

Public Participation Statement for the Draft Jericho Canalside Supplementary Planning Document

Regulation 12 (a) Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

December 2013

www.oxford.gov.uk



1. Introduction

- 1.1 This Public Participation Statement sets out how Oxford City Council has engaged and consulted with the public on the Jericho Canalside Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in accordance with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, and the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
- 1.2 This Statement provides details of the informal engagement and consultation activities and the resulting feedback relating to the pre-production stage of the SPD in July 2013. This document sets out the persons consulted, summarises the main issues they raised and, shows how those issues have been addressed in the SPD. The Statement also summarises the comments made during the statutory public consultation (during Sept/Oct 2013). This Statement incorporates the information from the Interim Public Consultation Statement which itself is now superseded.

2. Purpose of the SPD

- 2.1 The SPD supplements Policy SP7 of the Sites and Housing Plan which allocates the Jericho Canalside site for a mixed-use development. It explains the vision for the site of the City Council, evolved with the local community, and will assist developers in the submission of high quality proposals befitting of the site's character and heritage.
- 2.2 The principle of allocating the site for development has been agreed through adoption of the Sites and Housing Plan in February 2013. The production of the Plan included a series of public consultation exercises.

3. Pre-production consultation (July 2013)

- 3.1 The approach to consultation on this SPD was to involve local people at the earliest stage. This would enable to City Council to gain a sample of views from the local community on their layout and design aspirations prior to drafting the SPD. A considerable amount of information was already available to the City Council that had been produced by the community but it was important for the City Council to also undertake its own consultation as well.
- 3.2 The pre-production consultation included:
 - Drop in event for people of Jericho
 - Meetings with local interest groups and organisations

Drop in event

- 3.3 The City Council held a drop in event at the Jericho Community Centre on 10 July 2013 from 3.30pm – 7.30pm. The event was mainly advertised through a flyer produced by the City Council but kindly delivered by the Jericho Community Association to about 1,200 addresses in Jericho, including Rewley Road on the western side of the canal. The event was also advertised on the Jericho Community Association’s website. Over 50 people from the local community attended the event. The local press also attended and published an article.
- 3.4 The format of the event was a drop-in session where people were provided with information on exhibition boards which included questions to prompt discussion with officers of the City Council. Comment forms with a map of the site were provided.
- 3.5 Comments received showed a clear consensus in some areas but some showed a divided opinion which is also significant. Below are the main issues raised through the consultation with an explanation as to how these issues have been addressed in the draft SPD:
- Whilst there were many different opinions on how much of each use would be appropriate, the most popular opinion was that the mix of uses (residential, boatyard, community centre and public square) should be broadly equal. The City Council agreed that this approach would deliver a truly mixed development and should be the starting point for design considerations.
 - In terms of the location of uses, there was clear consensus that the boatyard would be best placed at the north of the site next to College Cruisers and that the public square should be in front of the church. There was some agreement that there should be at least some housing on the southern part of the site. The City Council agreed with this approach.
 - There was divided opinion as to the preferred location of the community centre with suggestions evenly split between the Dawson Place end and the southern end of the site. The Jericho Wharf Trust feel strongly about it being located south of the square. This is one reason for this being its preferred location within the draft SPD.
 - There was generally agreement that the community centre should be larger than the current centre and multi-functional with small and large rooms capable of accommodating a wide range of activities. This opinion was also clear from other non-Council consultations with which the City Council agreed.
 - There was divided opinion as to the preferred location for a new bridge with suggestions split evenly between the southern end of the site and a more central location leading onto the square. Similarly, there was no clear agreement as to the most appropriate type and style of bridge. For this reason, and because of the many factors to consider with regards to the bridge, the City Council remained open minded about the most appropriate location for the bridge.
 - There was overwhelming support for a footpath along the canal frontage. This re-affirmed the City Council’s view that some space should be retained along the canal frontage to the south of the site leading from Great Clarendon Street to the new square not only for public access but for canal maintenance and boat access.
 - There was general agreement that 3 storeys is the maximum appropriate height of buildings (in line with Policy SP7) but also that 2 storeys may be more appropriate in some locations depending on any impact upon neighbouring buildings. For this reason the Brief adds some guidance on this matter.
 - There was general agreement that there should be little or no car parking on the site. This re-affirmed the City Council view that this would be a suitable location for low-car or car-free development and guidance has been added on this matter.

3.6 Some more specific comments or key words received on the issues:

Boatyard	Community centre	Residential	Public Square	Important characteristics	Other comments
Viable	Multi-purpose	Low-rise	Trees	Harmony with area	Viable
Functional	Small and large rooms	Shoebox cottages	Showcase church	Brick and wood	Labyrinth on ground outside church
DIY	Hall	Affordable	Terraces seating	Variety	Encourage biodiversity
Craning	Pre-school	In keeping	Provide a reason to visit it	Conservation area	Light pollution concern
Soundproofing	External space	Set back from canal	Nice paving	Scale of area	Flooding concern
Bigger than before	Sustainable	Live/work units	Intimate urban space	Reclaimed canal and iron work	No retail
Smaller than before	Economical	For local people	Hard and soft landscaping	Bookbinding vernacular	Shops and cafe
Share with College Cruisers	Catering			Not too modern	Lots of activity – a hub
Visitor moorings	Café and wine bar	Footpath along canal front	Parking	Pedestrian and bike friendly	Views of church from towpath
Chandlery	Badminton	Only if you can get somewhere	None	Big windows	Sandpit/ playground
	Music and dance	Allotments	As little as possible	Big trees	Old narrowboat with tea and snacks
	Bigger than current	Landscaped	Underground	Human scale	Mooring for the venture
	Above boatyard	Pontoon/ boardwalk	Residential only	Presence of church	Not like the Lucy's housing
	Function rooms		For deliveries		Outdoor gym
	Allotments		Only for workers		Views to Radcliffe Observatory
	Bike repair				Concern about crime
					Preserve heritage
					How to maintain site

