are cooperatively engaged through the Oxfordshire Growth Board in considering the means to address unmet need from elsewhere in the Housing Market Area. At its meeting on 20 November 2014, the Growth Board

agreed a set of principles, a process, milestones and key deliverables for this work. The agreed 'key' principles are:

- *'The district Local Plans are sovereign and all work should feed into Local Plans for them to determine the spatial future of the districts;*
- *A recognition however that the work must be collaborative and joined up to provide a county wide spatial picture and strategy;*
- *A recognition therefore that joint work on future spatial options, transport infrastructure and green belt will be required to feed into Local Plans;*
- *Recognition that the City cannot fully meet its housing needs and there is a need to agree on the level of unmet need. However work on determining spatial options in Local Plans can commence alongside this;*
- *A wish that the timescale for completing the Review is 12-18 months and that this should not hold up Local Plan timescales'*

A copy of the Growth Board Report is attached as Appendix 1.

Monitoring and Delivery of the Local Plan

3.3 Both Councils agree that infrastructure needs arising from proposed developments will be included in appropriate documents as set out below. Under Mod 315a relating to Paragraph E.2, which requires that *'Annual monitoring will inform local plan reviews'* and that these reviews may be in response to *'shortfalls in the delivery of infrastructure'*, shortfalls will be measured through an assessment of the delivery of infrastructure requirements associated with the development against the requirements and timing of delivery set out in these documents:

- the Infrastructure Delivery Plan;
- the Local Transport Plan and related Area Strategies;
- Supplementary Planning Documents and masterplans for strategic sites;
- any future CIL charging regime;
- Local community and Neighbourhood Plans;
- Infrastructure partners' capital investment strategies; and
- OCC's 'Pupil Place Plan'.

3.4 The Councils also agree that the delivery of infrastructure required in the medium and longer term will be further secured by:

- i. Monitoring of infrastructure delivery on a yearly basis as part of the AMR process.

- ii. Update of the IDP on a yearly basis alongside the AMR and which will include infrastructure needs identified in the above documents.
- 3.5 If a shortfall in delivery is identified, the parties agree to review the issues and actions available to enable delivery of the infrastructure, including:
- co-operating with key stakeholders to address challenges to delivery, including through county-wide working;
 - investigating alternative sources of funding;
 - identifying and managing risks to development;
 - agreeing appropriate phasing of development to allow for the necessary provision to be made.
- 3.6 The two Councils agree that CDC will commit as Local Planning Authority to seek to safeguard land required for identified infrastructure and adopt the following protocol:
- in preparing the LTP, OCC will undertake to provide the appropriate evidence base, assessment and SA/HA tests in order to inform the update of its Area Strategies which form the basis of the local application of policies approved in the Local Transport Plan (LTP4);
 - where land is identified but is yet to be safeguarded, any proposals for development that may reasonably be considered to impact upon the delivery of the identified infrastructure schemes should demonstrate that the proposal would not harm their delivery; and
 - developments that would prejudice the construction or effective operation of critical infrastructure schemes will be resisted.
- 3.7 If through the delivery of the Local Plan key infrastructure cannot be fully provided and under-delivery cannot be addressed through these processes, this will trigger a small scale review of policies through the preparation of Development Plan Documents or their review in accordance with para. E.25 of the Local Plan (Further Minor Mod. 318a).
- 3.8 Both Councils would welcome the inclusion of paragraphs 3.3 - 3.7 as a minor modification.

Education

- 3.9 Both Councils agree that Infrastructure requirements for education relating to the first five years of the Plan period have been accounted for in the Plan and the IDP, subject to some minor changes. Using the monitoring and delivery process set out above the Councils agree that there is also a reasonable prospect of delivery of required education infrastructure within the medium and longer term.

