

## Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

2012 Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013) with minor updates

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards       | Corylus Ltd   | Paragraph                          | Forward                            | Forward                             | Supports recognition of need for limiting housing growth while enabling growth in locations where integration with existing communities is possible.  |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell       | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group                                | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Summary                             | Supports the extended Plan period to 2031.  |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers      | Wendlebury Parish Council                                       | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | The LP contradicts the aim to strictly control development in open countryside by proposing a Bicester Relief Road that cuts across open countryside.   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3                        | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | The forward and summary discussing housing delivery should be revised in order to consider the John Harmon Report.  |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne      | CPRE Bicester District  | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | Support overall vision, strategy and objectives. Support strongly controlling development in the open countryside. Concern at the level of growth allocated at Bicester, reliance of the South East RSS housing targets and traditional 'predict and provide' approach. |
| 67         | Gemma      | Care          | Barton Willmore / Bovis Homes                                   | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | Supported.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | Amendment proposed to Vision.   |
| 112        | Keith      | Dixon         | Launton Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | Supports the vision and strategy  |
| 112        | Keith      | Dixon         | Launton Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | The vision and strategy should mention preserving the District  |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards       | Corylus Ltd   | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | Supports directing growth to the urban centres  |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards       | Corylus Ltd   | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | Supports control of growth in the open countryside  |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards       | Corylus Ltd   | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | Supports the recognition of the importance of maintaining local identity  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | 'Aiming to' is incompatible with 'strictly control' and it should be removed.   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                              | 'Aiming to' is incompatible with 'strictly control' and it should be removed.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)       | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                                    | It would have been helpful if the Neighbourhoods DPD were submitted with the Draft Local Plan. There is confusion in using Neighbourhood Development Plan reference in the NPPF it could be interpreted as plans drawn by Neighbourhoods not LPA's. There is a need for clarification. |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                                    | The figure to take into account for table 5 should be 13th December 2004, the date CDC created the Non statutory Local Plan 2011.  |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society   | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                                    | Vision should make reference to historic environment, old buildings and Canal.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Archaeology   | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                                    | Should refer to Historic Environment. List as challenge and objectives.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport                                    | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Vision                                    | OCC Countryside Access Team support vision. Rural economy, high quality of life, and social and physical infrastructure - green infrastructure. Public rights of way network. Support focus of growth at Banbury & Bicester. LTP2 objectives used instead of LTP3 objectives.          |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP                            | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Developing a Sustainable Local Economy    | Object to balance of employment growth between Bicester & Banbury. Further employment opportunities required at Banbury.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Table                              | Table 1                            | Proposed Strategic Employment Allocations | Table 1 should make reference to Oxford Technology Park.   |
| 190        | Nik        | Lyzba         | JPPC / Oxford University Press                                  | Table                              | Table 1                            | Proposed Strategic Employment Allocation  | The employment allocation at Kidlington should be a Strategic Employment Allocation and noted in Table 1.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport                                    | Table                              | Table 1                            | Proposed Strategic Employment Allocations | Job provision for North West Bicester should be approx 1,794 to match new housing target.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                      | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP      | Paragraph                          | Executive Summary                  | Building Sustainable Communities   | Object to balance of growth between Bicester & Banbury. Banbury is identified as a Primary Regional Centre in the South East RSS. 41% of jobs are at Banbury opposed to 20% at Bicester. Bicester has expanded seven times compared to Banbury which has doubled since 1951. Banbury is more self contained.  |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell       | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group          | Table                              | Table 3                            | Proposed Overall Development Strategy in the District                    | The Policy refers to Upper Heyford as the rest of the District which is inaccurate as it should be recognised as a significant brownfield site separately within the settlement hierarchy   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3  | Table                              | Table 3                            | Proposed Overall Development Strategy in the District                    | Support.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP      | Table                              | Table 4                            | Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031 | Insufficient evidence to justify 1,050 allocation at Banbury Canalside and its delivery in Plan period.   |
| 189        | David      | Locke         | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates | Table                              | Table 4                            | Proposed Strategic Housing Sites in Bicester and Banbury 2011 - 2031     | Concern at the delivery of Canalside site, land assembly, design and capacity, viability. Cooperation amongst large number of land owners. High density target does not reflect market conditions for flats. Poor market conditions. Expensive relocation costs. Land at Wykham Farm should be included within the table with a development capacity of approximately 100 dwg. Site will improve housing land supply. Site is in single ownership. Site is capable of early delivery. Design and Access Statement attached. |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3  | Table                              | Table 4                            | Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031 | Support in relation to Hanwell Fields.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                 | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Table                              | Table 5                            | Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas          | Remove Kidlington from group 3 and create its own group.  |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council  | Table                              | Table 5                            | Distribution of Housing in Rural Areas              | When will village housing allocation be made known?. Delays in this will delay proposals and implementation of the Local Plan.  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3   | Table                              | Table 6                            | Affordable Housing Policy as set out in Policy BSC3 | Object to 30% affordable housing - inflexible - should be subject to viability  |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council  | Table                              | Table 6                            | Affordable Housing Policy as set out in Policy BSC3 | In table 6 reduce Kidlington Affordable Housing Threshold to 3 homes.   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3   | Table                              | Table 7                            | Supporting Strategic Policies                       | Support objectives. Should have due regard to viability.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | 1.3                                | How the Local Plan has been Prepared                | Incomplete evidence base - Banbury Masterplan, movement assessment & landscape analysis.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister    | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | 1.3                                | Introduction to the Local Plan                      | The Local Plan is not supported by required Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity study at Banbury or Movement Assessment for the town and Viability Assessment of the Canalside development. Proposals for a major employment allocation on the eastside of the M40 at Banbury are not available for the consultation. Plan post dates the evidence base. |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | 1.6                                | Introduction to the Local Plan                      | Critical challenges should be expanded - 2nd bullet point should ensure development is delivered in the most appropriate locations, 3rd bullet point should be deleted, new bullet point should reflect low carbon economy, new bullet point should ensure sufficient flexibility to allow for changes.   |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers      | Wendlebury Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | 1.13                               | Introduction to the Local Plan                      | The proposed relief road will destroy the quality rural and natural environment that Wendlebury currently enjoys. There appears to be no clear boundary to limit growth of Bicester along the A 41 towards Junction 9 of M40.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                     | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | 1.13                               | Introduction to the Local Plan                          | Object to bullet point seven - green buffer policy unjustified.  |