Meetings with local interest groups and organisations

- 3.7 Prior to the drop in sessions, meetings or telephone conversations were arranged with local interest groups and organisations. These were with representatives from:
- Jericho Wharf Trust (JWT)
 - Jericho Living Heritage Trust (JLHT)
 - Jericho Community Boatyard (JCBY)
 - St Barnabas Church Parochial Church Council
 - Oxford City Canal Partnership
 - Worcester College
 - College Cruisers
 - Canal & River Trust (formerly British Waterways)
- 3.8 These discussions helped to understand the variety of opinions on the future use of the site. The Jericho Wharf Trust comprises partner organisations of the JLHT, JCBY but also the Jericho Community Association. Jointly their aspiration is for the redevelopment of the site to create a vibrant community space for local people and boaters including a new large community centre and essential boatyard facilities to serve the needs of boaters with some residential accommodation.
- 3.9 The Oxford City Canal Partnership and Worcester College stated that they were keen to be involved in the development of the SPD.
- 3.10 College Cruisers occupy the northern part of the site on a long lease from the Canal & River Trust. Their main site will not be affected by proposals within the SPD and they confirmed that they should be able to continue to operate satisfactorily.
- 3.11 The Canal & River Trust provided information on designing development that is close to, or crosses the canal. They confirmed that they offer a pre-app service for applicants to ensure that their proposals will meet design requirements that will ensure the safe operation of the canal.

4. Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Consultation

- 4.1 A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report has been produced to identify whether the draft Jericho Canalside SPD would have any significant environmental impacts in accordance with the European Directive 2001/42/EC and associated Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004.
- 4.2 The statutory consultees for the SEA (Environment Agency, English Heritage and Natural England) agreed with the conclusions of the Screening Report that no Strategic Environmental Assessment of the Jericho Canalside SPD was required. Where advice has been provided this has been incorporated within the SPD.

5. Consultation on the Draft SPD

- 5.1 The draft SPD was approved by the City Executive Board for consultation on 11 September 2013. Formal public consultation on the draft SPD took place for a six-week period from 13th September to 25th October 2013. The consultation invited comments from the following groups/organisations:

- Approximately 1,000 Jericho and Rewley Park residents who were notified by a City Council flyer kindly distributed by the Jericho Community Association;
 - People who responded to the July consultation event who requested further contact (30+ people);
 - People on the City Council’s online consultation portal (approximately 1,400 people) and those wanting a letter (approx. 50 people);
 - 30 Statutory consultees including the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Natural England, Thames Water, Scottish and Southern Energy, District Councils and Oxfordshire County Council;
 - Landowners/Administrator: PriceWaterhouseCoopers, HSBC Ltd; Cordatus; Savills
 - Local interest groups including: Jericho Wharf Trust, Jericho Community Association, Jericho Community Boatyard Ltd, Jericho Living Heritage Trust, Parochial Church Council of St Barnabas and St Paul, Oxford Civic Society, Oxford Preservation Trust;
 - Canal related organisations: Canal & River Trust, Oxford City Canal Partnership, Boats of Oxford Action Team, Residential Boat Owners' Association, The Inland Waterways Association Oxfordshire Branch;
 - Heritage groups including: Oxfordshire Architectural and Historical Society, The Twentieth Century Society, Garden History Society, The Georgian Group, The Society for the Preservation of Ancient Buildings, The Ancient Monuments Society;
 - Neighbouring organisations: College Cruisers, Worcester College
- 5.2 The methods used included the City Council’s online consultation portal, email and letter. Other advertising took place on the website and by a press release.
- 5.3 The Draft SPD together with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report was made available during the consultation period on the City Council’s website and for viewing at St Aldate’s Customer Service Centre.
- 5.4 Following the six-week period of statutory public consultation, responses were received from 40 individuals or organisations. Responses were considered and as a result changes made to the SPD. The overarching general comment was one of support for the SPD with many respondents supplementing support with some more specific wording changes. Below is a summary of the main issues raised.

Summary of main issues from respondents

General

- The vast majority of respondents welcomed the SPD. Compliments were made on the presentation and clarity of the SPD. One respondent was not in support of redevelopment.

Characteristics

- Pleased that the layout directs the most vulnerable uses to the area with lower flood risk
- Welcome the concern about trees but any trees lost should be replaced
- Essential that biodiversity maintained
- Support for the attention and respect shown to heritage

Boatyard

- Support for the detail on what is meant by an 'appropriately sized' boatyard
- Welcome its position at the northern end
- Unconvinced that more fuelling stations needed
- Noise could be an issue but suggestions for mitigation

Community centre

- Pleased with support shown for a community sensitive development
- Suggested changes to provide further information on delivery, management and what is meant by sustainably sized
- Concern that the community centre won't be large enough
- Positioned at north of square is an alternative to the south
- Multi-purpose buildings would be suitable

Residential

- Support for mix of dwellings including for disabled people
- About 20 dwellings is sensible
- 50% affordable housing is consistent with the heritage of a diverse and mixed community
- The housing stock should be balanced with identified need
- Should be for local people not luxury apartments
- Residential should be resisted

Public Square

- Pleased with the proposed position of the square in front of the church
- Hope the square will have planting and shrubs
- The space will be enjoyed by people working locally
- An on-going management plan should be agreed

Bridge

- Support for a bridge to improve cycle routes and accessible to cyclist, wheelchair users and those with prams
- A static bridge would reduce conflict between boaters and pedestrians
- A swing/lift would be beneficial and reduce tree loss
- A bridge at the southern end would provide a better link to employment areas
- A bridge positioned centrally would bring people into the square and create a vibrant area
- The existing bridge at Mount Place could be replaced
- The SPD cannot insist upon a bridge

Parking and access

- Should be some parking for the boatyard and deliveries
- Opportunity to introduce a car club
- Support for path along the canal front

Design principles

- Support for the design principles and Framework Plan
- Buildings should be no higher than 3 storey
- Buildings should be no higher than 2 storey
- Essential that important views should not be compromised
- Lighting would improve the safety of the area
- Question over whether dormer windows are appropriate
- The development could form a hub for the residents of Rewley Park and Jericho

Delivery and Implementation

- There is little reference to the Canal & River Trust's discretionary approval
- The repeated reference to purchase price is unnecessary
- Welcome how viability has been dealt with

5.5 Appendix 1 lists the changes made to the SPD and notes whether they were as a result of detailed comments. The full comments are available on the City Council's website and for viewing at St Aldate's Customer Service Centre.