- 3.10 The key items of education infrastructure required to accommodate Local Plan growth are referred to in site specific policies, the IDP, in section 3.32, 3.33 & 3.34 of this statement and:-
- i. Expansions of existing secondary schools serving the Banbury area – All schools have indicated a willingness to expand with appropriate investment, depending on site and traffic constraints. Up to 900 additional secondary school places will be needed by c2020 (with extensions in place by around 2018, noting that they would take time to fill). A further 1,300 places will start to be needed by after 2020, and by 2030, all the places will be needed. (See table attached at Appendix 2)
 - iii. New secondary facility in Banbury - The size of this facility will depend on the scale of expansion feasible at existing sites, but is expected to be in the range of 600-1,200 places; as a result of site assessment the best available option at present is to safeguard land in two locations (see policy specifics below).
- 3.11 The County Council will continue to work with local providers of education for the secondary age group to secure sufficient places as the needs of the town evolve. It will also work with potential new providers of secondary-age education. Once the potential for expansion of existing establishments has been fully assessed and confirmed, the County Council will plan the commissioning of the additional establishment which is required, the specification for which will be based on local consultation.

Transport

- 3.12 The County has undertaken further assessment of the specific transport infrastructure required as a result of the proposed Modifications which confirms the need for additional infrastructure in the later period of the Local Plan, ie post 2024. It also confirms that sufficient strategic transport investment is planned in the initial Local Plan period, up to 2021, so confirming its deliverability.
- 3.13 The proposed yearly reviews and monitoring and associated rolling programme of infrastructure as part of the IDP will ensure delivery as the plan moves to its later phases. The LTP4 and the related Area Strategies are to be published for public consultation in early 2015 and will include the principles for the main infrastructure requirements associated with all development proposed in the Local Plan.
- 3.14 Traffic modelling will continue to inform the Area Strategies in the LTP4 and updates of later iterations of the IDP as required. The consultation draft LTP4, including the Area Strategies, is due to be considered by Cabinet on 27 January 2015, and followed by a six-week statutory consultation and culminating in Council adoption in July 2015.

Bicester

- 3.15 Cherwell's IDP includes a long term aspiration to improve highway capacity to support Bicester's Growth, including highway capacity improvements to peripheral routes.

By 2024 the following infrastructure will be needed:

- i. western peripheral route improvements including a new tunnel under the railway to relieve congestion at Howes Lane / Bucknell Road / Lord's Lane and enable a more accessible scheme by all modes of transport;
- ii. eastern peripheral road improvements to include junction and lane capacity schemes between the A4421 / A4095 junction and the A4421 / Gavray Drive junction ~~and through the South East Bicester development;~~
- iii. southern peripheral route improvements including improvements to the A41 / Vendee Drive junction, improvements to the Vendee Drive / Wendlebury Road junction and possible lane improvements at either end of Boundary Way depending on the likely delivery time of a more substantial scheme.

By 2031 the following infrastructure is anticipated to be needed:

- iv. a major scheme to deal with the link capacity issues and severance issues caused by increasing flows on the A41 Boundary Way;
- v. a south-east link road, for which, two preferred options have been identified. Confirmation of preferred options will be considered through the Local Transport Plan process, in particular the Area Strategies due for consultation in February 2015. The LTP will be the subject of SEA. Final scheme design will follow the Area Strategies and be subject to SEA and Habitats Assessment.

3.15a Provision will be made for a potential relief road through the South East Bicester site linking the A41 to the south of the site with the junction of the A4421 with Gavray Drive, (subject to on-going work by the County Council as Highways Authority being confirmed) as follows:

- Provision for the potential relief road will be made within site Bicester 12 subject to the precise route to be determined through the Local Transport Plan and/or through agreement with the County Council as Highways Authority.
- The specification of the road, and timing, will be determined in consultation with the County Council as Highway Authority. This is subject to the evidence clearly demonstrating the need for the link road, justifying the need for the land through the Bicester 12 site as a preferred option and subject also to detailed site planning and design.