| 377        | Richard    | Foot          | GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village)  | Paragraph                          | 1.13                               | Introduction to the Local Plan                          | Support statement - major employer .   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park  | Paragraph                          | 1.21                               | The Planning Context for the Local Plan                 | Support reference to RSS.  |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Appendix                           | Appendix 1                         | Background to Cherwell's Places                         | Para 1.23 - Population of just under 15,000  |
| 40         | Geoff      | Bolton        | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd  | Para                               | 1.35-1.40                          | How the Local Plan has been Prepared                    | The Council has failed to undertake a proper assessment of the reasonable alternative options for major development at Banbury. The Local Plan seeks to provide a significant change in the number of dwellings over the plan period and should have triggered a further Options for Growth consultation. The Council failed to assess Land at Broughton Road as a separate site. The emerging Masterplan presents an opportunity to undertake detailed assessment of potential development sites as it has been the case with Bicester . The Local Plan should not proceed without the publication of the Banbury Masterplan. |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister    | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | 1.37                               | How the local Plan has been Prepared                    | See comment 1.3  |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Paragraph                          | 1.52                               | Other Policy Links and Additional Local Policy Guidance | Add Kidlington Masterplan  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | 1.52                               | Other Policy Links and Additional Local Policy Guidance | Additional guidance unjustified - should not add unnecessary financial burden.   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward  | Paragraph                          | 1.52                               | Other Policy Links and Additional Local Policy Guidance | Include all the lower level SPDs   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                     | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath     | Kidlington Parish Council                                       | Paragraph                          | 1.52                               | Other policy Links and Additional Local Policy Guidance | Support Kidlington Masterplan.   |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams    | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors            | Paragraph                          | 1.52                               | Other Policy Links and additional Local Policy Guidance | Support Banbury Masterplan - would like to see retail capacity figures within the Local Plan.  |
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton    | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors              | Paragraph                          | 1.53                               | What does the Plan do?                                  | Details of how the relevant town centre allocations can contribute towards retail capacity is required in order to provide certainty to communities and developers re what can be developed and where. |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council                                       | Paragraph                          | 1.53                               | What does the Plan do?                                  | No green buffer proposed to protect Wendlebury from the proposed development.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | 1.53                               | What does the Plan do?                                  | Para 1.53 should make reference to Oxford Technology Park.   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP                            | Paragraph                          | 1.53                               | What does the Plan do?                                  | New bullet point required to address provision of housing need. Bullet point 9 refers to green buffers to prevent coalescence, this is unjustified   |
| 318        | Chris      | Wardley     | The Inland Waterways Association                                | Paragraph                          | 1.53                               | What does the Plan do?                                  | Should protect and 'enhance' the Oxford Canal and 'take advantage of its potential'  |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams    | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors            | Paragraph                          | 1.53                               | What does the Plan do?                                  | Para 1.53 2nd bullet point - include retail capacity figures within the Local Plan   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP                            | Paragraph                          | 1.54                               | What does the Plan do?                                  | Various elements of the Plan are undeliverable - e.g. Canalside  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)    | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 6          | Tom        | Ashley        | Turnberry Planning Ltd / Merton College  | Section                            | A Strategy for Development         | A Strategy for Development             | Oxford has an acute housing need and this will need to met elsewhere as the urban extension to the south of the city has not gone ahead. The Inspector at the SODC examination stated that it would not be appropriate for South Oxfordshire to undertake a green belt review in order to accommodate this. The inspector has recommended the following be included in the SODC Plan. ' Any provision of a strategic development area on the scale identified in the South East Plan would require joint work and sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternative options involving a number of Districts boarding the City. The current adopted Oxford Core Strategy makes no reference to any wider growth needs beyond the City boundaries. However, if it became necessary to address the matter on an inter-authority basis the established County/District mechanisms provide a means of pursuing the duty to cooperate'. |
| 6          | Tom        | Ashley        | Turnberry Planning Ltd / Merton College  | Section                            | A Strategy for Development         | A Strategy for Development             | There should be an inter-authority mechanism for identifying the scale of that unmet need and investigating appropriate locations for accommodating that housing, including undertaking a robust Strategic environmental assessment  |
| 6          | Tom        | Ashley        | Turnberry Planning Ltd / Merton College  | Section                            | A Strategy for Development         | A Strategy for Development             | The Cherwell Local Plan should include an undertaking to engage in such a process to the benefit of all the County as means of pursuing the duty to cooperate. (wording is suggested)  |
| 38         | Rachael    | Blakey        | Bucknell Parish Council                  | Section                            | A Strategy for Development         | A Strategy for Development             | Supports the approach to protecting the character of villages.   |
| 133        | Theresa    | Goss          | Milcombe Parish Council                  | Theme                              | Theme A                            | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | Agree developing a sustainable local economy but as sites are mainly in the Bicester Area, the comments of Bicester residents would be most relevant.  |
| 133        | Theresa    | Goss          | Milcombe Parish Council                  | Theme                              | Theme A                            | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | Definite need for town centre improvements - filling the already empty shops in Banbury and Bicester town centres should be a priority.  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Section                            | A.1                                | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | Support challenges and objectives. Concerned raised regarding the viability of the Plan.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)     | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)    | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|--|--|--|
| 150        | Tim        | Hibbert     |  | Section                            | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | No consideration has been given to how development at Bicester would protect Wendlebury  |
| 150        | Tim        | Hibbert     |  | Section                            | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | Objects as the plan will involve building on productive farmland   |
| 150        | Tim        | Hibbert     |  | Section                            | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | The focus on Banbury and Bicester is a significant flaw  |
