5 SOCIO-ECONOMIC ISSUES

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 This chapter establishes the baseline socio-economic conditions and then considers the likely socio-economic effects of the Proposed Development.

5.1.2 The considerations of this chapter are most commonly related to the effects of the Proposed Development upon the human population who will live, work and/or use the facilities in the Proposed Development and in the local area.

5.1.3 This is achieved by examining the potential effects on the population anticipated as a result of the Proposed Development and, in turn, assessing the effect that this could have on relevant services and facilities, including education, healthcare, recreational facilities and job creation. The assessment enables consideration to be given to the ability of existing social infrastructure and that proposed by the development to accommodate the additional population and identifies the extent to which additional demands will be placed on existing facilities. Where additional demands will be generated the methods of mitigation are identified and the residual effects assessed.

5.2 ASSESSMENT APPROACH

<u>Methodology</u>

5.2.1 There is no specific guidance available which establishes a methodology for undertaking an EIA of the socio-economic effects of a proposed development. Accordingly, the approach adopted for this assessment is based on professional experience and best practice, and in consideration of the policy requirement/tests set out within the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), and the extant and emerging development plan.

5.2.2 The assessment considers the potential effects of the Proposed Development relative to the future baseline position rather than the current baseline position. This ensures that the potential effects are considered relative to the position that is likely to arise should the Proposed Development not occur.

5.2.3 The baseline information has been collated with reference to the following:

- NPPF;
- Cherwell Local Plan Part 1;
- Emerging Partial Review of Cherwell Local Plan Part 1;
- Office of National Statistics (ONS) data (various outputs as individually referenced in this chapter);
- Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (MHCLG) data (various outputs as individually referenced within this chapter);
- Information obtained from the client with regards to the current land use and site characteristics
- •

Assessment of Significance

5.2.4 Given the nature of the socio-economic factors under consideration, it is not considered appropriate to assign a 'sensitivity of receptor' scale in accordance with the generic approach set out within **Chapter 2**. Accordingly, a qualitative assessment of the likely significance of socio-economic effects has been carried out and significance rating

5.Socio-Economic Issues

assigned in accordance with the matrix and associated commentary set out in **Table 5.1**.

Table 5.1 Significance Matrix

| Significance | Negative | Neutral | Beneficial | |
|--------------|--|--|--|--|
| Major | An undesirable effect of strategic significance or one that runs counter to the objectives of the Local Plan and/or the NPPF | | A desirable effect of strategic significance and one that is required to support the objectives of the Local Plan and/or NPPF | |
| Moderate | An undesirable effect that has more than localised significance or compromises the objectives of the Local Plan and/or the NPPF | development are either neutral or not quantifiable | A desirable effect that has more than localised significance and will support the objectives of the Local Plan and/or NPPF | |
| Minor | An effect that is localised and undesirable | | An effect that is localised and desirable | |

Legislative and Policy Framework

5.2.5 Guidance on producing EIAs published by the European Commission and UK Government suggests that the possible socio-economic effects that should be considered are those relating to changes in population, such as changes in the demand for housing and services such as schools and recreation facilities.

5.2.6 The NPPF provides the Government's planning policies for England and how these are expected to be applied. Paragraph 11 sets out the golden thread running through the NPPF, namely that a presumption in favour of sustainable development applies. It identifies how local planning authorities should plan for sustainable development within their area and across local boundaries and emphasises the three interdependent roles of sustainable development:

"An economic objective – to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity; and by identifying and coordinating the provision of infrastructure;

A social objective – to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities' health, social and cultural well-being; and

An environmental objective – to contribute to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment; including making effective use of land, helping to improve biodiversity, using natural resources prudently, minimising waste and pollution, and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy".

5.Socio-Economic Issues

5.2.7 Cherwell District Council adopted the Local Plan Part 1 in July 2015¹. This comprises the Development Plan for the area subject to this application. The Council have now also submitted a Partial Review of the Local Plan Part 1 for examination.

5.2.8 Development which provides for the objectives of the extant Development Plan will contribute to the delivery of sustainable development as required by the NPPF. As such, assessment of the various socio-economic aspects within this chapter has been considered in light of the sustainable development objectives of the NPPF with reference to the objectives of the extant Development Plan, and in particular the associated gains that sustainable development can deliver.

Scoping Criteria

5.2.9 The scope and contents of this socio-economic assessment are based on professional experience and best practice.

5.2.10 Consideration has been given only to those socio-economic factors for which there is a potential for likely significant effects or which are relevant to assessing these effects. Different factors are considered in the baseline assessment and during the construction and operational phases of the Proposed Development as identified in **Table 5.2**, owing to the likelihood of effects over these phases.

| Factor | Baseline Assessment | Likely Significant Effects during the Construction Phase | Likely Significant Effects during the Operational Phase | | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|--|---|--|--|
| Population | 4 | Not considered as the effects can only be estimated once the development is complete | \checkmark | | |
| Deprivation | 4 | Not considered as the effects can only be estimated once the development is complete | \checkmark | | |
| Housing | ✓ | ✓ | \checkmark | | |
| Educational Capacity | ~ | Not considered as the effects can only be estimated once the development is complete | ~ | | |
| Healthcare Provision | ~ | Not considered as the effects can only be estimated once the development is complete | ~ | | |
| Community Facilities | 4 | Not considered as the effects can only be estimated once the development is complete | \checkmark | | |

Table 5.2: Socio-economic Factors

¹ And subsequently readopted containing Policy Bicester 13 in December 2016

5.Socio-Economic Issues

| Factor | Baseline Assessment | Likely Significant Effects during the Construction Phase | |
|---------|------------------------|--|--------------|
| Economy | \checkmark | \checkmark | \checkmark |

5.2.11 Consideration has been given to the potential effects at a local, district and where relevant, national scale.

Limitations to the Assessment

5.2.12 Baseline information is derived from the latest available statistics, however, there is often a time-lag associated with the publication of this data and this needs to be recognised.

5.2.13 The subnational population and household projections, prepared by the ONS and MHCLG respectively, are based on past trends and as such do not take account of future policy decisions or objectives. The assumed future baseline position may not therefore fully reflect changes that arise as a result of political or economic changes.

5.2.14 The extent to which the Proposed Development generates additional population growth cannot be calculated with absolute certainty due in part of the fact that some people moving to the development will already be living within Heyford Park. Many of these will release their previous houses to the market and thereby accommodate an increased population within the area, although not at the Application Site.