Appendix 1

Paragraph/Section of the final SPD	Detail of change	Justification	Related respondent
1.0 Introduction			
Paragraph 1.2	Amend sentence: “Oxford is one of the least affordable cities in the UK, as cited in the Centre for Cities report <u>2013</u> , but with a huge property demand for property.”	Factual update, and to reflect comment	Jericho Community Association (#83)
2.0 Objectives			
Paragraph 2.2 First objective	Amend sentence: “Provide detail on what is expected with regards to the essential boatyard facilities <u>an appropriately sized boatyard</u> , the <u>new sustainably sized</u> community centre, the residential and the public square (Policy SP7)”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Jericho Community Association (#83)
3.0 Relevant Planning Policy			
Paragraph 3.1	Amend sentence: “The key policies of the Development Plan which are particularly relevant to this site are set out below. although a Any planning application will be considered against all relevant policies in Oxford’s Development Plan.”	So that the sentence reads well	
Sites and Housing Plan Paragraph 3.3 (second bullet point in box)	Amend sentence: “The canal boat hire base <u>(College Cruisers) occupying the extreme</u> to the north of the site should be retained”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Mark Johnstone Davies (#65)
Sites and Housing Plan Paragraph 3.3 (fifth bullet point in box)	Amend sentence: “The wall separating the Church and the proposed new square can <u>should</u> be demolished to open up the square and views of the Grade 1 listed building”	For clarity	
Sites and Housing Plan Paragraph 3.4 (fourth bullet point)	Insert sentence: “ <u>The City Council are developing the Heritage Energy Efficiency Toolkit (HEET) which will help property owners and developers understand the heritage value of historic buildings and explore the wide range of options for enhancing the energy efficiency of historic buildings and options for renewable and low-carbon technologies.</u> ”	For information	
Oxford Core Strategy Paragraph 3.5 (fifth bullet point)	Amend sentence: “ <i>CS14 Supporting city-wide movement</i> - The City Council will work with its partners to promoting greater pedestrian and cycle priority through and to	So that the sentence reads correctly	

	the city centre...”		
Supplementary Planning Documents Paragraph 3.7	Amend sentences: “- Affordable Housing and Planning Obligations SPD (Draft Sep 2013) - Affordable Housing SPD (2006) and Planning Obligations SPD (2007) – to be superseded upon adoption of the above”	Factual update	
4.0 Characteristics, Constraints and Opportunities			
Site description Paragraph 4.2	Amend sentence: “By far the greatest opportunity for the site is to maximise its position on the canal and to create a unique focal point for the Jericho <u>and boating communities</u> whilst also delivering housing.”	Factual update, and to reflect comment	Jericho Community Association (#83)
Heritage Paragraph 4.5	Insert new sentence: “ <u>The site comprises the very first wharf to be established in Jericho, set up by Henry Ward, a member of a successful and philanthropic Oxford family of coal merchants, boatowners, and boatbuilders in the early 19th century. The Ward family still owned most of the land here when St Barnabas’ Church was built, and as well as providing the land for the church’s construction, the Wards also provided the site for Jericho’s first school in 1856. In 1927 the Oxford Canal Company undertook a strategic withdrawal and sold its two terminal wharves (New Road and Hythe Bridge). The Jericho wharves became the terminus for cargo and leisure boats. The site is the last remnant in Oxford of the working manifestation of this transport network.</u> ”	For information, and to reflect comment	Mark Johnstone Davies (#65) Jericho Community Boatyard Ltd (#78) Jericho Living Heritage Trust (#91)
Heritage Paragraph 4.11	Insert new sentence: “ <u>Any planning application should be accompanied by a heritage statement that sets out the heritage significance of the site, how that has influenced the proposals and the measures undertaken or proposed to avoid or mitigate any harm to that significance.</u> ”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	English Heritage (#81)
Archaeology Paragraph 4.12	Insert new sentence: “There is however a high potential for palaeo-environmental remains <u>so an archaeological assessment is likely to be required to be submitted with the planning application.</u> ”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	English Heritage (#81)
Flooding Paragraph 4.13	Insert new sentence: “ <u>Any site specific Flood Risk Assessment will need to ensure that the development is safe, does not increase risk elsewhere and that safe access and egress arrangements can be implemented.</u> ”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Environment Agency (#59)

Flooding Paragraph 4.15	Amend sentence: “This work is expected to be completed in <u>late</u> 2013. It is not clear at this stage whether there will be any change to the Flood Zone classification at this location. The outputs of this model could <u>should</u> be used to assess flood risk which may allow the recommendations of the L2SFRA to be met. ”	Factual update, and to reflect comment	Environment Agency (#59) Jericho Community Association (#83)
Trees Paragraph 4.20	Amend sentence: “The false acacia in particular is a prominent feature of public views along Canal Street and is important to the setting of St Barnabas Church, while <u>Both</u> trees are visible in views from the canal providing screening from the urban area behind helping to protect the rural character of the canal.”	So that the sentence reads well	
Trees Paragraph 4.22	Amend sentence: “This combined with a non-interventionist approach to vegetation management gives the canal corridor its ‘wild’ rural feel.”	Grammatical change	
Trees Paragraph 4.23	Amend sentence: “Development might also affect trees that stand in the garden of adjacent properties; for example the mature hawthorn tree and 2 <u>two</u> cypress trees which stand within the rear gardens of properties in Combe Road.”	Grammatical change	
Trees Paragraph 4.24	Insert new sentence: “ <u>Developers will be expected to consider all opportunities for new tree planting to mitigate against any loss of trees and to enhance public spaces.</u> ”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Paul Hughes (#64)
5.0 Community Aspirations			
Paragraph 5.1	Amend sentence: “ They <u>The community</u> consider that it has the potential to become a vibrant hub of activity for local people and visitors.”	So that the sentence reads well	
Paragraph 5.2 (first bullet point)	Amend sentence: “Jericho Community Boatyard <u>Ltd</u> (JCBY)”	Factual correction, and to reflect comment	Mark Johnstone Davies (#65) Jericho Community Boatyard Ltd (#78)
Paragraph 5.2 (fourth bullet point)	Amend sentence: “ St Barnabas Church <u>Parochial Church Council of St Barnabas and St Paul.</u> ”	Factual correction	
Paragraph 5.3	Amend sentence: “The City Council have been keen to understand the aspirations of the community and, in the spirit of the National Planning Policy Framework and the localism agenda, felt it very important to work closely with the community on this Brief <u>but recognising that the majority of the site is in private ownership and it is the landowner who will consider a scheme for</u>	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Cordatus and PriceWaterhouseCoopers (#80)