| 150        | Tim        | Hibbert     |  | Section                            | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | The needs of rural communities have not been addressed   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council                           | Section                            | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | With no Structure Plan who will be responsible for distributing development across Oxfordshire   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council                           | Section                            | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | When the South East Plan is revoked who will be responsible for determining the overall balance between employment, transport over the region  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council                           | Section                            | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | Announcements from Westminster about the planning system and reforms to the Green Belt will undermine the Local Plan.  |
| 54         | Phil       | Brown       | Savills for Magdalen Development Company / Kennet Properties Ltd | Paragraph                          | A.3                                    | A Strategy for Development in Cherwell | Plan should include a commitment to joint working with Oxford City Council and the other Oxfordshire authorities in relation to future housing need. Wording supplied.   |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | A.8                                    | Our Vision for Cherwell District       | The proposed Relief Road will dramatically reduce the quality of life for residents of Wendlebury, it will create a 4th physical barrier to the village boxing it completely. Wendlebury will be cut off from direct access to the countryside, increasing noise, air pollution and reducing the attraction of the village to incomers. Horse riding from the village supports local business and will be effectively stopped. |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council   | Paragraph                          | A8-A9                                  | Our Vision for Cherwell District       | Agree with the vision for Cherwell   |
| 7          | Vicky      | Aston       |  | Paragraph                          | A.9                                    | Our Vision for Cherwell District       | Support Vision for Cherwell where it relates to Health. Suggest the word sport is added to bullet point 7 and amended to read 'Where and When'.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)        | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council              | Paragraph                          | A.9                                | Our Vision for Cherwell District           | The proposed relief road is not sustainable as it does not cherish, enhance or protect the natural environment.   |
| 126        | Rose       | Freeman     | The Theatres Trust                     | Paragraph                          | A.9                                | Our Vision for Cherwell District           | Para A.9 Bullet point 2 states that the cultural and social hubs of town centres will be maintained and improved including a vibrant evening economy. This aim is not reflected in Policy SLE2. |
| 246        | Jonathan   | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land       | Paragraph                          | A.9                                | Our Vision for Cherwell District           | Support Vision in respect of supporting a stronger, sustainable and rural economy and seek to offer all communities a range of good housing.  |
| 248        | Jonathan   | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land       | Paragraph                          | A.9                                | Our Vision for Cherwell District           | Support Vision in respect of supporting a stronger, sustainable and rural economy and seek to offer all communities a range of good housing.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Paragraph                          | A.9                                | Our Vision for Cherwell District           | Should clarify the transport objectives will be supported by OCC.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                       | Paragraph                          | A.9                                | Our Vision for Cherwell District           | The 8th bullet point should say: 'We will cherish, protect and enhance our distinctive natural and built environment and our rich historic heritage. Cherwell will...'                          |
| 293        | Oliver     | Taylor      | Framptons / The Banbury AAT Academy    | Paragraph                          | A.9                                | Our Vision for Cherwell District           | Support bullet point seven.   |
| 294        | Oliver     | Taylor      | Framptons / Mintondale Development Ltd | Paragraph                          | A.9                                | Our Vision for Cherwell District           | Support.  |
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney     | BioRegional Development Group          | Paragraph                          | A.9                                | Our Vision for Cherwell District           | Sustainable Development is not clearly expressed in the vision and strategic objectives. Wording supplied.  |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)       | Paragraph                          | A.10                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Broadly support strategy. Plan shouldn't dis-regard rural areas. Approach supported by SO6, 8, 9 & 14.  |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones       | Boyer Planning                         | Paragraph                          | A.10                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Support Strategic Objectives SO6-10.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)        | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                                    | Paragraph                          | A.10                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Should clarify economic development at London Oxford Airport refers to Langford Lane Technology Park.   |
| 286        | Emily      | Sparrow     | JPPC / Merton College   | Paragraph                          | A.10                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Support overall Strategy.   |
| 293        | Oliver     | Taylor      | Framptons / The Banbury AAT Academy                             | Paragraph                          | A.10                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Support.  |
| 294        | Oliver     | Taylor      | Framptons / Mintondale Development Ltd                          | Paragraph                          | A.10                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Support.  |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd                         | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | The rural areas should continue to grow. Affordability and a lack of new dwellings means that people are being forced to converge on the two main towns. The strategy should allow more development in the rural areas to sustain them. |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd                         | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Supports the broad strategy of directing development to the towns.  |
| 36         | Reuben     | Bellamy     | CALA Homes Ltd  | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Support Spatial Strategy and distribution of growth at Banbury & Bicester. In accordance with South East Plan - Policy CO1. Bicester is sustainable location.   |
| 67         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore / Bovis Homes                                   | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Supported. Ensure some growth in outlying areas.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Support A.11 & small scale review of the Green Belt to accommodate employment needs. Review should form part of the Local Plan process and not subsequent DPD given exceptional circumstances.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations                                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)        | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|----------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 112        | Keith          | Dixon       | Launton Parish Council                       | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The spatial strategy for Cherwell District | Directing development to larger villages only is not justified as it will not allow smaller villages to grow and become sustainable. Larger villages are already sustainable. The policy is inconsistent with the NPPF. |
| 178        | Andrew         | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP         | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Object to balance of growth between Bicester & Banbury.   |
| 189        | David          | Keene       | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates    | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Support Spatial Strategy and direction of growth at Banbury & Bicester. Strategy make effective use of land, existing infrastructure and is sustainable.  |
| 194        | James          | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward                  | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | State that Upper Heyford has permission for 761 houses. The Plan cannot be used to lever an increase.   |
| 246        | Jonathan       | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land             | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Broadly support spatial strategy and strategic objectives SO8, SO9 & SO14. Rural areas require sufficient housing to support new homes and provide choice.  |
| 248        | Jonathan       | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land             | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Broadly support spatial strategy and strategic objectives SO8, SO9 & SO14. Rural areas require sufficient housing to support new homes and provide choice.  |
| 254        | Mark           | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                         | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Agree with the spatial strategy and are pleased that Banbury's growth will be slower and the town will need time to deal with the expansion and improved transport links.   |
| 289        | Chris          | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                     | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Reference to Upper Heyford and 760 homes is too precise and lacks flexibility. The Spatial Strategy should include the settlement in hierarchy of settlements.  |
| 301        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |  | Paragraph                          | A.11                               | The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District | Objection to strategy as it seeks to direct growth only at the existing sustainable settlements at expense of smaller villages.   |