5.2.15 The primary source for identifying the socio-economic profile of an area is the 2011 Census. However, at the time of the 2011 Census no housing completions had been recorded at Heyford Park, although some pre-existing houses were leased to households. It is therefore not appropriate to use the socio-economic profile of Heyford Park at 2011 to consider the likely socio-economic profile of residents likely to occupy the Proposed Development. Instead, the socio-economic profile of the Proposed Development is assumed to reflect that in the southwest Bicester urban extension, which is within the same District and Housing Market Area, 5 miles from Heyford Park, and which was more than half complete by the time of the 2011 Census. The socio-economic profile of this area may not precisely align with that at the Proposed Development, but this is considered to provide a reasonable proxy.

5.3 **BASELINE CONDITIONS**

Site Description and Context

5.3.1 A detailed description of the Application Site and its surrounding context is provided within **Chapter 3**, and therefore is not repeated. However, the details of the Proposed Development that are pertinent to the socio-economic assessment are described below.

5.3.2 The assessment considers the provision of the following aspects of the Proposed Development:

- Approximately 1,175 dwellings;
- Up to 60 close care dwellings;
- 35,175m² of new commercial and industrial buildings at the Creative City (made up of 6,330m² of B1a uses; 13,635m² of B1b/c uses; 9,250m² of B2 uses; and 5,960m² of B8 uses);
- The change of use of 6,510m² of existing buildings to provide B1b/c employment floorspace, 1,747m² to provide B1a floorspace and 5,555m² to provide B8 floorspace;

5.Socio-Economic Issues

- The demolition of 200m² of B1a floorspace, 676m² of B2 floorspace and 11,475m² of B8 floorspace;
- An indoor sports facility;
- 4.2ha Sports Park;
- A community orchard;
- A medical centre of 670m²;
- A community use building of 800m²;
- Retail floorspace of 929m²;
- An energy facility of 1,000m²;
- A car processing area of 20.3ha to support an existing business;
- A temporary film set construction area/event parking;
- A filming area of 76.6ha;
- Buildings for filming activities totalling 1,860m²;
- A destination park including an observation tower accommodating visitor facilities of 100m²;
- A core visitor destination area;
- Heritage facilities;
- A site for a new school of 2.4ha and the change of use of 2,520m² of existing buildings for educational use as part of the new school to provide 1.5FE to 2FE of primary education and 1.5FE of secondary education; and
- Public open space and Green Infrastructure.

5.3.3 The Proposed Development is considered alongside the existing (consented) baseline developments compromising the original new settlement (including 1,075 dwellings², retail floorspace, employment floorspace and community facilities), Phase 5³ (including 60 dwellings⁴), Phase 6 (including 43 dwellings) and the Village Centre South (including retail floorspace). This provides for a total of 1,753 dwellings yet to be built.

5.3.4 The Proposed Development forms part of Heyford Park. The socio-economic make-up of the Proposed Development is considered in the context of the nearby urban extension of Northwest Bicester (which broadly corresponds with the output areas of E00145015, E00145019, E00145022, E00145025, E00145026, E00169025 to E00169027).

5.3.5 However, the existing socio-economic profile of Heyford Park (which broadly corresponds with the output areas of E00145237 to E00145240) is considered where relevant. Where the data is not available at an output area level, the Middle Super Output Area (MSOA) of Cherwell 010 and the Lower Super Output Areas (LSOA) of Cherwell 010D are used.

5.3.6 Given the range of socio-economic issues, each is considered separately in the following sections, with the baseline established first and then the likely significant effects considered.

Baseline Survey Information

Population

5.3.7 The 2011 Census identified 141,868 usual residents in Cherwell District in 2011. However, by 2018 the mid-year population estimates (ONS) identify that the population had increased to 149,161.

⁴ Of which all 60 are complete.

² Of which 540 were built at April 2019 according to the Annual Monitoring Report of the Council, leaving a remainder of 535 to be built

³ Since the assessment in 2018 phase 6 has been built out and only 7 units remain to be built within phase 5.

5.Socio-Economic Issues

5.3.8 The 2016 based subnational population projections (ONS), project a further increase of circa 5,300 persons from 2018 to 2031.

5.3.9 The 2016 based subnational population projections (ONS) identify the factors that make up the projected population change. Within Cherwell District the majority of growth (63%) arises from natural growth rather than from net in-migration between 2016 and 2031.

5.3.10 The 2016 subnational population projections forecast the future age structure of Cherwell assuming recent trends continue as presented in Table 5.3a and Figure 5.1.

| Tuble blog i i rejected Age bridetale of eller well | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------------|--------------------------|--------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Age Structure in 2018 | Age Structure in 2031 | Change | | | | | |
| Pre-school (0-4) | 9,058 | 8,347 | -711 | | | | | |
| Primary school (5-10) | 11,546 | 10,255 | -1,291 | | | | | |
| Secondary school (11- 17) | 12,089 | 12,685 | +596 | | | | | |
| Working age (18-64) | 88,528 | 86,735 | -1,793 | | | | | |
| Older (65+) | 26,926 | 36,434 | +9,508 | | | | | |

Table 5.3a⁵: Projected Age Structure of Cherwell

5.3.11 This demonstrates that the population of Cherwell District is expected to continue ageing with a projected increase of over 9,500 people over the age of 65.

5.3.12 The 2011 Census⁶ identifies that migrants tend to be younger on average than existing residents.

Deprivation

5.3.13 The Index of Multiple Deprivation 2019⁷ provides an indication of the average levels of deprivation for LSOA across England. The Index provides an overall assessment of the average levels of deprivation as well as an assessment against particular domains of deprivation.

5.3.14 The LSOAs which contain the Application Site have average or low levels of deprivation for the overall index and for the majority of domains of deprivation. However, the LSOAs are respectively within the 3.4% and 29.2% most deprived areas nationally in regards to Barriers to Housing and Services.

<u>Housing</u>

5.3.15 The Local Plan Part 1 sets out a requirement to deliver 22,840 new homes over the period 2011-2031. However, the Council have identified an additional requirement to deliver housing to contribute to the unmet needs of Oxford City. In the submission draft of the Partial Review of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1, a figure of 4,400 additional homes was identified.

5.3.16 Policy Villages 5 of the Local Plan Part 1 identified a requirement for Heyford Park to deliver 2,361 dwellings and necessary supporting infrastructure including primary and secondary education provision and appropriate community, recreational and employment opportunities.

⁵ Tables within this SEI which have been updated since the 2018 ES have been re-numbered with an 'a' within them so ease of referencing.

⁶ Tables UKMIG001 and QS103EW, 2011 Census – Office for National Statistics.

⁷ September 2019, English Indices of Deprivation 2015, Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government.

5.Socio-Economic Issues

5.3.17 The NPPF requires that a Local Planning Authority maintains a rolling supply of deliverable housing land to provide for housing needs for the following five years. It also requires that sites or broad locations are identified to ensure sufficient capacity for housing in years 6-10 and where possible 11-15. The five-year land supply ensures that the current and imminently arising future needs for housing are addressed. Where there is an insufficient land supply, the needs for housing will not be being planned for and further sites will need to be brought forward to address this.