	<u>submission.”</u>		
Paragraph 5.7 (third bullet point)	Amend sentence: “This is one reason for this being its preferred location within the <u>draft</u> SPD.”	Factual correction	
Paragraph 5.9	Insert new sub-section: “ <u>Formal consultation (Sept/Oct 2013)</u> 5.9...”	Information on the main issues raised during the formal consultation	
6.0 Development Requirements			
Boatyard Paragraph 6.1	Amend sentence: “The closure in 2007 of the Castle Mill boatyard on this site left a deficiency in boatyard provision on this part of the canal where there had been boat building and repair since <u>the 1960s and had been a wharf since</u> at least 1842... <u>A census (2011) identified more than 400 boats in the wider Oxford area, of which 109 were residential boats moored on the canal or river within the Oxford City boundaries. This stretch of the Oxford canal has an estimated annual boat count of 4,547.</u> ”	Factual correction, for information and to reflect comment	Mark Johnstone Davies (#65) Rewley Park Management Company (#86)
Boatyard Paragraph 6.2	Amend sentence: “The nearest boatyard on the canal that had with a reasonably full level of facilities and services was Alchemy Boats near Yarnton. However, the future of the boatyard is uncertain as it is currently closed and it has no security of tenure. It had no DIY facilities or hardstanding so it lacked some of the essential facilities. there is currently a planning application seeking redevelopment of that site for residential with no boatyard. The new owner has applied for planning permission to develop the site for a marina to include a boatyard but this application has been withdrawn. It is unclear whether development on the site would be permitted as it is in the Green Belt and within Cherwell District Council’s District Authority area. The next nearest boatyard with a full level of facilities and services is Heyford Wharf 14 miles away but when the River Cherwell is in spate, (in flood or fast flowing due to heavy rain), it is not always possible for boats to get beyond Thrupp to access it so it is not equally accessible. Some facilities are available at Osney Marina but similarly, these are on the river and not the canal and it does not have facilities for craning narrow boats. ”	Factual correction, and to reflect comments	Mark Johnstone Davies (#65) Jericho Community Boatyard Ltd (#78)
Boatyard Paragraph 6.4	Amend sentence: “...It is also possible in the future that new boatyard facilities will be provided	For information and to reflect comment	Mark Johnstone Davies (#65) Jericho Community Boatyard

	at Yarnton but this is not guaranteed <u>looking less likely...</u> "		Ltd (#78)
Boatyard Paragraph 6.5 (first bullet point)	Amend sentence: " approximately up to two weeks... <u>at least 1 metre around a boat</u> ". " <u>at least 1 metre around a boat</u> ".	For clarity, and to reflect comments	John Keyes (#14)
Boatyard Paragraph 6.5 (first bullet point)	Amend sentence: "The appropriate number of dry berths will depend on the number of boats in the Oxford area <u>which could be up to four berths.</u> "	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Jericho Community Boatyard Ltd (#78)
Boatyard Paragraph 6.5 (fourth and fifth bullet point)	Amend sentence: "Boaters, <u>including passing boaters</u> , should be able to fill up with water, use an Elsan point, fill up with diesel, gas, coal, wood and drop off rubbish" "For boat owners whose boats are out of the water and are unable to use their own bathrooms <u>and for passing boaters.</u> "	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Boatyard Paragraph 6.6	Amend sentence: "The appropriate <u>level type and scale</u> of these essential boatyard facilities..."	For clarity	
Boatyard Paragraph 6.7	Insert sentence: " <u>The provision of visitor electrical hook-ups may reduce the use of noisy generators.</u> "	For information, and to reflect comment	Jo Hamilton (#82)
Boatyard Paragraph 6.8	Insert new paragraph: " <u>The expectation is that the portion of the Canalside site from the developer required for the boatyard will be transferred for a nil consideration. The applicant/developer of the Canalside site will not be expected to construct the boatyard but will be expected to demonstrate that the land transferred is capable of accommodating the required facilities.</u> "	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Jericho Wharf Trust (#84)
Boatyard Paragraph 6.9	Amend sentence: Applicants will be expected to <u>demonstrate provide evidence to support the level of boatyard facilities proposed. how they have assessed the requirements of the boatyard in liaison with the Jericho Community Boatyard Ltd. Evidence should be submitted with a planning application to support the boatyard facilities proposed. Provide evidence to support the level of facilities proposed.</u> Opportunities for the community centre and boatyard to share some facilities would be considered favourably.	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Jericho Wharf Trust (#84)