| 24         | Suzanne        | Bangert     | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Mr & Mrs P. Ashworth | SO                                 | Strategic Objectives               | Strategic Objectives                       | Support Strategic Objectives SO2, 7 & 9.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 96         | Philip     | Collett       | rep form  | SO                                 | Strategic Objectives               | Strategic Objectives                | Missing Objective - Plan should aim to influence National Guidance to comply with best standards and the benefits of the area.  |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | SO                                 | Strategic Objectives               | Strategic Objectives                | Support SO12 & SO13.  |
| 190        | Nik        | Lyzba         | JPPC / Oxford University Press                                  | SO                                 | Strategic Objective                | Strategic Objective                 | OUP support limited employment development at Kidlington as a strategic objective.  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell      | Bicester Town Council   | SO                                 | Strategic Objectives               | Strategic Objectives                | Support 5 Strategic objectives - developing a sustainable local economy in the Bicester Master plan - seen as complementary. Other issues for Bicester include; allotments & burial ground.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Archaeology   | SO                                 | Strategic Objectives               | Strategic Objectives                | Support wording change.   |
| 289        | Chris      | Still         | Gladman Developments Ltd  | SO                                 | Strategic Objectives               | Strategic Objectives                | Should recognise the direct and indirect employment generation and benefits of a buoyant construction industry.   |
| 293        | Oliver     | Taylor        | Framptons / The Banbury AAT Academy                             | SO                                 | Strategic Objectives               | Strategic Objectives                | Propose new Strategic Objective - wording supplied,. Support SO10.  |
| 289        | Chris      | Still         | Gladman Developments Ltd  | SO                                 | Strategic Objectives               | Strategic Objectives                | Should reference meeting the market and affordable needs of the district.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | A.14                               | Strategic Objectives                | Support para A.14 & SO1 to SO5.   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society   | Paragraph                          | A.14                               | Strategic Objectives                | Support need to improve urban centres and employment areas. This can be achieved through a mix of community, business and residential throughout the town centre. Support residential above shops. Preference for mix of uses through the town centre and not to cluster activities at Spiceball. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations                          | Paragraph                          | A.14                               | Strategic Objectives                | What is the source of population projections? What assumptions?   |
| 321        | Malcolm    | Watt          |   | Paragraph                          | A.17                               | Strategic Objectives                | Support Objectives SO6-10   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport                                    | SO                                 | SO5                                | Strategic Objectives                | Clarify term sustainable development. Define south of the District. Should link to challenges. Unclear why district is ranked poorly in respect of access to services.  |
| 295        | Oliver     | Taylor        | Framptons / Banbury Golf Club                                   | SO                                 | SO5                                | Strategic Objectives                | Support SO5.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                        | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                                      | Paragraph                          | A.21                               | Strategic Objectives                | Concern that population of Kidlington is falling.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP | Paragraph                          | A.21                               | Strategic Objectives                | Although Cherwell is affordable in terms of Oxfordshire this is less so when compared against the rest of the South East. Paragraph to include need for all tenures of housing including market housing. |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward          | Paragraph                          | A.21                               | Strategic Objectives                | Mention the rapid rise forecast in Cherwell's elderly population. This rise is significant given their specific housing needs.   |
| 256        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council            | Paragraph                          | A.21                               | Strategic Objectives                | Population figure for Kidlington & Gosport is an underestimate.  |
| 289        | Chris      | Still         | Gladman Developments Ltd             | Paragraph                          | A.21                               | Strategic Objectives                | A.21 - bullet point 1 - Object as it does not reflect the acute affordable housing shortage. Phrase most affordable district in Oxfordshire should be deleted.   |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease         | RPS / Thames Valley Police           | Paragraph                          | A.21                               | Strategic Objectives                | Plan should identify the importance of providing social and physical infrastructure in creating sustainable communities. New bullet point suggested.   |
| 101        | Robert     | Cramp         | Congregation of Jehovah's Witnesses  | Paragraph                          | A.22                               | Strategic Objectives                | The strategic objectives for building sustainable communities should refer to places of worship in accordance with the NPPF paragraphs 22 and 126.   |
| 322        | Malcolm    | Watt          |                                      | Paragraph                          | A.22                               | Strategic Objectives                | Support Objectives S06-10  |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease         | RPS / Thames Valley Police           | Paragraph                          | A.22                               | Strategic Objectives                | SCS identifies community safety as a key consideration. Suggest as Strategic Objective text supplied.  |
| 80         | David      | Coates        | Kingerlee Homes                      | SO                                 | SO9                                | Strategic Objectives                | Concern that the Council's approach to growth will lead to an under supply of new homes and in particular rural affordable housing. Delete 'availability' and insert 'supply'.                           |
| 126        | Rose       | Freeman       | The Theatres Trust                   | SO                                 | SO10                               | Strategic Objectives                | SO10 concerns provision of accessible services and facilities for culture, social and community needs. There is no implementation policy.  |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                                      | Paragraph                          | A.25                               | Strategic Objectives                | Separate housing target would reduce in-commuting.   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP | Paragraph                          | A.25                               | Strategic Objectives                | Sustainable development means growth. Add bullet points to ensure delivery of jobs and new homes in sustainably locations and reducing the need to travel by car.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                 | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                 | Paragraph                          | A.25                               | Strategic Objectives                | Support bullet point 8.  |
| 323        | Malcolm    | Watt        |                               | Paragraph                          | A.27                               | Strategic Objectives                | Support Objectives S011-15   |
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney     | BioRegional Development Group | Paragraph                          | A.27                               | Strategic Objectives                | Sustainable Development is not clearly expressed in the vision and strategic objectives. Wording supplied.   |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council     | SO                                 | SO12                               | Strategic Objectives                | The proposal does not achieve this objective. It does not enhance the countryside, landscape and setting of the village. It will increase dependency on motor cars due to village being curtailed by the relief road in addition to existing barriers. It will make the village less sustainable by reducing the quality of the environment. It does nothing to protect and enhance the natural environment and will increase pollution in a rural area. |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council     | SO                                 | SO13                               | Strategic Objectives                | The proposal does not achieve this objective. It does not enhance the countryside, landscape and setting of the village. It will increase dependency on motor cars due to village being curtailed by the relief road in addition to existing barriers. It will make the village less sustainable by reducing the quality of the environment. It does nothing to protect and enhance the natural environment and will increase pollution in a rural area. |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council     | SO                                 | SO14                               | Strategic Objectives                | The proposal does not achieve this objective. It does not enhance the countryside, landscape and setting of the village. It will increase dependency on motor cars due to village being curtailed by the relief road in addition to existing barriers. It will make the village less sustainable by reducing the quality of the environment. It does nothing to protect and enhance the natural environment and will increase pollution in a rural area. |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council     | SO                                 | SO15                               | Strategic Objectives                | The proposal does not achieve this objective. It does not enhance the countryside, landscape and setting of the village. It will increase dependency on motor cars due to village being curtailed by the relief road in addition to existing barriers. It will make the village less sustainable by reducing the quality of the environment. It does nothing to protect and enhance the natural environment and will increase pollution in a rural area. