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1. Introduction
	1. This Interim Public Participation Statement sets out how Oxford City Council has engaged and consulted with the public to date on the Jericho Canalside Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) in accordance with Regulation 12 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012[[1]](#footnote-1), and the adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
	2. This interim statement provides details of the informal engagement and consultation activities and the resulting feedback relating to the pre-production stage of the SPD. This document sets out the persons consulted, summarises the main issues they raised and, shows how those issues have been addressed in the SPD. Following the period of statutory public consultation (during Sept/Oct 2013) this statement will be updated to include details of the responses received.
2. Purpose of the SPD
	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. 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
	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.
	2. The pre-production consultation included:
		* Drop in event for people of Jericho
		* Meetings with local interest groups and organisations

*Drop in event*

* 1. 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.
	2. 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. 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 would agree 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 would agree 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 locates south of the square. This is one reason for this being its preferred location within the 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 would agree.
* 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 will remain 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.
	1. 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 that 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*

* 1. 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 and River Trust
	2. 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 complementary residential.
	3. The Oxford City Canal Partnership and Worcester College are keen to be involved in the development of the SPD and will consider the draft during consultation in September.
	4. College Cruisers occupy the northern part of the site on a long lease from the Canal and River Trust. Their site will not be affected by proposals within the SPD and they confirmed that they should be able to continue to operate satisfactorily.
	5. The Canal and River Trust (formerly British Waterways) 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.
1. Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Consultation
	1. A Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Screening Report has been produced to identify whether the 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 for the draft Jericho Canalside SPD.
	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 draft SPD.
2. Consultation on the Draft SPD
	1. Once approved by the City Executive Board for consultation, formal public participation on the draft SPD will take place for a six-week period during September and October 2013. The consultation will invite comments from the Jericho community, local interest groups, people on our consultation database, statutory consultees, the administrators PricewaterhouseCoopers and developers with a known interest in the site. The methods used will be the City Council’s online consultation portal, email and letter. Advertising will take place on the website, social media and by a press release.
	2. The Draft SPD together with the Strategic Environmental Assessment Scoping Report will be made available during the consultation period on the City Council’s website and for viewing at St Aldate’s Customer Service Centre.
	3. Following the six-week period of statutory public consultation, responses received will be processed, analysed and reported in a revision to this statement. The comments will be made available on the City Council’s website and for viewing at St Aldate’s Customer Service Centre as soon as is reasonably practicable.
	4. The final Public Participation Statement will set out a summary of the main issues raised through the consultation and how those issues have been addressed in the final SPD. The Public Participation Statement will be completed and reported to City Executive Board when the final SPD is presented for adoption.
1. With effect from 6th April 2012, the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004 (Statutory Instrument 2004 No. 2204) were replaced by the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (Statutory Instrument 2012 No. 767). Therefore 2004 Regulation 18 was replaced by 2012 Regulations 12(b) and 13. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)