<p>Community Centre Paragraphs 6.13-6.20</p>	<p>Amend sentences: <u>“6.13 ...The current community centre is constrained in terms of internal layout and lack of external space. A report to the City Council’s Scrutiny Committee in January 2013 classified the existing Centre as “POOR – Showing major defects and / or not operating as intended.</u></p> <p>6.14 The Jericho Canalside site has been identified as a site for a replacement Community Centre in the Sites and Housing Plan Policy SP7 and had been in the superseded Local Plan Policy DS.13. <u>The existing community centre building and land is owned by the St Barnabas Church Institute a trust administered by the Parochial Church Council of St Barnabas and St Paul. The expectation is that the portion of the Canalside site from the developer required for the new community centre will be transferred for a nil consideration. A contract was entered into with Spring Residential Ltd for this purpose in 2007. The City Council is willing, in principle, to also allow its land in Dawson Place to form part of a comprehensive redevelopment of the site towards the provision of a new community centre. The applicant/developer of the Canalside site will not be expected to construct the new community centre but will be expected to demonstrate that their land transferred is capable of accommodating the required facilities. Construction is likely to be undertaken by the Jericho Community Association (and other local partners) utilising funds from the sale of the existing community centre and other fundraising.</u></p> <p>6.15 <u>It is critical that the portion of the site transferred for the new community centre is of an adequate size. Policy SP.7 requires the community centre to be ‘sustainably-sized’. This means that it must be of a size and design to include the facilities required to sustain the ongoing management and maintenance of the centre including repairs and replacements (short and long term), rent and salaries. Historically, the typical financial model for community centres was one where the community rented the building from the City Council who would provide funding for maintenance. However, the City Council cannot provide on-going funding support here. This has been the case since 2004 and has applied to the centres built subsequently. Instead, the financial model that will be utilised will be one whereby the Jericho Community Association will take on the responsibility of the management and maintenance over the long term. The JCA will require significant sources of</u></p>	<p>For clarity on what is meant by a “sustainably sized community centre” reflecting consultation with the Jericho Community Association</p>	<p>Jericho Community Association (#83) Jenny Mann (#2) Cordatus and PriceWaterhouseCoopers (#80) Simon Lea (#85)</p>
---	---	--	---

income from the community centre in order to cover these costs.

6.16 In liaison with the City Council's Communities and Neighbourhood's Team, the JCA has undertaken an assessment and financial appraisal of the type of facilities that will generate the income required to cover their management and maintenance costs and concluded that this income will need to come from a café, hall/room lettings and a pre-school. Without these facilities, and the income they generate, the community centre could not be managed and maintained. They are therefore critical to the success of the community centre.

6.17 The pre-school is an important element of the financial model and has been since the initial plans in 2004. There is likely to be a considerable demand for a pre-school in this location due to the significant increase in jobs in the immediate vicinity at the Radcliffe Observatory Quarter and at Oxpens and at the existing large employer Oxford University Press. Demand for places will also be increased following the introduction of the new government voucher scheme to provide free pre-school places for 2 year olds. Oxfordshire County Council/Diocese is unlikely to run pre-school facilities that are not on existing school sites and therefore a commercial/charity provider will be required. To ensure that places are affordable, the JCA will consider subsidising their cost, though this will reduce the available rental stream.

1.1 6.18 Whilst the exact position of the community centre is not known at this point, the JCA has worked up viable options whilst ensuring that the building is designed to make the most efficient use of space and minimise unnecessary circulation space. Their designs have followed guidance in Sport England's "Village and Community Halls Design Guidance Note".

1.2 The following facilities must be able to be delivered in the new community centre:

Ground Floor

- Multi-use community hall - The main hall will need to be able to accommodate a range of uses and be suitable for hiring out for functions. It is expected to meet the requirements set out in the Sport England guidance on Village and Community Halls (see

Section 11.0) and be adjacent to a secure outdoor space. This space, which is separate from that for the pre-school facility, would be for use in conjunction with the hall for functions.

- Café and kitchen/servery - These will facilitate events and enable the rooms to be hired out for functions. The café could be incorporated into the foyer area as a way of minimising circulation space. Its location should allow “spill out” onto the square.
- Pre-school facility with private external area – In order to comply with legislation on the safeguarding of children, this facility will need independent ground floor access as well as secure access to external space. For viability reasons the Preschool must be on the ground floor and the optimum size is considered to be c50.
- Changing and shower rooms – These will be of a scale to meet the needs of users of the centre, hall sports users and also possibly the boating community.

Upper Floors

- Other rooms – these will include a multi-functional studio hall (dance quality); meeting and educational rooms; studios and office. There should be rooms of a sufficient range of sizes. Some should be suitable for hiring and renting out. The existing community centre rents out offices/studios so there is an identified demand” for this type of use.

Delete:

~~“The Jericho Community Association (JCA) undertook a considerable amount of work assessing what would be needed in a new community centre and what would be viable to run and submitted an outline planning application (09/01203/OUT) on part of the site which was approved in 2010 which still remains relevant. The uses considered necessary by the JCA were a new multi use community hall, café and kitchen/servery, pre school facility with external area, changing and shower rooms, multi functional small studio hall, meeting/education rooms, studios, offices and lifts to allow full DDA access. The JCA assessed a need for about 1,600m² Gross External Area (GEA).”~~

"The community centre is expected to be 'sustainably sized'. This means that it must be large enough to accommodate the likely demand from the community but not so large that it would not be fully and regularly utilised, and not so small that it would be uneconomical to run. In relation to the appeal into the 2003 application, the Inspector concluded that the area of the site being offered by that appellant for the new community centre was inadequate, having a net developable area of only 260m², and would need to be "considerably larger" than this. The new community centre is expected to be DDA compliant."

Amend sentence:

"6.20 To deliver these facilities approximately 1,600m² floorspace (Gross External Area) will be required with secure external space of about 150m². The footprint that this will require, and therefore the area of land that will need to be transferred, depends the height that the building can go to which in turn depends on its position on the site. Where the building could go to 3 storeys, approximately 914m² footprint would be required. Where the building is restricted to 2 storeys, 1,163m² is likely to be required. Applicants will be expected to demonstrate how they have assessed the requirements of the community centre in liaison with the City Council's Communities and Neighbourhoods team and the Jericho Community Association. The onus should be on any developer to demonstrate that the community centre will be viable in the long term. Evidence should be submitted with a planning application to support the community facilities proposed. Opportunities for the community centre and boatyard to share some facilities such as showers and laundry uses would be considered favourably."