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations                                  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                          | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|----------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 194        | James          | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward                    | SO                                 | SO 15                              | Strategic Objectives   | Add 'preserve or enhance Conservation Areas'.  |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Archaeology                              | SO                                 | SO15                               | Strategic Objectives   | Amendment supplied.  |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Ecology                                  | SO                                 | SO14                               | Strategic Objectives   | Support.   |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                   | SO                                 | SO13                               | Strategic Objectives   | Add services after accessibility   |
| 279        | Martin         | Small       | English Heritage                               | SO                                 | SO15                               | Strategic Objectives   | Welcomes and supports SO15 although archaeological remains are part of cultural heritage and do not need to be identified separately.  |
| 289        | Chris          | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                       | SO                                 | SO12                               | Strategic Objectives   | Delete reference to conserving and enhancing the countryside and landscape as not realistic. Could be changed to conserve and enhance most sensitive designations.   |
| 299        | Bruce          | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District                         | SO                                 | Strategic Objectives               | Strategic Objectives   | Support Strategic objectives 11-15.  |
| 302        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |  | SO                                 | SO12                               | Strategic Objectives   | Objection to strategy as it seeks to direct growth only at the existing sustainable settlements at expense of smaller villages. Wording suggested.   |
| 381        | Conor          | Moloney     | BioRegional Development Group                  | SO                                 | SO11-15                            | Strategic Objectives   | Sustainability - Model Policy supplied - One Planet Living   |
| 85         | Will           | Cobley      | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Blenheim Palace Estate | Theme                              | Theme 1                            | Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy          | Support principle of theme.  |
| 133        | Theresa        | Goss        | Milcombe Parish Council                        | Theme                              | Theme B                            | Policies for Development in Cherwell                         | Want to see properly built houses in keeping with their area. It is the choice of the people to live in either towns or rural villages -Keep them separately. Affordable homes in villages should be provided for the local people. Most villages have carried out surveys with ORCC to prove their needs. |
| 293        | Oliver         | Taylor      | Framptons / The Banbury AAT Academy            | Theme                              | Theme 1                            | Theme 1: Policies for developing a sustainable local economy | New Policy regarding new improved education facilities - Wording supplied.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | B.5                                | Introduction                        | Support Para B.5 - B.7.   |
| 5          | Tom        | Ashley        | Turnberry Planing Ltd / Oxford University                       | Paragraph                          | B.7                                | Introduction                        | Support reference to Begbroke Science Park.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | B.7                                | Introduction                        | Amendment suggested to B.7.   |
| 160        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Paragraph                          | B.7                                | Introduction                        | Employment Land Review sets out expansion at Kidlington for High Tech employment. Text supplied.  |
| 243        | Placi      | O'Neil-Espejo | Bicester Vision   | Paragraph                          | B.12                               | Introduction                        | Do not consider the paragraphs comments correct. WYG reported a chronic shortage of employment land in and around Bicester. The constraint in Bicester is the availability of land for a broad range of employment uses.                    |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | B.13                               | Introduction                        | Object to statement 'employment growth has been strongest in Bicester in recent years'. Evidence supplied.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP                            | Paragraph                          | B.13                               | Introduction                        | Object to balance of growth between Bicester & Banbury. Further employment needed at Banbury.   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward                                     | Paragraph                          | B.14                               | Introduction                        | Add improving the poor results of the District's secondary schools, especially in Bicester. This is where skill deficiencies start.   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP                            | Paragraph                          | B.19                               | Introduction                        | Object to balance of growth between Bicester & Banbury.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations                          | Paragraph                          | B.20                               | Introduction                        | What is the source of the district jobs forecasts? With or without additional employment land?  |
| 289        | Chris      | Still         | Gladman Developments Ltd  | Paragraph                          | B.20                               | Introduction                        | Plan should be more ambitious than to provide 7000 jobs.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | B.22                               | Introduction                        | Support themes set out in para B.22 to B.31 . Kidlington has more B1 than Bicester and ran out of employment land in 2006/2007. Oxford Technology Park should be allocated in the Local Plan as a strategic site for immediate development. |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones         | Marrons / Hallam Land Management                                | Paragraph                          | B.126                              | Introduction                        | Where appropriate housing sites will include a number of self contained extra care dwellings with the location and amount to be agreed. Wording supplied.   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | B.28                               | Introduction                        | Refer to Bicester Gateway at B.28.  |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward                                     | Paragraph                          | B.28                               | Introduction                        | The call for family housing is at odds with the Housing Needs Survey which prioritised small flats for the young and the old. The Plan should follow evidence.  |
| 378        | Richard    | Foot          | GVA / Bicester Business Park                                    | Paragraph                          | B.29                               | Introduction                        | Support growth at Bicester.   |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw      | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON)                               | Paragraph                          | B.31                               | Introduction                        | Object to expansion at Bicester Village. Delete Reference   |
| 288        | Sarah      | Stevens       |   | Paragraph                          | B.31                               | Introduction                        | Object to the proposed extension to Bicester Village without justification by the evidence base or public consultation. Suggest para B.31, B.51 & B.57 are modified to remove reference to enabling and promotion of an extension to Bicester Outlet Village.         |
| 377        | Richard    | Foot          | GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village)                           | Paragraph                          | B.31                               | Introduction                        | Support promotion of the sustainable expansion of Bicester Village.   |
| 378        | Richard    | Foot          | GVA / Bicester Business Park                                    | Paragraph                          | B.31                               | Introduction                        | Support growth at Bicester.   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP                            | Paragraph                          | B.32                               | Introduction                        | Object to balance of growth between Bicester & Banbury. Banbury is principal commercial centre, good motorway and rail access. Diverse range of town centre uses. Has achieved a sustainable balance of growth over last 30 years. Amend 'moderate' to 'significant'. |
| 5          | Tom        | Ashley        | Turnberry Planing Ltd / Oxford University                       | Paragraph                          | B.33                               | Introduction                        | Support reference to Begbroke Science Park.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | B.33                               | Introduction                        |   |