5.3.18 Cherwell District Council's Annual Monitoring Report 2019 identifies that there is and will continue to be a five-year housing land supply shortfall for the District. The Application Site forms part of the deliverable supply.

5.3.19 The ratio of house prices to earnings provides a measure of the affordability of housing within an area. In 2018, the lower quartile workplace based house price was less affordable at 11.14 times the lower quartile income in Cherwell as compared to 7.29 times across England. This indicates that the area is less affordable for lower earners. The median workplace based house price to median income ratio indicates that Cherwell (9.73) was also less affordable than England (8.00) for average earners.

5.3.20 The average house price in Cherwell in November 2019 was £283,616⁸ compared to the average house price of £251,222 across England.

Educational Capacity

5.3.21 Local Education Authorities (LEA) have a statutory duty to secure sufficient school places within their area. The school that any particular child attends is a matter of parental choice subject to availability of capacity at the selected school. It is always subject to the overriding requirements of any published admission criteria that the school has, as well as the appeals procedure for individual pupils.

5.3.22 Heyford Park Free School opened a 1FE nursery in September 2017. Planning permission was granted by the Council for an early years day care nursery (for 10 years) at Heyford Park. Since the 2018 ES this nursery has been built and is now operational.

5.3.23 Heyford Park Free School is now fully open and provides primary and secondary education. It has a total capacity for 840 students (or 60 per year) according to the Department for Education⁹. At this time, the Department for Education record that there are 663 students in these 840 places. This would indicate that there is a significant surplus capacity within the school as a whole.

5.3.24 The Oxfordshire Pupil Place Plan 2019-2023 confirms that there is surplus capacity in the school.

Healthcare Provision

5.3.25 Heyford Park is served by Bicester Community Hospital which lies within 5 miles of the Proposed Development. This hospital provides children's and adolescent services, physiotherapy, and a walk-in centre. Additional services including an Accident and Emergency service are provided at Horton NHS Treatment Centre and Horton General Hospital in Banbury within 10 miles.

⁸ House Price Index, Land Registry (accessed 17th February 2020)

⁹ Taken from the Get Information about Schools website (accessed 17th February 2020)

5.Socio-Economic Issues

5.3.26 In terms of primary healthcare, there are no operational GP surgeries at Heyford Park. The nearest such facilities are in Bicester. There is a single surgery within 5 miles of the Proposed Development. The practice size and patient number for this surgery are shown in **Table 5.4a**. This gives an indication as to whether there is a capacity for existing surgery to absorb additional patients having regard to the number of patients per GP.

5.3.27 According to NHS Digital there were an average of 2,087 patients per GP nationally in July 2019.

| GP Surgery ¹⁰ | Approx. distance from Application Site (miles) | No. of GPs | No. of patients on roll | No. of patients per GP | Acceptin g new patients? |
|--------------------------|--|------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Bicester Health Centre | 4.6 | 12 | 15,035 | 1,253 | Yes |
| Total | | 12 | 15,035 | 1,253 | |

Table 5.4a: GP Surgery Capacity

5.3.28 There are a significantly greater number of GPs within this surgery than would be expected on average across the nation, and this surgery is also accepting new patients.

5.3.29 The nearest dental surgeries, opticians and pharmacies are also located in Bicester.

Community Facilities

5.3.30 Heyford Park is currently served by a small number of community facilities (in addition to the educational facilities identified previously), including the Heyford Park Shop and Community Centre, and the Heyford Park Chapel.

5.3.31 Planning permission was granted in November 2016 for a Village Centre (south) including a hotel, bar/brasserie and covered market and this is currently under development. Planning permission was also granted for a Village Centre (north) including offices and retail units in July 2018 and construction is underway. These proposals will provide an improved offer for local residents.

5.3.32 The NPPF provides the national guidance relating to the provision of Green Infrastructure in new developments. The NPPF states that planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the needs for open space, sports and recreation facilities and opportunities for new provision.

5.3.33 The Developer Contributions SPD, February 2018 identifies the open space standards required of new developments. The Open Space Update 2011 identifies the existing provision for the "Astons and Heyfords" ward¹¹. The existing shortfall or surplus can be calculated from the current population.

5.3.34 The 2011 Census identified that the Astons and Heyfords ward had a population of 4,939 persons in 2011. Since this time, Cherwell Council's Residential Completions and Permissions at 31st March 2019 report identifies that 608 dwellings have been constructed within the ward. Assuming that each of these had a population of 2.49 persons (based on the rate identified in the Developer Contributions SPD), there would be a total of 6,453 people in the ward in 2019.

¹⁰ NHS Choices website, National Health Service (accessed 17th February 2020).

¹¹ Which includes Lower Heyford, Upper Heyford, Steeple Aston, Middle Aston, Duns Tew, North Aston Somerton, Fritwell and Souldern

5.Socio-Economic Issues

5.3.35 The standards are applied to the estimated population in **Table 5.5a** to provide an estimate of the existing shortfall or surplus of Green Infrastructure.

| Туроlоду | Standard (ha per 1000 people) | Estimated population in 2019 | Require ment in 2019 | Provision in 2011 | Surplus/ shortfall |
|-----------------------------|--|------------------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|
| General green space | 2.74 | | 17.68ha | 20.65ha | +2.97ha |
| Playspace | 0.78 | | 5.03ha | 0.64ha | -4.39ha |
| | | 6,453 | | | |
| Outdoor sports provision | 1.13 | | 7.29ha | 10.04ha | +2.75ha |
| Allotments | 0.37 | | 2.39ha | 4.45ha | +2.06ha |

Table 5.5a: Green Infrastructure Provision

<u>Economy</u>

5.3.36 The 2011 Census¹² identified that 85.0% of people in the comparator area of Northwest Bicester were economically active, compared to 75.7% in Cherwell, 72.6% in Oxfordshire and 69.9% across England.

5.3.37 The 2011 Census also identified that Northwest Bicester (3.0%) had unemployment rates¹³ below that of Cherwell (3.8%), Oxfordshire (3.7%) and England (6.3%).

5.3.38 The 2011 Census identified that Cherwell District experienced net out-commuting flows, with 23,206 workers commuting in to the area but 26,184 commuting out.

5.3.39 The 2016 Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings¹⁴ identified that the median salary of a full-time employed person living in Cherwell was £31,290 whereas the median salary of someone that worked in Cherwell was £31,599. This indicates that there is a minimal pay differential between residents and workers.