Amend sentence:

"External funding will be expected to help deliver the new community centre. In addition, £100,000 is currently available from existing s106 funds as contribution towards the new community centre (although there is a time limit on its spending), plus the City Council can contribute £100,000 towards its development. The City Council will only make its land available for community facilities, on any terms, to a developer who, in the Council's opinion, meets the needs of the city and the community."

Community Centre Paragraph 6.22	Amend paragraphs: “6.22 It is preferable for the The community centre <u>must</u> to occupy a position directly onto the new public square. This creates active frontages, animation of the public space and a presence around the square. It allows the community uses to spill out onto the square and increases its vibrancy. <u>There are two suitable positions:</u> ” 1.3 <u>A position on the south of the square on its longest length would</u> To ensure maximum integration with the square, a position to the south of the square on its longest length would be most appropriate and together with the church and the canal frontage helps frame the square and promotes a shared public space and interaction. Spreading the active/public uses (community centre and boatyard) and private uses (dwellings) across the whole site will help ensure that the entire site feels and acts as part of community rather than community uses being pushed to the margins of the development. 1.4 <u>A position on the north of the square would also promote a shared space and interaction although to a lesser extent. Additionally it has the benefit of being able to be built higher to 2.5 or 3 storeys which will reduce the footprint and area of land needed to be transferred. There is an extant planning permission for a community centre at this location and the principle for a community centre in this general location remains appropriate. These principles are consistent with the assessment made by the Planning Inspector in June 2007 in refusing the appeal for a proposed development which placed the community facilities at the margins of the scheme and surrounded the square with residential properties.</u>	For clarity, and to reflect comments	Jericho Community Association (#83)
Public square Paragraph 6.28	Insert sentence: “ <u>Vehicular access to the square should be restricted to avoid unauthorised</u>	For clarity	

	<u>parking.”</u>		
Public square Paragraph 6.30	Amend sentence: ““The longest southern edge of the square is an important frontage so <u>it should be a landmark building of exemplar architectural design in order to maximise the animation of the square the community centre should be positioned here...A condition requiring a management plan for the public space to be submitted and implemented is likely to be imposed on any permission granted.</u> ”	For clarity	Jericho Community Association (#83) Jericho Wharf Trust (#84)
Bridge Paragraph 6.31	Insert sentence: “ <u>It will also help to provide a link between the relatively new community at Rewley Park and Jericho and the boating community.</u> ”	For information, and to reflect comment	Rewley Park Management Company (#86)
Bridge Paragraph 6.33	Amend sentence: “The existing footbridge to the north of the site is not easily accessible by cyclists so it does not create an adequate network for cyclists and pedestrians and certainly not for people with disabilities, mobility problems or people with pushchairs. <u>In the City Council’s view an “improved crossing” does not simply relate to creating a better physical design of a bridge but also improving the position of the bridge so that it delivers an improved network for pedestrians and cyclists that better links the station with major employment areas in Jericho.</u> There is no obvious solution as to how this the <u>existing</u> bridge could be improved in a way that would allow access for everyone particularly as the east end of the bridge emerges through a building. <u>Even if a developer was able to propose a design solution for the existing bridge, the City Council is likely to remain of the opinion that the position of this bridge would do little to improve the network because of its location at the far north of the site.</u> ”	For clarity	
Bridge Paragraphs 6.33-6.35	Amend name to read “ <u>Canal & River Trust</u> ” at all instances	Factual corrections, and to reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Bridge Paragraph 6.33	Amend sentence: “In addition, the bridge is leased to the City Council by the Canal & River Trust which expires in about 20 years. The Canal & River Trust have indicated that they would be likely to take a more commercial view for future leases and may charge a significant fee. <u>There is no guarantee that This will affect whether the City Council will be in a position to renew the lease and therefore the continued existence of that footbridge is not guaranteed.</u> ”	For clarity, and to partially reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)

Bridge Paragraph 6.35	Amend sentence: “...Despite previous unsuccessful negotiations with applicants, the Canal & River Trust are confident that they would be able to come to an agreement with a future applicant on the design of the bridge and that this would not create an obstacle to delivery <u>although their agreement will depend upon the proposal.</u> ”	For clarity, and to partially reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Bridge Paragraph 6.36	Amend sentence: “...The developer should grant permissive rights over the bridge in perpetuity <u>and ensure on-going maintenance.</u> ”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Bridge Paragraph 6.37	Amend last sentence: “ <u>The amount of foot and cycle traffic across the bridge would be far greater than traffic on the canal. The priority should therefore be for the ease of movement of pedestrians and cyclists and so</u> To overcome this a lifting bridge’s default position should be down.”	To provide further information and to reflect comment	
Bridge Paragraph 6.38	Amend sentence: “An arch bridge allows constant access for boaters, pedestrians and cyclists <u>and removes any potential conflict.</u> ”		Ed Surridge (#11)
Bridge Paragraph 6.42	Insert new sentence: “ <u>Engine noise from boats queuing to pass the bridge is likely to cause less noise disturbance to existing residents of Rewley Road if the bridge was central to the site rather than at the southern end.</u> ”	To provide further information and to reflect comment	Jonathon Roberts (#70)
Bridge Paragraph 6.45	Insert new sentence: “ <u>It should be noted that an electricity circuit runs beneath the canal near the southern end of the site which may affect the potential for positioning a bridge in this location. Further information is in Section 9.0. There is also a pumping station which alleviates flooding in Jericho and a pipe running through the site which may affect the position of the bridge.</u> ”	Factual information, and to reflect comment.	Scottish and Southern Energy (#73)(part) Rewley Park Management Company (#86)(part)
Car parking, cycle parking and access Paragraph 6.57	Delete sentence: “ This space will also ensure that the Canal and River Trust can maintain the eastern canal wall with plant machinery through their retained 0.5 metre strip of land. Canal banks can sometime be accessed from the opposite towpath but on this section of canal access down the towpath by machinery is restricted due to the footbridges to the north and south. ”	To reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Dog Litter Bins Paragraph 6.58	Insert sentence: “ <u>The design and text of the information board should be integrated with the</u>	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Rewley Park Management Company (#86)