| 160        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Paragraph                          | B.33                               | Introduction                        | Paragraph should set out the scope for development at Oxford Airport.   |
| 190        | Nik        | Lyzba         | JPPC / Oxford University Press                                  | Paragraph                          | B.33                               | Introduction                        | OUP support broad thrust of Para B.33 in respect of the need for growth in the Langford Lane Area of Kidlington.  |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                                       | Paragraph                          | B.33                               | Introduction                        | Should qualify the degree of growth at London Oxford Airport within its existing boundaries.  |
| 102        | Sam        | Croft         | RPS Planning & Development / Banner Homes Ltd / Rowland Bratt   | Paragraph                          | B.34                               | Introduction                        | Re-word forth bullet point.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)  | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|
| 185        | Michael    | Lea         | Jones Land LaSalle / Bonhams 1793 Ltd                           | Paragraph                          | B.36                               | Policy SLE 1: Employment Development | Support approach to protecting, in principle, existing employment land and buildings for B class employment use.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | B.44                               | Policy SLE 1: Employment Development | Add Kidlington to para B.44.   |
| 3          | Alec       | Arrol       | Kennet Properties / Thames Water                                | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development               | The policy and supporting text do not set out the amount of employment land required to be provided during the life time of the LP and how this should be distributed across the District. The employment land trajectory in table 18 shows no land coming forward for employment in Banbury beyond 2021. This is a significant problem for the spatial strategy of Banbury. Although redevelopment of employment sites will come forward during the lifetime of the LP these are often difficult to redevelop and may come forward for alternative uses. There is already a perceived problem of the ability of existing employment land to come forward which is potentially hindering the economic development of the District.<br>There is additional need for new employment land during the lifetime of the LP within Banbury. |
| 38         | Rachael    | Blakey      | Bucknell Parish Council   | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development               | Needs to be more focus on existing employment areas which are in need of action  |
| 42         | John       | Braithwaite | South Newington Parish Council                                  | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development               | Support the policy   |
| 45         | Gemma      | Brickwood   | Turley Associates / Sainsbury                                   | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development               | Policy is not consistent with the employment objectives of the Plan and does not protect against the loss of employment sites.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development               | Object to Policy SLE1 as it should refer to Kidlington alongside Banbury & Bicester. Should define small scale employment proposals.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council  | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development               | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council  | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development               | Agree  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP                            | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development               | Approach conflicts with NPPF, as it controls types of employment.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                         | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 185        | Michael    | Lea           | Jones Land LaSalle / Bonhams 1793 Ltd | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Policy does not go far enough to support employment proposals in rural areas to enable existing businesses to expand to meet the needs of their customer base and operational requirements.  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell      | Bicester Town Council                 | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Support jobs led development. With emphasis on providing the right jobs for local people. Local Plan should have an over arching policy for Bicester that spells out Bicester is open for Business. Land allocation is insufficient to meet immediate demands. Support Bicester Masterplan view that clusters employment to the South and East as well as along the A41 corridor towards Junction 9 of the M40. Employment envelope should be extended to include Heyford and Graven Hill. |
| 219        | Peter      | Frampton      | Framptons / Mr D Mahon                | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | New Policy - To promote greater range of employment sites for existing companies to grow and provide for new company formation.  |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale         |                                       | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Employment growth at Banbury will not support proposed housing numbers resulting in traffic congestion.  |
| 243        | Placi      | O'Neil-Espejo | Bicester Vision                       | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | There should be a clear presumption against the change of use from employment to residential without qualification.  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council                  | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Generally supportive but concerned over a perceived lack of employment land, particularly if existing businesses at Canalside are relocated.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Archaeology                     | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Amend to include important non-designated assets. The phrase 'any buildings or features should be amended.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport          | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Text should reference other sustainable modes where possible.  |
| 289        | Chris      | Still         | Gladman Developments Ltd              | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Employment need should be categorised by 'B' use classes and supported by an up to date employment land review.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)        | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 296        | Robert     | Thompson    | Mr Robert Thompson (Chartered Surveyor) / Mr John Stroud | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development                     | Objection on the grounds of insufficient employment land proposed. Former Alcan site allocated for employment is now proposed for residential development and small businesses at Canalside will be affected by redevelopment. Suggest allocated land to the East of Banbury between A361 and M40 for employment. Land comprises 12 hectares. Land is no longer suitable for farming as it has become separated from other farming land by Flood embankment and the M40 & A361. Land is not subject to flooding. Land is suitable for a high quality Business Park.  |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group                  | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development                     | Plan is light on economic development; Cherwell should offer practical help to businesses, encourage farming, build infrastructure - Roads, Schools, Medical, Telcom & Regeneration.   |
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion                             | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development                     | Further analysis and explanation required to explore market conditions. Plan unclear whether one job per dwelling should be provided on-site or not. Proposal should be seen as part of the wider strategy for Bicester itself. Other areas in Bicester maybe more appropriate for employment opportunities. e.g. Graven Hill for B8. NWB maybe better suited for innovation, enterprise and small scale start up businesses. Greater working from home should be encouraged. Bicester Masterplan is the appropriate vehicle to discuss town wide issues. Note that other uses; schools, retail generate employment opportunities. |
| 368        | P          | Keywood     |  | Policy                             | SLE.1                              | Employment Development                     | Object to viability test as it is considered a subjective test. (Suggested text supplied)  |
| 288        | Sarah      | Stevens     |  | Paragraph                          | B.51                               | Policy SLE2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres | Remove reference to enabling and promotion of an extension to Bicester Outlet Village.   |
| 377        | Richard    | Foot        | GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village)                    | Paragraph                          | B.51                               | Policy SLE 2: Securing Dynamic Town Centre | Support greater interaction with Bicester Town Centre and Bicester Village.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton      | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors   | Paragraph                          | B.53                               | Policy SLE 2: Securing Dynamic Town Centre  | Sufficient background evidence should be available now to set a clear strategy for retail development within the district. The Local Plan should show that retail capacity can be met in full and in accordance with the sequential approach. |
| 195        | Serena     | Page          | WYG / LXB Properties                                 | Paragraph                          | B.53                               | Policy SLE.2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres | Para does not comply with NPPF para 24 & 26. Remove first sentence.   |