5.3.40 The sectoral breakdown of industry¹⁵ for the residents of Cherwell is broadly reflective of that in England, with the exception that residents are more likely to work in the manufacturing sector (11.5%) or the wholesale and retail trade (17.7%) as compared with England (8.9% and 15.9% respectively). This may in part reflect the presence of Bicester Outlet Shopping Village.

5.3.41 The occupations of the residents of Cherwell is again broadly consistent with those across England¹⁶.

5.3.42 The 2011 Census¹⁷ identified that 5,519 (7.4%) residents within Cherwell were employed in the construction sector. This compares to 7.7% of the workforce nationally.

¹² May 2014, Table KS601EW, Office for National Statistics

¹³ The unemployment rate is taken as the proportion of economically active persons that are unemployed

¹⁴ Annual Survey of Hours and Earnings, Office for National Statistics

¹⁵ February 2013, Table KS605EW, Office for National Statistics.

¹⁶ February 2013, Table KS608EW, Office for National Statistics

¹⁷ February 2013, Table KS605EW, Office for National Statistics.

5.4 ASSESSMENT OF LIKELY SIGNIFICANT EFFECTS

5.4.1 The Proposed Development will be delivered in a phased programme before the development is fully operational. The construction will be responsive to demand and as such no prescriptive delivery schedule is set out. However, this forms the final residential phase of Policy Villages 5 (which provides a total of 2,361 dwellings), which is envisaged to be developed from 2024 to 2032 according to the Council's 2019 Annual Monitoring Report. The effects of the Proposed Development are assessed in this context.

5.4.2 The effects that arise during the construction phase will be dependent upon the delivery rate and as this is not prescribed it is difficult to provide a detailed assessment. However, for the purposes of this assessment it is assumed that on the best information available, the construction period will last for 8 years.

Construction

<u>Housing</u>

5.4.3 The delivery of homes throughout the construction phase will respond to the need for housing that currently exists. Delivery will be responsive to demand and so the specific needs will be able to be responded to in a flexible way, subject to any planning conditions.

5.4.4 The delivery of appropriate housing at appropriate times to meet district wide needs will support the objectives within the Local Plan Part 1, and this is therefore considered a **major beneficial effect** given the scale of the development.

<u>Economy</u>

5.4.5 The estimated construction costs for each element of the Proposed Development are taken from the Building Cost Information Service (BCIS) database and based upon the mean cost within the South East region, as follows:

- The provision of up to 1,175 dwellings is estimated to cost circa £135.4M based on the average floorspace of new dwellings identified in the English Housing Survey (87m²).
- The construction cost of 60 close care units is estimated to be £5.8M.
- The costs of building $35,175m^2$ of new employment floorspace is estimated to be £56.0M.
- The change of use of 12,156m² of existing buildings to employment floorspace is estimated to cost £14.4M.
- The construction of 515m² of indoor sports facilities is estimated to cost £0.9M.
- The costs of constructing a medical centre of $670m^2$ is estimated to be £2.2M.
- The provision of 800m² of community uses is estimated to cost £1.8M.
- The construction cost of 929m² of retail floorspace is estimated to be £1.3M.
- The change of use of 3,959m 2 of buildings for heritage uses is estimated to cost £11M.
- Oxfordshire County Council identify that a 1.5FE primary school would cost £8.2M in the Education Assessment of Spatial Options for Oxford's unmet housing needs paper, September 2016.
- The change of use of $2520m^2$ of existing buildings to educational floorspace is estimated to cost £2.0M.
- There will also be additional as yet unspecified costs associated with the proposed demolitions and the construction of the sports pitches, play areas, the filming

area and buildings, the parks, the energy facility, and the Core Visitor Destination Area.

5.4.6 The above figures produce an estimated construction cost of \pounds 239.1M as an absolute minimum. This is additional to the construction costs associated with the baseline developments.

5.4.7 The average turnover of an individual construction worker across the region¹⁸ can be applied to the construction costs. In the South East region this average turnover is £148,516 per worker which results in circa 1,610 person years of construction employment arising from the Proposed Development. The jobs that provide for this employment will fluctuate, but it is reasonable to assume that on average the development will support circa 201 jobs directly per year, over the 8-year development period.

5.4.8 The Scottish Government produced analysis on employment multipliers in 2011¹⁹, which identify that for every 1 direct construction job generated there would be an additional 0.7 indirect jobs (in the supply chain) and 0.4 induced jobs (supporting the supply chain) generated. Whilst this rate reflects employment within Scotland rather than England, no comparative analysis is available in England and the rates are assumed to be broadly consistent across the UK. Using this information, the Proposed Development would support an additional 141 indirect jobs and 80 induced jobs, in addition to the 201 direct jobs per year during the estimated 8-year development period. A proportion of these jobs will be maintained once the development is complete to support future development across the area and/or the newly arising population.

5.4.9 Additional benefit to the economy would also occur during the construction period with expenditure on local goods and services.

5.4.10 The generation of jobs within the construction sector during the construction phase and beyond is considered to be a **major beneficial effect** to provide the economic growth required by paragraph 18 of the NPPF²⁰ and the objectives of the Local Plan Part 1.

Operation

Population

5.4.11 The Proposed Development provides up to 1,175 dwellings. Once, the baseline developments are added in, there will be an additional 578 dwellings (excluding the 600 which were already complete at April 2019) totalling 1,753 dwellings to be built. Assuming the average number of persons per dwelling (of 2.49) identified in the Developer Contributions SPD the Proposed Development and baseline developments would accommodate 4,365 people.

5.4.12 However, the identified average number of persons per dwelling is greater than the average identified in the 2011 Census (2.35) and takes no account of the forecast reduction in average household sizes. Indeed, the latest MHCLG Household Projections identify that the average number of persons per dwellings²¹ will decline to 2.24 by 2031. As a result, the population identified above is likely to be an over-estimate and this will feed through to subsequent calculations.

¹⁸ October 2016, Business Population Estimates 2016, Department for Business, Innovation and Skills

¹⁹ August 2014, Employment Multipliers Input Output Tables, The Scottish Government

²⁰ March 2012, The National Planning Policy Framework, Department for Communities and Local Government

 $^{^{\}rm 21}$ Assuming the ratio of households to dwellings identified in the 2011 Census

5.Socio-Economic Issues

5.4.13 The above calculation does not take account of any additional houses which have been occupied in the baseline developments in 2019/20. It therefore assumes that these residents are not yet included in the relevant statistics and will in effect double count those which are. This again serves to over-estimate the population. Nevertheless, this population is used as a 'worst case' to ensure that sufficient mitigation is provided.

5.4.14 Some but not all of the population growth will be new to the area as some households will move from within the wider area. Many of these will release their previous homes to the market which in turn will be occupied by new households and so generate additional population within the wider area although not on the site. However, some people moving within the area will not release a previous property to the market (i.e. first time buyers, household separations etc.) and so will not have any implications on the population within the area.