Banbury

- 3.16 The IDP provides for improvements to the east-west strategic movements on the Hennef Way corridor to Junction 11 subject to confirmation of funding package.
- 3.17 Both Councils agree that a step-change in the increased use of sustainable transport modes is essential to support growth in Banbury. The County Council is working with partners on a bus strategy for Banbury to encourage modal shift, bus priority at key congestion pinch points, revitalisation of the bus and railway stations, and the promotion of walking and cycling for short trips. These measures will play a key role in reducing the volume of traffic associated with the town's growth and mitigating the traffic impacts on local roads serving Banbury and the surrounding villages.
- 3.18 By 2024 the following infrastructure will be needed:
- i. Step-change improvement in cross town bus services including infrastructure improvements to support quicker and more reliable bus journeys, focusing on direct links between existing and proposed residential areas, key employment sites and the town centre.
 - ii. Internal Spine Road Serving Development – South of Salt Way East.
 - iii. New Perimeter Bridleway Providing Pedestrian / Cycle / Horse Riding route from White Post Road to Bloxham Road and circular connection with Salt Way - South of Salt Way – East.
 - iv. Ermont Way/ Middleton Road improvements.
 - v. Provide footways cycleways connecting to other strategic development sites in North West Banbury - Drayton Lodge Farm.
- 3.19 If site Banbury 15 is delivered in accordance with the Local Plan employment trajectory, a new link road SE of junction 11 may be required by 2024. However, were this site to be phased with a slower rate of delivery, the road will not be required until after 2024.
- 3.20 By 2031 the following infrastructure may be needed:
- vi. If site Banbury 15 is delivered with a slower rate of delivery than set out in the Local Plan employment trajectory, a new link road SE of junction 11 will be required by 2031.
- 3.21 The County Council will explore the need for further capacity improvements in Banbury through LTP4 and its Area Strategies and their process of annual review

Upper Heyford

- 3.22 The increased scale of development proposed at the former RAF Upper Heyford will have significant transport impacts, particularly between the former airbase and Bicester, which will require mitigation. ~~Transport modelling suggests that it would not be possible to accommodate more than 1,600 additional dwellings without impacts on the wider area requiring substantial investment in strategic transport infrastructure. Contributions towards capacity improvements for M40 Junction 10, as required by the Highways Agency, will be necessary for the development. Transport modelling has not been required (and has not been undertaken) to test growth higher than the 1,600 additional dwellings proposed. However, it is apparent from the work done to date that were higher numbers to be proposed, it is likely that a substantial investment in the highway network would be needed.~~
- 3.23 Highway improvements and traffic management measures encouraging movements onto the strategic network and minimising impact on local villages, are considered critical in order to deliver the necessary level of mitigation required for development proposals at Upper Heyford. This will require capacity improvements, traffic management measures and village traffic calming. Contributions towards capacity improvements for M40 Junction 10, as required by the Highways Agency, will be necessary for the development.
- 3.24 Although mitigation provided by the development will reduce the impact, there will still be a noticeable increase in traffic on the network and travelling through villages such as Middleton Stoney, Lower Heyford, Ardley, Somerton, Caulcott and The Astons.
- 3.25 The transport modelling has shown that a significant package of increased public transport provision will be essential to accommodate the proposed additional growth. New or improved bus services with connections to other transport nodes in addition to those in the scheme with planning permission, as well as the potential requirement for bus prioritisation measures, are considered essential mitigation for the development proposals to help improve accessibility and provide sustainable travel options. Discussions have commenced with a major public transport provider.
- 3.26 In terms of timing of mitigation measures, due to the existing constraints of the highway network in this location and the low level of public transport provision, it is expected that any transport mitigation should be delivered at the earliest opportunity to support the additional 1600 homes.

Specific Policies

- 3.27 In preparation for the Examination Hearing the two Councils agree on the following policy specific issues (in plan order):

Policy SLE4: Improved Transport and Connections (Main Mods. 25, 27 and Minor Mod 243)

- 3.28 Policy SLE4. In conjunction with the site specific policies, now sets out a suitable general framework for ensuring the provision of transport infrastructure, including that developments contribute to transport infrastructure and services required to mitigate their impact

Policy Bicester 2: Graven Hill (Main Mod. 74)

- 3.29 It is agreed that bullet point 15 of Policy Bicester 2 “Key site specific design and place shaping principles” should be amended to say:

“Biodiversity protection and enhancement measures should be implemented in any future development. Ecological surveys must be undertaken to identify habitats and species of value and any mitigation measures required, including those required to mitigate cumulative impacts on Local Wildlife Sites. Protective measures for bats and great crested newts will be required, and sufficient measures agreed prior to planning permission being granted.”