| 222        | Peter      | Frampton      | Framptons / Barwood Developments                     | Paragraph                          | B.53                               | Policy SLE.2 Securing Dynamic Town Centres  | Statement conflicts with Policy Bicester 12. Paragraph is not consistent with National Planning Policy. RE a blanket objection to out of town retail.   |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams      | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors | Paragraph                          | B.53                               | Policy SLE.2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres | Should be sufficient background evidence to set a clear strategy for retail development within the District. Local Plan should show the retail capacity can be met in accordance with sequential approach.                                    |
| 370        | P          | Keyword       |  | Paragraph                          | B.53                               | Policy SLE2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres  | Object to para B.53 on the grounds that it is not based on up to date evidence. 2012 Update Retail Study has not yet been published. Delete paragraph.  |
| 45         | Gemma      | Brickwood     | Turley Associates / Sainsbury                        | Paragraph                          | B.57                               | Policy SLE.2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres | Expansion of Bicester Village is unjustified - evidence required to demonstrate sequentially preferable.  |
| 159        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Paragraph                          | B.57                               | Policy SLE.2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres | Kidlington Masterplan should address design, environmental issues to improve public realm. Amend Para C.188 accordingly.  |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                            | Paragraph                          | B.57                               | Policy SLE2: Securing Dynamic Town Centre   | Support Kidlington Masterplan.  |
| 288        | Sarah      | Stevens       |  | Paragraph                          | B.57                               | Policy SLE2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres  | Remove reference to enabling and promotion of an extension to Bicester Outlet Village.  |
| 38         | Rachael    | Blakey        | Bucknell Parish Council                              | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres               | Questions if its worth trying to rejuvenate the town centre when trends are leading to out of centre shopping areas   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                      | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton    | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | There is no mention of retail capacity figures for the district. The Local Plan should detail the retail capacity identified for the district through the supporting evidence base. It should then be shown how each of the relevant town centre allocations e.g. Bolton Road can contribute towards meeting the capacity. This would demonstrate the plan is justified. Without this it is unclear whether sufficient space for retail uses has been identified within the key centres to meet the District's needs and to comply with the requirements of the NPPF. |
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton    | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Once a robust assessment has been undertaken of town centre sites to meet retail capacity bullet point 5 should be re-visited to see if the threshold should be reduced. At present there is no available up to date evidence base and analysis of whether a local threshold below that identified in the NPPF is appropriate or not.   |
| 45         | Gemma      | Brickwood   | Turley Associates / Sainsbury                      | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Extension to town centre boundary is unjustified & unclear.   |
| 73         | Colin      | Clark       | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party                   | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Object to Banbury gateway as it undermines Bolton Road Town Centre development. Banbury Canalside will displace existing business when employment land is in short supply.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 126        | Rose       | Freeman       | The Theatres Trust        | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | LPA should undertake an assessment of the need to expand town centres to ensure a sufficient supply of suitable sites. Policy SLE2. only says 'Retail and other town centre uses'. Policy should be expanded to refer to other town centre uses. Policy should also establish a premise for an evening economy in town centres. This includes restaurants, bars, pubs, clubs and music, performance and entertainment venue including theatres and Cinemas. Policy should also include a further point about protecting buildings of cultural & community benefit from loss or change of use unless replacement facilities are provided on site or within the vicinity which meet the need of the local population or services can be delivered from other facilities and without leading to a shortfall in provision and no demand for similar use. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council  | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council    | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Agree  |
| 159        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                           | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Policy SLE 2 should restrict proposals for out-of-centre superstores at Kidlington.  |
| 177        | Vic        | Keeble        | Chesterton Parish Council | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Recommend that Phase 2/3 of the Bicester Town Centre Development is given priority at an early stage so that retail / leisure provision remains competitive.   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society     | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Support presumption against out of town and edge of centre retail. Retail in town centres should respect historic built environment.   |
| 195        | Serena     | Page          | WYG / LXB Properties      | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Paragraphs relating to retail proposals should not require the applicant to demonstrate proven need. The Council's final retail study has yet to be published and therefore the evidence to justify quantitative and qualities need has not been assessed. Remove first bullet point.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)     | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 240        | Ellen      | O'Grady       | Defence Infrastructure Organisation                  | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres           | The latest Retail Study is not available for assessment. The policy is not positively prepared or justified.   |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                            | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres           | Support Policy SLE2 and expand to include Kidlington.  |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                            | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres           | Policy SLE 2 should not support new out-of-centre convenience superstores in Kidlington.   |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams      | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres           | Welcome approach of securing dynamic town centres within the District through strategic town centre allocations.   |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams      | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres           | Concern that there is no mention of retail capacity figures for the District or quantum of retail development that could come forward on each site nor the overall provision during the plan period. Unclear if sufficient space has been identified in town centres. If insufficient land is identifies this could undermine the town centre first policy. Plan should include commentary of the evidence base if each of the town centres. |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams      | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres           | Once a review of town centres has been carried out suggest bullet point 5 is re-visited. Case to reduce threshold. At present no available up to date evidence base.   |
| 369        | P          | Keywood       |  | Policy                             | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres           | Object to Policy SLE2 on the grounds that it is not based on up to date evidence. 2012 Update Retail Study has not yet been published. No requirement to demonstrate need for retail proposals outside town centres. Delete first & third bullet point. Forth bullet point should refer to NPPF paragraph 26.  |
| 162        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Paragraph                          | B.62                               | Policy SLE.3: Supporting Tourism Growth | Protection of Oxford Canal should cover towpath and hedgerows.   |
| 377        | Richard    | Foot          | GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village)                | Paragraph                          | B.62                               | Policy SLE.3: Supporting Tourism Growth | Support statement - most visited tourist attraction.   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                     | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)              | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council          | Policy                             | SLE.3                              | Supporting Tourism Growth                        | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council            | Policy                             | SLE.3                              | Supporting Tourism Growth                        | Agree  |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society             | Policy                             | SLE.3                              | Supporting Tourism Growth                        | Support policy. Upper Heyford as a tourism attraction.   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward       | Policy                             | SLE.3                              | Supporting Tourism Growth                        | Bicester Village is the most important destination for visitors from China. Maximising return from this should be a higher priority.   |
| 295        | Oliver     | Taylor        | Framptons / Banbury Golf Club     | Policy                             | SLE.3                              | Supporting Tourism Growth                        | New Policy - Regarding tourism. Reword Policy SLE3 - Text supplied.  |