	<u>Oxford City Canal Partnership’s heritage initiative.”</u>		
7.0 Design Principles			
Paragraph 7.3 (third bullet point)	Amend sentence: “New development should provide uses that promote the active use of the waterway as a recreational resource, an area for residential moorings (<u>subject to consent from the Canal & River Trust</u>) and a working waterway, as well as providing opportunities for positive interaction between the residential communities of Jericho and the canal;”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Paragraph 7.3 (fourth and new fifth bullet point)	Amend sentences: “- Buildings facing onto the canal should be designed using a scale, form, materials and detailing that make references to historic canalside structures <u>and should be of exemplar architectural quality</u> . This does not mean that buildings should provide a pastiche of historic canalside buildings, however the influence of historic precedents on the architecture should be evident and understandable; - <u>Boundaries between historic and new areas should not be blurred and the insertion of the new urban space along the canal within a historic street pattern should be made clear;”</u>	To provide further information and to reflect comment	Simon Lea (#85)
Paragraph 7.3 (eighth bullet point)	“New development should avoid the generation of significant overspill lighting affecting the dark night-time environment of the canal <u>although sensitive lighting would help to improve safety and visibility.”</u>	To provide further information and to reflect comment	Jonathon Roberts (#70) Rewley Park Management Company (#86) Richard Smethurst (#87)
Paragraph 7.5	Insert sentence: “ <u>The canal is a public asset and the design of development and access to the canal should reflect this.</u> ”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Jericho Living Heritage Trust (#91)
Paragraph 7.6	Insert sentence: “ <u>3 storey buildings are exceptional in the local area and the modest, low-scale, generally uniform, 2 storey workers’ cottages with continuous rooflines provide a distinctive architectural character for the area. Therefore 3 storey buildings are an exception. They should be of exceptional quality and should not have a negative impact on the character of the area.</u> ”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	English Heritage (#81) Jericho Living Heritage Trust (#91)
Paragraph 7.7	Amend sentence: “Any building provided on the southern edge of the new public square should consider the fortuitous view that exists from the towpath to the Radcliffe	Factual correction, and to reflect comment.	Rewley Park Management Company (#86)

	Observatory to the west east.”		
Paragraphs 7.9-7.11	Amend name to read “ <u>Canal & River Trust</u> ” at all instances including sub heading	Factual corrections, and to reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Paragraph 7.10	Insert new sentence: “ <u>It is advisable for developers to consider the Policy Advice note which gives recommendations on the design of new development adjacent to waterways (see Section 11.0).</u> ”	Factual information, and to reflect comment.	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Paragraph 7.11	Insert new paragraph: “ <u>It is important that developers liaise with the Canal & River Trust to ensure that they support the requirements and detailed design, otherwise the Canal & River Trust may withhold their consent for matters that affect the canal. Consent would be required for works such as the construction of a boatyard, winding hole, dock, slipways, moorings, bridge and connection points to the canal. Their consent may be subject to a commercial agreement.</u> ” Delete paragraph: “ The requirement for a footway along the east bank from Great Clarendon Street to the new public square is referred to in Section 6.0. One reason for this requirement is so that the CaRT can access the east canal wall for maintenance. Often the CaRT can access canal walls using machinery from the opposite bank but in this location the towpath opposite has restricted access for large machinery due to the listed Isis lock bridge to the south and the footbridge structure to the north. The CaRT have raised a concern that a number of canal banks have collapsed during recent periods of heavy rain and they would need to be satisfied that they could adequately access the canalside to ensure the canal remains safe. ”	Factual information, and to reflect comment that the bank is already piled and the developer is already obliged to carry out any improvement necessary	Canal & River Trust (#79)
8.0 Framework Plan			
Paragraph 8.2	Amend sentence: “The Framework Plans below <u>are options</u> showings broadly how the City Council considers that the site should be developed in order to satisfy policy requirements. They <u>#</u> balances all of the relevant issues discussed in the Brief to create a suitable layouts and massing. <u>The precise layout and areas shown in the Framework Plans are indicative rather than precise.</u> In addition, an illustrative drawing of how <u>the Option 1</u> this design might look has been provided <u>although the specific architecture shown should not presume to be</u>	For clarity	

	<u>appropriate and merely gives an indication of bulk and massing.”</u>		
Framework Plan	Update map and create second option plan with community centre at the north of the square. Update references as consequential changes.	For clarity	Jericho Community Association (#83)
9.0 Delivery and Implementation			
Land ownership map	Update the land ownership map	For clarity	Jericho Community Association (#83) Scottish and Southern Energy (#73)
Ownership Paragraph 9.1	Amend name to read “ <u>Canal & River Trust</u> ” at all instances	Factual corrections, and to reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Ownership Paragraph 9.1	Amend sentence: “The majority of the site is <u>in private ownership under the control of administrators PricewaterhouseCoopers</u> . The City Council are freeholders of the land at Dawson Place. The Canal & River Trust own land at the north of the site which is on a long lease to College Cruisers and is therefore unavailable for development. There are no proposals within this Brief for new development to be located upon the part of the site <u>leased on a long lease to College Cruisers. College Cruisers hold a short term lease on land to the south of their main site which will be ending soon.</u> The Canal & River Trust also own a 0.5 metre strip on land along the length of the canal frontage for maintenance including a triangle of land intended for the new winding hole. The church own a piece of land in front of the west face which they would allow the public to use although would be unlikely to grant permissive rights. <u>It is likely that the Parochial Church Council would not consent to the inclusion of its land in the square if the development was detrimental to the setting and life of the church and vicarage therefore developers are encouraged to liaise closely with the Parochial Church Council. Part of the site is subject to a covenant restricting its use to a community centre.”</u>	For information, factual updates and to reflect comment.	Parochial Church Council of St Barnabas and St Paul (#88)
Ownership Paragraph 9.2	Amend sentence: “In 2005, <u>and reaffirmed in 2009,</u> Oxford City Council indicated their willingness to make available the land it owns in Dawson Place to facilitate <u>the re-provision of the community facilities centre</u> within the Jericho area. The City Council is willing, in principle, to allow its land to form part <u>of a comprehensive redevelopment of the Jericho Canalside site...”</u>	For information, grammar and to reflect comment.	Peter Stalker (#89)