5.4.15 The National Association of Estate Agents report²² that somewhere between 20% and 25% of all purchases are made by first time buyers. If it is assumed that 22.5% of market housing is occupied by existing residents; and that 30% of dwellings are delivered as affordable homes which are occupied by existing residents of Cherwell District, circa 802 of the 1,753 dwellings would provide for the existing population without releasing an existing property (526 affordable homes and 276 for those moving from within the area without releasing a property). Therefore 951 of the 1,753 dwellings in the Proposed Development and baseline developments would provide for people new to the area (even if further along the housing market chain). This translates to circa 2,368 new people.

5.4.16 The Proposed Development and baseline developments provide an additional 1,753 new dwellings which therefore provides for between 2,368 and 4,365 people new to the local population.

5.4.17 The Proposed Development also includes 60 close care units. The "Establishing the extra in Extra Care Report" (Dylan Kneale, September 2011) identifies that circa 30% of extra care units are occupied by couples (see tables 4, 5 and 6) and the remainder are occupied by single persons. It would therefore be expected that the 60 close care units would accommodate circa 78 people. These people are all expected to be resident in Cherwell and therefore these will release circa 60 dwellings for occupation by other households which would be expected to accommodate 149 people, a net increase of 71 people.

5.4.18 The Proposed Development is therefore likely to accommodate between 2,439 and 4,436 people new to the population. Except for the close care residents, the migrants are likely to be younger on average than the existing population and so will limit the ageing of the population locally.

5.4.19 The Proposed Development is considered to be a **minor beneficial effect** in terms of the resulting age of the population, as any development will help to support a younger population that will support the economy of the local area.

Deprivation

5.4.20 The LSOA within which the Application Site is located has low levels of overall deprivation although suffer from deprivation in relation to barriers to housing and services. The Proposed Development will deliver housing and services, and will thereby address this deprivation. Given that the deprivation applies to a very small area (i.e. the LSOA), the Proposed Development is considered to have a **minor beneficial effect**.

²² June 2014, National Association of Estate Agents Housing Market Report, National Association of Estate Agents

<u>Housing</u>

5.4.21 The Local Plan Part 1 identifies a housing requirement for 22,840 homes across the plan area from 2011 to 2031 of which 1,753 are to be provided at Heyford Park, including the Proposed Development. It also sets a requirement for 30% affordable housing as proposed.

5.4.22 The provision of housing to contribute to existing and newly arising levels of demand will alleviate house price rises and the deterioration of the affordability of housing. The impacts of individual residential schemes on house prices is however negligible.

5.4.23 The delivery of homes (including affordable homes) to maintain a continuous supply of housing, to alleviate house price rises, and to meet the specific needs of the population is considered a **major beneficial effect** of the Proposed Development given its strategic scale.

Educational Capacity

5.4.24 The Proposed Development and baseline developments will generate additional school aged children, and will therefore have implications for local education provision. It is difficult to accurately estimate the number of children that will occupy these dwellings. This is because some children will arrive as migrants to the settlement, whilst others will move to the site from other existing nearby residential areas, although these will often be replaced by other families with school aged children in the vacated properties.

5.4.25 The Applicant and the Council have agreed that Heyford Park developments are likely to generate a need for 1.5FE of primary and secondary educational provision (in addition to the existing proposals). Such provision is included in the Proposed Development.

5.4.26 The Proposed Development makes educational provision to respond to the identified needs of the wider Heyford Park. As students currently travel out of Heyford Park to meet their educational needs, such provision is likely to impact the broader area. The Proposed Development is therefore considered to provide a **moderate beneficial effect**.

Healthcare Provision

5.4.27 With the anticipated increase in population of up to 4,436 people (although some of these will already live within the locality) the number of patients that could register at the Bicester Health Centre could increase to 19,471. This would result in an average of 1,623 patients per GP which remains below the average experienced nationally.

5.4.28 However, the proposed medical facility will maintain the existing capacity to accommodate new development at Bicester as well as limiting the travelling distance for residents of Heyford Park.

5.4.29 There may be sufficient capacity in the existing surgery although this is remote from the Proposed Development. The additional provision included in the Proposed Development provides additional flexibility to respond to needs across the broader area and meets the needs of Heyford Park on-site. This is therefore considered to provide a **moderate beneficial effect**.

Community Facilities

5.4.30 The Proposed Development will increase the population and spending power in Heyford Park to the benefit of local facilities and those in Bicester. The provision of additional housing growth will support the viability of shops and services, including leisure facilities through additional local spending. Indeed, the ONS Family Spending dataset identifies that the average household spent £657.50 per week in the South East in the financial years 2016-18. This would indicate that the 1,685 households (who would be expected to be accommodated in the 1,753 dwellings) in the Proposed Development and baseline developments would spend approximately £57.6M annually. However, as noted previously only 54% of these households are likely to be new to the area and so £31.2M of this expenditure would be new to the local economy.

5.4.31 The heritage, tourism and filming offer provided by the Proposed Development will have a significant effect on the local economy. Tourists and temporary film workers will provide an extra source of income for local facilities particularly for hotels, bed and breakfasts, hostels, campsites, pubs and restaurants.

5.4.32 The Proposed Development also includes a community centre and recreational facilities.

5.4.33 The Proposed Development (in isolation of the baseline developments) is predicted to accommodate up to 3,004 people²³ (although a proportion of these will move from within the area) in addition to the existing population of Heyford Park. **Table 5.6a** applies the Green Infrastructure standards identified in Table 5.5a to this population to calculate the requirement for facilities and compares this to the identified current provision.

| Type of space | Need arising from the Proposed Development | Existing surplus (if any) | Requirement for Proposed Development | |
|----------------|--|------------------------------|--|--|
| General green | 8.23ha | +2.97ha | 5.26ha | |
| space | | | | |
| Playspace | 2.34ha | 0ha | 2.34ha | |
| Outdoor sports | 3.39ha | +2.75ha | 0.65ha | |
| provision | | | | |
| Allotments | 1.11ha | +2.06ha | 0ha | |

Table 5.6a Requirement for Green Infrastructure

5.4.34 The Proposed Development includes Green Infrastructure provision which equates to the identified standards, even where there is already a surplus of provision. This will provide the required amounts of Playspace and General Green Space but a surplus of Outdoor Sports across the ward. Provision is also made for a community orchard in response to the feedback received through consultation.

5.4.35 The Proposed Development will provide Green Infrastructure in accordance with the identified standards which will result in a surplus of some forms of provision across the ward. It will also generate a significant increase in expenditure which will support services across the broader area and it will provide a unique heritage/tourism facility and film-making facilities with the potential to boost the economy of the sub-region. The Proposed Development is therefore considered to have a **major beneficial effect**.