Policy Bicester 11: Employment Land at North East Bicester (Main Mod. 87)

- 3.30 Bicester Wetland Reserve is also a Local Wildlife Site. It is agreed that bullet point 10 of Policy Bicester 11 “Key site specific design and place shaping principles” should be amended to say:

“The site lies adjacent to a designated Local Wildlife Site and a proposed Local Wildlife Site. Ecological surveys must be undertaken to identify habitats and species of value and any mitigation measures required, including those required to mitigate cumulative impacts on Local Wildlife Sites. Features of value, including existing mature hedgerows and important trees, should be preserved, retained and enhanced and the proposals should result in a net gain in biodiversity.”

Policy Bicester 12: South East Bicester (Main Mod. 88)

- 3.30 Bicester 12 lies adjacent to two Local Wildlife Sites. It is agreed that the policy should include the following under “Key site specific design and place shaping principles”:

“The site lies adjacent to designated Local Wildlife Sites. Ecological surveys must be undertaken to identify habitats and species of value and any mitigation measures required, including those required to mitigate cumulative impacts on Local Wildlife Sites.”

Policy Bicester 13: Gavray Drive (Main Mod. 89)

- 3.32 Bicester 13 contains a Local Wildlife Site. It is agreed that bullet point 4 of Policy Bicester 13 “Key site specific design and place shaping principles” should be amended to say:

“Protection of the Local Wildlife Site and consideration of its relationship and interface with residential and other built development. Ecological surveys must be undertaken to identify habitats and species of value and any mitigation measures required, including those required to mitigate cumulative impacts on Local Wildlife Sites.”

Policy Bicester 12: South East Bicester (Main Mod. 88)

- 3.33 Bicester 12 requires the provision of a primary school on site and seeks financial contributions towards secondary school provision. It is agreed that greater clarity should be provided by specifying the primary school size requirement as follows: *“Schools – to include the provision of a 1.5 FE primary school on the site with capacity to expand to 2FE if required plus financial or in-kind contributions towards secondary education provision”*.

Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2 (Main Mod. 100)

- 3.34 Banbury 4 includes reference to “Provision of vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access directly from the site into site ‘Banbury 12’, being required to secure future access to the secondary facility. However, the wording could be made clearer though a further minor modification, to state: “Provision of vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access directly from the site to the proposed secondary facility.”

Policy Banbury 12 (Main Mod. 113)

- 3.35 It is agreed that 8.42 hectares of land should be safeguarded at Banbury 12 for provision of a secondary facility alongside the relocated football club. Banbury 12 covers an area of some 16.1 hectares. The remaining 7.68 hectares is expected to be a large enough area for the proposed relocation of the football club and the provision of associated playing pitches.

Policy Banbury 17 (Main Mod. 120)

- 3.36 It is agreed that 2.855 ha of land should be safeguarded at Banbury 17 for secondary education use to provide for the likely expansion of secondary capacity.

Our Villages and Rural Areas, Paragraph C.205 (Main Mod. 130)

- 3.37 This paragraph states that housing development in rural areas might require the village school to expand. The wording of the supporting text should be made clearer in a minor modification as sometimes local primary, secondary and SEN education facilities cannot be expanded and other options may need to be considered. A more appropriate wording addressing education needs across the rural areas would state: *“A lack of school places, meaning that housing developments might require *the provision of new or the expansion of existing education facilities in villages or nearby towns.*”*

Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford (Mod 157)

- 3.38 Modification 157 requires the provision of 2.22ha for a new 1-1.5 FE primary school. This modification should make it clearer that a 2.22ha site is required to allow for possible future expansion.

Signed on behalf of Cherwell District Council



Adrian Colwell

Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy

15 December 2014

Signed on behalf of Oxfordshire County Council



Dr Tom Flanagan BEng (Hons) PhD CEng MICE MCIHT

Service Manager – Localities, Policies and Programmes

15 December 2014

Appendix 1 - Report of the Oxfordshire Growth Board – 20 November 2014

Growth Board 20 November 2014

Agenda item : 4

Contact: Giles Hughes: Head of Planning and Strategic Housing- WODC

E- mail Giles.Hughes@westoxon.gov.uk

T: 01993-861000

Title: Post SHMA Strategic Work Programme

Purpose of Report

1. To outline a strategic work programme that can address the unmet need arising from the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), and help local planning authorities meet the duty to cooperate, whilst protecting the sovereignty of individual Councils over their Local Plans.

