

WEST OXFORDSHIRE DISTRICT COUNCIL

Examination of Salt Cross Garden Village Area Action Plan (AAP)

Inspector: D.R McCreery MA BA (Hons) MRTPI

Programme Officer: Rosemary Morton

Programme Officer Address - c/o Planning and Strategic Housing, Elmfield,
New Yatt Road, Witney, OX28 1PB

Tel: 01628 672181

Email: rosemary.morton@publicagroup.uk

HEARING SESSION AGENDA

Matter 6 – Movement and connectivity Wednesday 30 June (PM) and Thursday 1 July (AM)¹

Issue

Whether the policies on movement and connectivity are justified, effective, and consistent with national policy.

Relevant Policies – 13-17

Notes.

- Questions relevant to this Matter are those listed at 1-23 of the Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions (MIQ)² and have been the subject of written statements.
- This agenda is an abridged version of the MIQs designed indicate the specific areas that the Inspector would like to focus on in the Hearing session. This is to assist all participants with preparation (with the relevant question number from the MIQ document also included to allow cross referencing). Other MIQs within this matter that are not on the agenda are still open for discussion at the Hearing session.

Agenda items

1. Transport infrastructure requirements and evidence base

- Does the evidence base demonstrate a clear understanding of the transport infrastructure challenges and opportunities associated with delivery of the AAP? **MIQ1**
- Does Appendix 5 of the AAP clearly identify all the necessary transport infrastructure requirements, including those necessary to encourage walking and cycling? Is this list accurate, comprehensive and reflected in the policies? **MIQ2**
- Taking each transport infrastructure requirement in turn, what are the specific sources of evidence that support the need for it and the chosen policy approach? Is each requirement justified by the evidence, deliverable, appropriate in terms of when it is required and any phasing, with a source of financing identified? How have alternatives and the fully spectrum of delivery scenarios been considered and is the AAP flexible enough to respond? **MIQ3**
- In the interests of effectiveness how could policies 14 -17 be modified in the interests of improving their legibility – i.e could they be shorter, set out more clearly what is required, remove any duplication? **New MIQ**

¹ The full Hearing programme can be found here - <https://www.westoxon.gov.uk/planning-and-building/planning-policy/salt-cross-garden-village/salt-cross-area-action-plan-examination/>

² <https://www.westoxon.gov.uk/media/2p1dbd5h/insp-2-inspector-s-matters-issues-and-questions.pdf>

2. A40 and A34 specific questions (Policies 14, 15, 17)

- Are the necessary transport infrastructure requirements to the A40 sufficiently clear in the policies? Do policies 14, 15 and 17 repeat requirements, using different language without justification? Is modification required to remove repetition and improve clarity? Is the relationship with HIF sufficiently clear? **MIQ8**
- Is the requirement for an underpass between the Garden Village and Eynsham justified and deliverable? What alternatives were considered? How would proportionate costs for the underpass between the Salt Cross and SDA developers be achieved in practice and is this justified? **MIQ9 and MIQ4**
- Is the prohibition of additional junctions on the A40 justified? **MIQ11**
- How have the effects on the A34 been considered? How does the chosen approach in the AAP reflect engagement with Highways England? **MIQ5**

3. Hanborough station specific questions (Policies 14, 15)

- Will the policies achieve good connectivity between Salt Cross and Hanborough Station? How were options considered and discounted? Will the chosen policy approach be deliverable and effective? **MIQ12**
- How does policy in the AAP relate to the masterplan being developed for Hanborough Station? **MIQ13**
- Are the financial contributions towards the North Cotswold Line Transformation and development of Hanborough as a transport hub justified? **MIQ14**

4. Sustainable Transport Hub specific questions (Policy 15)

- Is expansion of the park and ride appropriately considered? **MIQ17**

5. Car and cycle parking specific questions (Policy 16)

- Are the absolute maximum car parking standards in Policy 16 justified and consistent with local and national policy? How have the standards taken account of policy in Paragraph 105 of the Framework? Is modification required to ensure consistency with national policy? **MIQ18**

6. Other questions

- Are the requirements in Policy 17 preventing occupation of Salt Cross (unless car free) until completion of related infrastructure works, including the A40 bus lanes, justified and deliverable? **MIQ20**
- Other points relating to Policies 13-17