 $^{^{23}}$ 1,175 dwellings x 2.49 + 78 in close care

<u>Economy</u>

5.4.36 The Proposed Development and baseline developments will support local jobs in the construction sector as identified previously. Some of these are likely to persist following the construction phase, in developments elsewhere. There will also be maintenance and service jobs associated with the Proposed Development once this is complete.

5.4.37 The Proposed Development will also accommodate jobs on the employment land, and in the Employment Area/Creative City, the Filming Area, the Heritage/Visitor facilities, the new educational buildings, the close care units, the medical centre and the retail units.

5.4.38 The Proposed Development includes new build, demolitions and changes of use. In net terms, this provides for an additional $7,877m^2$ of B1a floorspace, $20,145m^2$ of B1b/c floorspace, $8,574m^2$ of B2 floorspace, and $40m^2$ of B8 floorspace.

5.4.39 The Employment Density Guide²⁴ identifies the average floorspace per employee ranges for these different uses classes. From this and a number of other sources (see below) the likely number of workers employed at the Proposed Development can be estimated, as follows:

- The close care units are likely to provide some employment on-site but the numbers will be dependent upon the way in which the care and any ancillary support is operated. In light of this uncertainty it is assumed that the number of workers will be minimal in order to provide a cautious assessment.
- The NHS Confederation publish statistics which indicate that in 2017 there were 124,593 members of staff employed in 7,454 GP surgeries. From this it can be estimated that the new medical centre would be expected to accommodate 17 workers.
- The 929m² of gross external retail floorspace proposed would equate to circa 794m² of net internal floorspace²⁵. This would be expected to accommodate circa 40 to 53 workers.
- For B1a uses, 7,877m² of gross external floorspace would typically provide for circa 6,173m² of net internal floorspace²⁶. The Employment Density Guide identifies an average of 8m² to 13m² per worker in this sector. The B1a floorspace would therefore be expected to accommodate circa 475 to 772 workers.
- For B1b/c uses, 20,145m² of gross external floorspace would be expected to provide 15,789m² of net internal floorspace²⁷. With an average of between 40m² and 60m² per worker, this floorspace would accommodate circa 263 to 395 workers.
- For B2 uses, 8,577m² of gross external floorspace would provide 8,145m2 of gross internal floorspace²⁸. This would accommodate circa 226 workers based on the average of 36m² per worker.
- For B8 uses, 40m² of floorspace would be expected to accommodate between 1 and 3 workers.

²⁷ Ibid

²⁴ November 2015, Employment Density Guide, Homes and Communities Agency

²⁵ Based on a net to gross conversion factor of 10% and a gross internal to gross external conversion factor of 5% taken from the Employment Density Guide

²⁶ Based on a net to gross conversion factor of 17.5% and a gross internal to gross external conversion factor of 5% taken from the Employment Density Guide

 $^{^{\}rm 28}$ Based on a gross internal to gross external conversion factor of 5% taken from the Employment Density Guide

5.Socio-Economic Issues

- The number of employees at the energy facility will be dependent upon the precise nature of the facility and it is at present impossible to identify an accurate estimate. However, by way of example, Combined Heat and Power facilities tend to accommodate circa 30-40 FTEs.
- The Filming Area includes buildings which are intended to be changed for filming uses. The number of people employed in these buildings is likely to be minimal except during filming sessions. Therefore, in order to provide a conservative assessment, it is assumed that no employees are accommodated in these buildings for the purposes of this assessment. However, during filming there is the potential for a significant number of employees. Indeed, according to a study by Stephen Follows (Film Data and Education) an average film credits 588 people.
- The jobs likely to be generated across the remainder of the heritage/tourism offer is difficult to estimate as this will depend upon the precise size and uses of individual buildings. However, the number is likely to be relatively small and so again for the purposes of this assessment it is assumed to be zero in order to be conservative.
- According to the 2015 School Workforce Census there were an average of 46 workers per school which could be employed on the new school site.
- The extension to the existing Heyford Park Free School is also likely to generate an additional workforce, although this will depend upon the operational arrangements of that school. In light of this uncertainty it is assumed that the number of workers will be minimal in order to provide a cautious assessment.

5.4.40 This analysis suggests that the Proposed Development will generate a minimum of 1,183 to 1,637 jobs in addition to those generated in the construction phase, although this is likely to be significantly greater while filming is in progress.

5.4.41 The Proposed Development (in isolation) is estimated to accommodate between 613 and 1,129²⁹ households that are new to the area within the 1,175 dwellings. In 2011, the Census identified that there was an average of 1.38 economically active persons per household in Cherwell which would suggest that between 845 and 1,559 economically active persons would be expected in the Proposed Development. The Annual Population Survey shows that around 95.5% of the economically active population in Cherwell were in employment from April 2016 to March 2017. It is therefore estimated that the Proposed Development would accommodate circa 807 to 1,488 workers once the site is fully built and occupied.

5.4.42 The Proposed Development is likely to accommodate more jobs than workers, which will help to address the current net out-commuting flows experienced within the District.

5.4.43 There will be additional jobs accommodated in the baseline developments. The socio-economic assessment prepared in support of the planning application for the original new settlement anticipated that it would accommodate 1,148 jobs and the Village Centre South will also accommodate a not insignificant number of jobs at the hotel, bar/brasseries and market. Therefore, as a minimum it is likely that the Proposed Development and baseline developments will accommodate in excess of 2,300 to 2,800 jobs.

5.4.44 Using the rates identified in paragraph 5.4.41 above, the Proposed Development and baseline developments would be expected to accommodate 1,383 to 2,550 workers. This would suggest that in combination, the propensity to commute is likely to decrease.

²⁹ Based on the average number of households per dwelling identified in the 2011 Census

5.Socio-Economic Issues

5.4.45 The additional jobs arising from the Proposed Development are considered to provide a **major beneficial effect** given the scale of the Proposed Development.

5.5 MITIGATION AND ENHANCEMENT

Mitigation by Design

5.5.1 No negative effects have been identified and so there is no requirement for mitigation.

Additional Mitigation

5.5.2 No negative effects have been identified and so there is no requirement for additional mitigation.

Enhancements

5.5.3 Without mitigation being proposed, there will be no enhancements arising from such mitigation.

5.6 CUMULATIVE AND IN-COMBINATION EFFECTS

5.6.1 The cumulative effects of related developments are considered in order to establish whether the Proposed Development would, in combination with other local developments contribute to socio-economic effects which may need to be mitigated. The related development which are considered are as follows:

- Village Centre North, Heyford 278.7m² convenience store, 5 A1 units (596.4m²), B1 uses (85.6m²) and 30 residential units;
- Pye Homes, Upper Heyford 79 new dwellings;
- Land south west of Camp Road, Heyford 296 new dwellings;
- Parcel 15, Heyford Park Masterplan remainder of the Policy Villages 5 allocation with the capacity for 49 new dwellings.