Recommendations

2. That the Growth Board endorses the principles set out in the proposed strategic work programme.
3. That the Growth Board asks each member council to identify the necessary resources for this collaborative work.
4. That a report from the Growth Board Executive Officer Group be presented to the next Growth Board outlining the project plan and resourcing arrangements for the strategic work programme.

Background

5. The Oxfordshire SHMA was published in April 2014. This suggests that across Oxfordshire, there is an identified need for provision of around 5,000 homes a year over the 2011-31 period. The need in Oxford City was identified as between 1,200 and 1,600 homes a year, a potential requirement of around 28,000 additional homes up to 2031. Although the precise ability of Oxford to accommodate its own need has yet to be concluded there is general agreement that there is limited capacity within the city to accommodate this number of dwellings and therefore there will be a significant potential shortfall which will need to be provided in neighbouring districts.
6. In March 2014, the Spatial Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SPIP) agreed a headline process, as part of the Statement of Cooperation, setting out how to address the outputs of the SHMA in relation to unmet housing need. Because this was relatively new ground for Oxfordshire, SPIP sought advice from two independent "critical friends". The advice concluded that a collaborative process is required to understand the strategic options, in the context of both the Strategic Economic Plan, and of existing and planned infrastructure.

7. Council leaders have considered the emerging ideas for the strategic work programme and agreed some key principles that should underpin future post SHMA work. These are summarised as:
 - The district Local Plans are sovereign and all work should feed into Local Plans for them to determine the spatial future of the districts;
 - A recognition however that the work must be collaborative and joined up to provide a county wide spatial picture and strategy;
 - A recognition therefore that joint work on future spatial options, transport infrastructure and green belt will be required to feed into Local Plans;
 - Recognition that the City cannot fully meet its housing needs and there is a need to agree on the level of unmet need. However work on determining spatial options in Local Plans can commence alongside this;
 - A wish that the timescale for completing the Review is 12-18 months and that this should not hold up Local Plan timescales
8. Using these principles as a basis and following further discussions at the EOG , officers have drawn upon the attached Strategic Work Programme for consideration by the Growth Board.
9. The key messages from the programme are:
 - The need to coordinate an agreed timetable for Local Plan reviews for the rural districts that build a collective spatial vision through the individual reviews;
 - The need to recognise the economic geography of the county and strategic infrastructure implications of growth;
 - The need to agree how to distribute the unmet need for Oxford City to enable districts to consider this need through their Local Plan reviews;
 - The constituent parts of the work programme necessary to meet the duty to cooperate;
 - The timetable together with an initial assessment of resource implications;
 - The respective roles of the partner agencies.

Conclusion

10. Officers believe that the attached proposal offers a methodology that appropriately balances the need for collaborative working, required by the

Duty to Cooperate, and for county wide strategic infrastructure planning with the statutory role of Local Plans.

11. The proposed work programme plans to complete the project within 12-18 months. However, the lead authority's view is that whilst this is achievable there are significant risks inherent in the approach that could lead to delay and these will need to be recognised and mitigated in a formal project plan.

Attachment

Scope of Post SHMA Strategic Work Programme

1. Purpose of the Strategic Work Programme

- 1.1 To protect the sovereignty of individual council's Local Plans whilst meeting the Duty to Co-operate, by providing an expedient but sound planning process for identifying the roles of the Districts/ City in accommodating future growth. This will consider housing need, including any unmet need, economic growth and infrastructure.
- 1.2 The work will allow Local Plans, in combination, to set out a coherent long- term spatial vision, and provide evidence that DPA s have complied with the Duty to Cooperate. The work programme will also include a long-term infrastructure strategy, led by the County Council, highlighting the key infrastructure interventions required to support growth.