Viability Paragraph 9.6	Amend sentence: “ The site has no AUV because the land uses are <u>The AUV is determined by the Sites and Housing site allocation Policy SP7.</u> ”	For clarity	
Viability Paragraph 9.7	Amend sentence: “ The site is currently in the hands of administrators who will be aiming to realise the property in order to make a distribution to creditors of Spring Residential Ltd. The developer who purchases the site will also have been <u>It is understood that the majority of the site was put under contract to a private company in October 2013. It is expected that the purchaser to considered the financial implications of all policy requirements and site specific constraints when making an offer for the site.</u> ”	For clarity and information	
Viability Paragraph 9.9	Amend paragraph: “All the requirements of the Brief are considered to be within the scope of Policy SP7. Any argument that the Brief has introduced an additional requirement for a new bridge compared to Policy SP7, which refers to ‘an improved crossing’, will be challenged as <u>–</u> Firstly , there has never been any other realistic option to improve the crossing other than a new bridge. Secondly, up until the receipt of the Sites and Housing Plan Inspector’s Report in Jan 2013, a new bridge had always been a requirement of the draft site allocation Policy SP7 and the previous Policy DS.13 (Oxford Local Plan 2001-2016). Between Jan 2013 and the publication of the draft of this Brief (Sep 2013) the site was not been sold to a developer and therefore the requirement for a bridge in this Brief will have had a neutral effect on the land value compared to pre Jan 2013. ”	To update and to and to partially reflect comment	Cordatus and PriceWaterhouseCoopers (#80)(part)
Viability Paragraph 9.9	Jericho Wharf Trust are <u>were</u> confident that they can <u>could have delivered</u> a residual land value higher than the EUV without having to compromise on policy requirements.	Factual update	
Community Infrastructure Levy Paragraph 9.11	Amend paragraph: “The City Council expect to <u>adopted</u> its Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) charging schedule in Oct 2013 <u>and it came into effect on 21st Oct 2013.</u> ”	Factual update	
Water supply Paragraphs 9.12	Amend paragraph: “Water supply capacity in this area is unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from development of this site. Policy SP7 says that Thames Water therefore require that applicants <u>demonstrate that there is adequate water supply capacity both on and off the site to serve the</u>	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Thames Water Utilities Ltd (#90)

	<p><u>development and that it would not lead to problems for existing or new users. In some circumstances it may be necessary for developers to fund studies to ascertain whether the proposed development will lead to overloading of existing water infrastructure. should fund investigations (which would be undertaken by Thames Water) to determine whether an upgrade to the water infrastructure is required. If the upgrade is required it could take up to three years lead in time for Thames Water to undertake any such works."</u></p>		
<p>Electricity circuits Paragraphs 9.13-9.16</p>	<p>Insert new sub-section: <u>"9.13 Scottish and Southern Energy (SSE) have advised that at the southern end of the site, within the site boundary, there are 2 x existing 33,000 volts (ehv) oil filled underground circuits and these should be regarded as permanent features and any development planned around them, as alterations would have a long lead time and would be extremely costly."</u></p> <p><u>9.14 It should also be noted that at the northern end of the development site, within the land on a long lease to College Cruisers, there is an existing distribution substation known as Combe Road Ferry Wharf, for which access is required 24 hours a day/365 days of the year, together with the existing 11,000 volt (hv) and 230/400 volt (lv) underground cables.</u></p> <p><u>9.15 The underground circuits have the potential to affect whether a bridge can be located at the southern end on the site. Developers will be expected to have considered how this will affect any proposals with SSE prior to submitting an application in order for the City Council to judge deliverability of the development. Initial advice from SSE is that a 5 metre exclusion zone from the circuits may be required. Before any trial excavation works are carried out on site, a site meeting should be arranged with the SSE Major Projects section to discuss and agree the scope of works, including the possibility of refining the exclusion zone distance. Once more detailed proposals are drawn up, these can be provided to the SSE Major Projects section for them to advise accordingly.</u></p> <p><u>9.16 Developers will be expected to enter into discussions with SSE to agree how their equipment can be accommodated within the proposal. Developers will also be expected to agree contractual arrangements with Southern Electric Power Distribution for any modifications prior to permission being</u></p>	<p>To provide further information and to reflect comment</p>	<p>Scottish and Southern Energy (#73)</p>

	granted.”		
10.0 Further Information			
Section 10.0	Amend sentence: “ Interim <u>Public Consultation Statement for the Jericho Canalside SPD (Sep Dec 2013)</u> ”	Factual update	
Section 10.0	Amend name to read “ <u>Canal & River Trust</u> ” in both instances	Factual correction, and to reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Section 10.0	Insert new sentence: <i>Policy Advice Note: Inland Waterways (July 2009) TCPA and British Waterways</i>	Factual information, and to reflect comment.	Canal & River Trust (#79)
11.00 Appendices			
Paragraph 11.11	Amend name to read “ <u>Canal & River Trust</u> ”	Factual correction, and to reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)
Paragraph 11.13	Amend paragraph: “ <u>This application set out the sustainably sized element of a new Community Centre and the footprint required. Application approved in 2010 for the following reasons (summarised):</u> ”	For clarity, and to reflect comment	Jericho Community Association (#83)
Paragraph 11.15	Amend name to read “ <u>Canal & River Trust</u> ”	Factual correction, and to reflect comment	Canal & River Trust (#79)