5.6.2 The other related developments considered in other Chapters of this ES are remote from Heyford and so are not considered likely to have direct socio-economic effects in most regards. Where these other related developments are considered to have direct socio-economic effects these are identified.

5.6.3 The Proposed Development and baseline developments provide up to 1,753 dwellings, and the related developments in combination could provide an additional 455 dwellings, resulting in a maximum potential of 2,208 dwellings. These developments in combination also provide community facilities, retail floorspace and employment floorspace.

Population

5.6.4 The Proposed Development and any combination of the related developments would accommodate an increased population. Using the number of persons per dwelling identified in the Developer Contributions SPD the Proposed Development and related developments would accommodate a maximum of an additional 5,498 people (excluding the close care units).

5.6.5 Many of these people will relocate from elsewhere within Cherwell and based on the rates assumed in paragraph 5.4.15 it is likely that only 2,983 of these people would be new to the local population.

5.Socio-Economic Issues

5.6.6 The remainder would migrate from elsewhere within Oxfordshire, the UK and overseas. These migrants typically have a younger age profile and will thereby alleviate the ageing of the population that is anticipated.

5.6.7 In addition to these, there are the 71 additional people which would be expected to be accommodated as a result of the close care units. This means that in total the Proposed Development, baseline developments and related developments could accommodate between 3,054 and 5,569 people.

5.6.8 The younger population will support the local economy and is considered a **minor beneficial effect**.

<u>Deprivation</u>

5.6.9 The LSOA within which the Proposed Development and related developments are located have low levels of overall deprivation although suffer from deprivation in relation to barriers to housing and services. The Proposed Development and related developments will deliver housing and services, and will thereby address this deprivation. Given that the deprivation applies to a very small area (i.e. the LSOA), the Proposed Development is considered to have a **minor beneficial effect**.

<u>Housing</u>

5.6.10 The housing within the Proposed Development and related developments in combination will contribute to the existing and newly arising need for affordable and market homes. This will also contribute to alleviating house price rises and provides the opportunity to deliver housing that is appropriate to the specific needs of the area. The Proposed Development and the related developments are strategic in scale and are therefore considered to provide a **major beneficial effect**.

Educational Capacity

5.6.11 As identified above, the Council has assessed the educational needs for Heyford Park to be 1.5FE of primary capacity and 1.5FE of secondary capacity. These educational requirements are provided for as part of the Proposed Development to address the needs across the related developments.

5.6.12 The Proposed Development and related developments are therefore considered to provide a **moderate beneficial effect** on educational capacity, as they provide greater choice and flexibility in the educational options available to the residents of Cherwell.

Healthcare Provision

5.6.13 The other related developments are located in Bicester and so would also impact the current healthcare services upon which the Proposed Development would rely in the absence of any alternative provision.

5.6.14 Within Bicester there are three medical groups which have a total 50,669 patients registered with 40 GPs. This provides an average of 1,267 patients per GP, significantly below the national average of 2,087 patients per GP.

5.6.15 The Proposed Development, related developments and other related developments³⁰ would provide a total of 7,236 dwellings which could accommodate a maximum of 18,018 people. As identified above, an additional 71 people are anticipated to arise from the proposed close care units providing a maximum of 18,089 people.

³⁰At North West Bicester, Land at Whitelands Farm, Network Bicester and Bicester Gateway.

5.Socio-Economic Issues

5.6.16 In addition to the existing patients, this could provide for a maximum of 68,758 patients arising from the Proposed and related developments. Based on the current number of GPs, this would still provide an average of 1,719 patients per GP which is below the average of 2,087 experienced nationally.

5.6.17 The Proposed Development, related developments and other related developments also make provision for additional healthcare services, including a medical centre at the Proposed Development and a health village including a GP surgery and community hospital at Land at Whitelands Farm.

5.6.18 This would indicate that the existing medical facilities may be able to accommodate the population within these developments. However, the Proposed and related developments will also provide additional capacity, including at Heyford Park which will be in much closer proximity to the population of the Proposed Development.

5.6.19 The Proposed Development and related developments are therefore considered to provide a **moderate beneficial effect** on healthcare provision.

Community Facilities

5.6.20 The Proposed Development and related developments will accommodate an additional population of up to 5,498 people in 2,122 households (excluding those in the close care units). These people will provide an additional disposable income as well as a potential critical mass to support the viability of existing and potential future retail and leisure facilities. The disposable income is estimated to be £72.6M per annum of which £39.2M is likely to be new to the area based on the rates identified in paragraph 5.4.30.

5.6.21 The Proposed Development and related developments include local centres, retail units and other services (including the mixed use area within the Proposed Development, and the Village Centre North). These facilities are designed to meet the needs of the new populations and would be designed so that they do not compete with existing facilities.

5.6.22 The additional housing at the Proposed Development and related developments would generate a need for open space, sports and recreation. Each of these developments is expected to provide either on-site facilities or financial contributions towards off-site provision to address the need arising from each development.

5.6.23 The Proposed Development also provides a heritage/tourism offer which will provide opportunities for the region.

5.6.24 The provision of additional disposable income to support the viability of services and the provision of local centres as well as open space facilities that either meet or exceed the identified standards, in addition to the tourism/heritage offer is considered a **major beneficial effect**.

<u>Economy</u>

5.6.25 The related developments provide the opportunity for a number of jobs including at the Village Centre North.

5.6.26 The 85.6m² gross internal floorspace of B1 uses at the Village Centre North would be expected to accommodate 6 to 8 jobs³¹, the convenience retail store of $278.7m^2$ would be expected to accommodate 11 to 16 jobs³² and the other retail units of 596.4m²

 $^{^{31}\}text{Based}$ on a gross to net conversion factor of 5% and 10-13m² per worker from the Employment Densities Guide.

 $^{^{32}\}text{Based}$ on a gross to net conversion factor of 15-20% and 15-20m² per worker from the Employment Densities Guide.

would be expected to accommodate 24 to 34 $jobs^{33}$. This provides a total of 41 to 58 jobs.

5.6.27 As identified above, the Proposed Development is expected to accommodate in excess of 2,300 to 2,800 jobs. Therefore, it is likely that the Proposed Development and related developments will accommodate in excess of between 2,341 and 2,858 jobs.

5.6.28 Based on the rates identified in paragraph 5.4.41, the Proposed Development and the related developments could accommodate an additional 1,695 to 3,126 workers.

5.6.29 It is therefore likely that the Proposed Developments and related developments will maintain the propensity to commute as they provide for a broadly balanced level of workers and jobs.