2. Milestones and Key Deliverables

- 2.1 The following key milestones will need to be delivered:

Milestone	Indicative Completion Date
Detailed Project Plan	January 2015
Further refine scale of Oxford City's unmet housing need	March 2015
Through iterative 'bottom up' processes identify long list of strategic spatial options to inform potential distribution of unmet need	March 2015
Infrastructure assessment of options	June 2015
High level Sustainability Appraisal	June 2015
Assessment of options for consistency with Strategic Economic Plan	June 2015
Green Belt review	June 2015
Determine distribution of unmet need amongst Districts	August 2015
Develop Local Plan growth proposals	December 2015
Informal consultation on emerging proposals through Local Plan reviews	January 2016

3. Scope

3.1 The strategic work programme will need to cover the following elements:

- Coordinated Local Plan Reviews, published to an agreed timetable, that will in combination, provide a collective spatial vision for Oxfordshire and its constituent districts, with clarity on how the area functions, both now and into the future.
- Needs assessment - what growth is required to meet future housing needs:
 - Population and jobs forecast , building on the SHMA;
 - Agreement of the scale of unmet housing need in Oxford City
 - Agreement of the existing shortfall in the ability to meet present housing need including a robust assessment of Oxford City's capacity for new housing.
- Opportunities and constraints – are there any strategic environmental or infrastructure constraints or limitations on the scale of future growth, and what areas of search emerge as the preferred, most sustainable options for meeting the county's needs spatially – this will include:
 - Landscape and physical capacity assessment, including green Infrastructure, SFRA and Green Belt Review;
 - Transport assessment - a county-wide agreed method of testing strategic options in transport terms (taking account of the emerging LTP4);
 - County-wide Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) – collate existing and emerging District level IDPs – also regional and intra-regional needs and emerging supply (rail, water, power);
 - Health, education needs and options assessment;
 - The Strategic Economic Plan, economic forecasts and fit with economic vision;
 - Environmental constraints – including a Habitats Regulations Assessment.
 - Strategic spatial options generation to inform District shares of unmet need - in light of the opportunities and constraints based on SHLAA work to date and updated with any further known major proposals, including those identified through any further Local Planning Authority calls for sites.
- Sustainability and deliverability appraisal – assess the relative sustainability of the strategic spatial options available for meeting the vision and growth needs of the county:
 - need to assess how deliverable the necessary infrastructure will be to support the various spatial options, this will include consideration of development viability.

4. Timelines

4.1 The indicative timelines for key elements of the strategic work programme, Local Plans and the Local Transport Plan LTP4 are shown in the following table. The work

programme will be an iterative process. Timeframes may be affected by external events such as the forthcoming Local Plan Examinations.

5. Resources

5.1 The work programme will have significant staffing and resource implications for all of the six councils. Initial indications are that the total cost, including staffing and consultancy input, could be in the order of £800,000. Consultancy input may be needed to provide capacity for project management, for technical studies, and for independent scrutiny. A tight timescale to deliver this work is crucial and needs credibility, as it will inform emerging Local Plans and be used as evidence of compliance with the Duty to Co-operate in forthcoming examinations. Each council is asked to identify a budget for this work.

6. Key Roles

6.1 Oxfordshire City and District Councils – the councils will carry out future reviews of their Local Plans, and provide financial and technical input into the collaborative work programme.

6.2 Oxfordshire County Council – the County Council will prepare a countywide Infrastructure Delivery Plan, and provide financial and technical input into the

		2014		2015												2016												
		November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November	December	
Cherwell	Examination																											
	Adoption																											
	Informal Consultation Future Local Plan Review																											
	Formal Publication Future Local Plan Review																											
Vale of White Horse	Publication Draft Local Plan																											
	Submission																											
	Examination																											
	Adoption																											
	Informal Consultation Future Local Plan Review																											
West Oxfordshire	Formal Publication Future Local Plan Review																											
	Publication Draft Local Plan																											
	Submission																											
	Examination																											
	Adoption																											
South Oxfordshire	Informal Consultation Future Local Plan Review																											
	Formal Publication Future Local Plan Review																											
	Preferred Options Consultation																											
	Publication Draft Local Plan																											
	Submission																											
Oxford	Examination																											
	Adoption																											
	Examination																											
	Adoption																											
Oxford	Timetable for future Core Strategy/Local Plan Review to be confirmed																											
Local Transport Plan LTP4	Consultation Draft LTP4																											
	Adoption																											
Strategic Work Programme	Project Initiation																											
	Detailed Project Plan																											
	Refine scale of Oxford's unmet need																											
	Assessment of options and Green Belt review																											
	Distribution of unmet need amongst Districts																											

collaborative work programme.

6.3 Growth Board – the Oxfordshire Growth Board will provide the forum where project management of the post SHMA timetables will be monitored and where processes and outcomes can be challenged. The Growth Board has a key role in assisting the authorities to demonstrate compliance with the Duty to Cooperate and reports will be brought regularly to the Board for consideration.

- 6.4 Growth Board Executive – the Executive will act as a project management board to ensure that the programme stays on brief, on time and on budget and will provide scrutiny of draft and final reports to the Growth Board.
- 6.5 West Oxfordshire District Council Chief Executive – the lead Chief Executive from Oxfordshire Local Authorities for Growth Board issues, chairs the Growth Board Executive.
- 6.6 Growth Board Programme Manager – the Programme Manager will coordinate the work programmes and agendas of the Growth Board and Growth Board Executive. The Programme Manager will be supported as required by staff of West Oxfordshire District Council.
- 6.7 Oxfordshire Planning Policy Officers Group – this group will act as a technical sounding board.
- 6.8 Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership – the Local Enterprise Partnership, through its officers and Board and business members, will provide guidance on the Strategic Economic Plan, and economic and infrastructure priorities.

Appendix 2 - Estimated Secondary Pupil Numbers in Banbury

	2014	2015	2016	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2030	2031
Banbury																		
Housing per year	105	565	820	1,065	890	589	438	453	485	387	337	337	287	137	137	37	37	0
Cumulative Housing	105	670	1,490	2,555	3,445	4,034	4,472	4,925	5,410	5,797	6,134	6,471	6,758	6,895	7,032	7,069	7,106	7,106
Secondary pupil generation	10	69	154	270	375	458	534	624	729	835	947	1,065	1,183	1,274	1,343	1,306	1,408	1,422
Cherwell rural - unknown how much will affect Banbury schools (including The Warriner); 50% assumed																		
Housing per year	191	188	188	188	188	188	188	158	158	129	129	104	79	79	79	79	79	0
Cumulative Housing	191	379	567	755	943	1,131	1,319	1,477	1,635	1,764	1,893	1,997	2,076	2,155	2,234	2,313	2,392	2,392
Secondary pupil generation	21	42	65	89	115	143	173	205	239	272	308	345	377	403	423	439	448	443
50% secondary pupil generation	11	21	33	44	58	71	87	102	119	136	154	173	188	201	212	219	224	222
Banbury and 50% rural housing																		
Secondary pupil generation	21	90	187	315	432	530	621	726	848	971	1,101	1,238	1,371	1,476	1,555	1,526	1,632	1,644
Estimated underlying pupil numbers excluding housing growth - existing pupils in schools rolled forward																		
Total secondary pupils*	4,310	4,332	4,403	4,472	4,664	4,853	5,038	5,140	5,263	5,327	5,357	5,368	5,354	5,358	5,358	5,358	5,358	5,358
Combined effect of housing and existing population																		
Total secondary pupils	4,331	4,422	4,590	4,787	5,096	5,383	5,659	5,867	6,111	6,298	6,458	6,605	6,725	6,834	6,913	6,884	6,990	7,002
Secondary school capacity - based on current capacities as reported by schools																		
Total capacity	4567	4642	4717	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792	4792
Additional capacity required	-	-	-	-	304	591	867	1,075	1,319	1,506	1,666	1,813	1,933	2,042	2,121	2,092	2,198	2,210
* Assumptions: transfer rates in line with 2013/14, i.e. 100% transfer from primary to secondary; 59% from Y11 to Y12; 79% from Y12 to Y13. After 2020 secondary numbers start to be affected by cohorts not yet in primary school, and therefore less predictable - assumed to stabilise at the average cohort size of 2011-2013's Reception intakes.																		

Sites included

Sites Included	Size
Bankside Phase 1	1082
Bankside Phase 2	600
Canalside	700
Southam Road	600
West of Bretch Hill	400
North of Hanwell Fields	544
West of Warwick Road	300
Bolton Road	200
South of Saltway - East	1345
South of Salt Way, West	150
Drayton Lodge Farm	250
Higham Way	150
Banbury other 10 +dwellings	369
Banbury Windfall Sites	416
Rural Areas (inc Kidlington) 10+ dwellings	1638
Rural windfall sites less than 10 dwellings	754