5.6.30 The Proposed Development and related developments are considered to provide a **major beneficial effect** to the economy by providing a significant number of additional jobs.

5.7 SUMMARY

Introduction

5.7.1 This chapter considers the potential socio-economic effects of the Proposed Development (and baseline developments) during both the construction and operational phases. The analysis focuses on the provision of social and economic effects of the Proposed Development.

5.7.2 There are a wide range of socio-economic issues that exist and which will be affected by the Proposed Development.

5.7.3 There is no specific guidance available which establishes a methodology for undertaking an EIA of the socio-economic effects of a proposed development. Accordingly, the approach adopted for this assessment is based on professional experience and best practice, and in consideration of the policy requirement/tests set out within the National Planning Policy Framework, and the extant and emerging development plan.

5.7.4 It considers the future baseline position rather than the current baseline position. This ensures that the potential effects are considered relative to the position that is likely to arise should the Proposed Development not occur.

Baseline Conditions

5.7.5 Cherwell is expected to experience population growth. It is expected to see the population age in accordance with national trends.

5.7.6 The LSOA which contains the Application Site currently experiences deprivation in regards to access to housing and services, but little deprivation in other domains.

5.7.7 Heyford Park is planned to accommodate significant levels of housing development during the plan period. The Proposed Development is expected to provide a significant component of this supply.

 $^{^{\}rm 33}\textsc{Based}$ on a gross to net conversion factor of 15-20% and 15-20m² per worker from the Employment Densities Guide.

5.7.8 There is currently sufficient educational capacity to serve the existing community within the Heyford Park Free School.

5.7.9 There are a greater number of GPs per patient within 5 miles of the Proposed Development than experienced on average across the nation, although these are somewhat remote from the Proposed Development. Indeed, the nearest healthcare facilities are located in Bicester.

5.7.10 Cherwell experiences net out-commuting, as there are fewer jobs in the district than workers.

Likely Significant Effects

5.7.11 The key socio-economic effects can be summarised as follows:

- Provision of 422 additional jobs during the construction phase of the Proposed Development alone;
- Accommodation for a population of circa 4,436 people in the Proposed Development and baseline developments, of which 2439 are estimated to be new to the area;
- A positive effect on the age of the population;
- New houses and services within the area to address the existing deprivation;
- Provision of planned housing (including affordable housing) of a range of types, sizes and tenures to meet local and district-wide housing needs;
- Provision of a new educational building and the extension of the existing school to provide the necessary accommodation for the entirety of Heyford Park which will free up existing capacity in schools across the broader area;
- Provision of a new medical centre which will address the healthcare needs of the community within Heyford Park thereby reducing the need to travel to Bicester, and providing additional capacity across the broader area;
- An additional £57.6M of gross income, of which £31.2M is likely to be new to the area, which will support local services;
- An increase in the tourist economy;
- A positive effect on the provision of open space, with the standards being exceeded or met;
- Accommodation for 1,183 to 1,637 jobs during the operational phase of the Proposed Development alone (depending upon the precise uses of the employment land).

Mitigation and Enhancement

5.7.12 No mitigation has been identified in socio-economic terms given that the Proposed Development provides for beneficial effects. However, if mitigation is required it is considered likely that this can be addressed through appropriate financial contributions towards off-site provision.

Cumulative and In-combination Effects

5.7.13 The key socio-economic effects of the Proposed Development considered in combination with the related developments are as follows:

- Accommodation for a population of circa 5,569 people in the Proposed Development, baseline developments and related developments, of which 3,054 are estimated to be new to the area;
- A positive effect on the age of the population;
- New houses and services within the area to address the existing deprivation;
- Provision of planned housing (including affordable housing) of a range of types, sizes and tenures to meet local and district-wide housing needs;

5.Socio-Economic Issues

- Provision of a new educational building and the extension of the existing school to provide the necessary accommodation for the entirety of Heyford Park which will free up existing capacity in schools across the broader area;
- Provision of a new medical centre which will address the healthcare needs of the community within Heyford Park thereby reducing the need to travel to Bicester, and providing additional capacity across the broader area;
- An additional £39.2M of gross income new to the area, which will support local services;
- An increase in the tourist economy;
- A positive effect on the provision of open space, with the standards being exceeded or met;
- Accommodation for 2,341 to 2,858 jobs during the operational phase of the Proposed Development, baseline developments and related developments.

Conclusion

5.7.14 Overall the Proposed Development (alone and in-combination) is considered to provide beneficial effects and will contribute to the housing and employment needs of the district as well as providing a new heritage offer and a film-making facility, both of which provide potentially significant economic benefits.

5.7.15 **Table 5.7** provides a summary of effects, mitigation and residual effects.

| Environmental Effect | Sensitivity of Receptor | Impact Magnitude | Nature of Impact | Significance | Mitigation / Enhancement | Geographical Importance | Residual Effects |
|-------------------------|-------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|------------------------|
| CONSTRUCTION | | | | | | | |
| Housing | N/A | N/A | Temporary | Major Beneficial | N/A | District | Major Beneficial |
| Economy | N/A | N/A | Temporary | Major Beneficial | N/A | District | Major Beneficial |
| OPERATION | | | | · | | | |
| Population | N/A | N/A | Temporary | Minor Beneficial | N/A | Local | Minor Beneficial |
| Deprivation | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Minor Beneficial | N/A | Local | Minor Beneficial |
| Housing | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Major Beneficial | N/A | District | Major Beneficial |
| Educational Capacity | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Moderate Beneficial | N/A | Local (with wider impacts) | Moderate Beneficial |
| Healthcare Provision | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Moderate Beneficial | N/A | Local (with wider impacts) | Moderate Beneficial |
| Community Facilities | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Major Beneficial | N/A | Sub-regional | Major Beneficial |
| Economy | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Major Beneficial | N/A | Sub-regional | Major Beneficial |
| CUMULATIVE AND I | N-COMBINAT | ION | | | | | |
| Population | N/A | N/A | Temporary | Minor Beneficial | N/A | Local | Minor Beneficial |
| Deprivation | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Minor Beneficial | N/A | Local | Minor Beneficial |
| Housing | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Major Beneficial | N/A | District | Major Beneficial |
| Educational Capacity | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Moderate Beneficial | N/A | Local (with wider impacts) | Moderate Beneficial |
| Healthcare Provision | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Moderate Beneficial | N/A | Local (with wider impacts) | Moderate Beneficial |
| Community Facilities | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Major Beneficial | N/A | Sub-regional | Major Beneficial |
| Economy | N/A | N/A | Permanent | Major Beneficial | N/A | Sub-regional | Major Beneficial |

Table 5.7a Residual Significance of Effects Assessment