| 96         | Philip     | Collett       | rep form                          | Paragraph                          | B.66                               | Policy SLE.4 Improved Transport and Connections  | Disagree with statement that Cherwell has excellent road links. Plan should apply over a longer period. Aspiration for further road junctions. Over development of residential, commercial & industrial development on a critical system. Proposed development will cover obvious routes for future roads. |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council            | Paragraph                          | B.69                               | Policy SLE.4: Improved Transport and Connections | No apparent consideration to the routes leaving Banbury. Commercial transport from the North East and East Banbury needs to be directed to the M40 for access to the M6 via the M42 and the M3&M4 via the M25.   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council | Paragraph                          | B.69                               | Policy SLE.4: Improved Transport and Connections | Take into account quarry activities present and planned at Wroxton & Shenington. Will new M40 Junction be created?   |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell        | Highways Agency                   | Paragraph                          | B.69                               | Policy SLE.4: Improved Transport and Connections | Welcome proposed improvements to works and new infrastructure. Require update of the transport and land-use study evidence base. No detail has been provided on the improvements to M40 J9 or mitigation of J10 & J11 in the draft IDP.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)              | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations | Paragraph                          | B.69                               | Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections | Support reference to a new inner relief road at Banbury. Strengthened to take account of town wide movement strategy.   |
| 42         | John       | Braithwaite   | South Newington Parish Council         | Paragraph                          | B.71                               | Policy SLE.4: Improved Transport and Connections | It is essential that new commercial developments are likely to be served by HGVs are required to make travel and transport plans that will as far as practically possible route HGVs away from town centres and unsuitable rural roads. |
| 52         | Peter      | Brown         | Drayton Parish Council                 | Paragraph                          | B.72                               | Policy SLE.4: Improved Transport and Connections | Traffic evidence study dated 2000 is out of date as it pre-dates Hanwell Fields. Sites to the South of Banbury should be preferred over site to the North.  |
| 377        | Richard    | Foot          | GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village)  | Paragraph                          | B.74                               | Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections | Support improved links between Bicester Village and Town Centre. Better access by Train through Evergreen 3 project.  |
| 104        | Robert     | Cronk         |  | Paragraph                          | B.75                               | Policy SLE.4: Improved Transport and Connections | Welcomes the statement but the importance of provision of adequate parking at railway stations must be recognised within the statement.   |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council              | Paragraph                          | B.75                               | Policy SLE4. Improved Transport and Connections  | Support proposals for a new train station at Water Eaton Park. Expect review of evidence for Station at new Technology Park.  |
| 160        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Paragraph                          | B.76                               | Policy SLE4: Improved Transport and Connections  | Paragraph should support a new Station at Water Eaton. To include a review of evidence in respect of a Station at Lyne Road to support a new Technology Park.   |
| 38         | Rachael    | Blakey        | Bucknell Parish Council                | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections               | Both Bicester eastern and western Ring Roads need to be considered  |
| 38         | Rachael    | Blakey        | Bucknell Parish Council                | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections               | The transport measures for Bicester need to be made clearer   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 48         | Justine    | Brown       |                                  | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Proposed route of Bicester Relief road does not make sense being so near Wendlebury. Crossing over railway is being paid for by Chiltern Railways and only agreed as a road for the local farmer. It should not be made into a formal road. The road should go around the hill and join at the new roundabout. Other road options should be looked at. Concern that road will bring additional noise, cause severance for walkers and increased flood risk.  |
| 49         | Kathryn    | Brown       | Stoke Lyne Parish Council        | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Is the proposed SE link road a single or dual carriageway? Would support objections from Wendlebury PC on environmental grounds and potential for further development into dual carriageway.   |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council        | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Object to the proposed Relief Road. No alternative routes have been proposed and the current route will have considerable impact on Wendlebury. Neither the village or the Parish Council were consulted resulting on a flawed document that does not reflect the reality of land use around Bicester nor take into account the well being of residents within Wendlebury.   |
| 73         | Colin      | Clark       | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connection   | Low Carbon Strategy is silent on public transport. Failed to consider 20 mph zones in the County. Are travel plans scrutinised? Traffic congestion at Banbury is not considered adequately. Plan is unclear on relief road between Thorpe Way (or the new M40 sites ) with southern Banbury. Station traffic is significant. Plan is unclear regarding the Southern relief Road at Bicester. Limited evidence regarding a planned rail-freight interchange at Graven Hill. Plan should consider additional park and ride at Kidlington into Oxford. Welcome Water Eaton Station - has traffic management been considered. Opposed to new passenger airport at Upper Heyford or expansions at Kidlington Oxford London Airport. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 73         | Colin      | Clark         | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party                                | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connection   | Local Plan should enhance rail services between Banbury & Oxford. A new station at Kidlington village centre and a new station near Kidlington Airport to serve employment areas with park and ride. Re-opening of stations between Banbury & Kidlington. Mini bus service between Heyford & Oxford. New station at Wolvercote and at Summertown with a bus service to hospitals at Headington and eastern side of Oxford. |
| 73         | Colin      | Clark         | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party                                | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connection   | Plan should ensure cycle paths beside main roads to encourage cycling into Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington from the surrounding areas.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Policy SLE4 should include improvements to Junction 9 of the M40.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council  | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council  | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Agree  |
| 150        | Tim        | Hibbert       |   | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Questions what information is available in terms of traffic count data   |
| 150        | Tim        | Hibbert       |   | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Objects as no other options for the road have been examined. Wendlebury is already a rat run.  |
| 150        | Tim        | Hibbert       |   | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Objects as there is no green buffer at Wendlebury  |
| 164        | Ian        | Inshaw        |   | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport Connections      |  |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society   | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Policy should include a South-East Link Road. Suggest upgrade of Bankside with a new spur continuing northeast from half way along Bankside to Banbury 6.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council       | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Support local plan comments regarding road transport, traffic flow and congestion issues. Local Plan should set out principles that promote the use of public transport. Wider road transport should reflect policies for Cherwell and Oxfordshire. Disappointed that opportunities associated with the railway have not been highlighted. Welcome Evergreen 3 East and West Rail and its electrification. Welcome use of rail to transport freight. Concern raised regarding London Road Level crossing with increased train movements. |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Long term aspirations for a Station at Langford and a parkway station at Shipton Quarry should still be pushed for.  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency          | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and connections  | The Bicester East Relief Road is mentioned but not shown in a map. The road as shown in the Bicester Masterplan will cross the Langford Brook and its impact on flood risk and nature conservation needs to be considered.   |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency             | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved transport and connections  | Recommend more sustainable measures to reduce the need to travel are explored in the first instance with large infrastructure improvements such as the Bicester South East relief road and Banbury Inner relief road explored as a last resort. Unclear how these projects are to be delivered or their affect on the SNR.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council        | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved transport and connections  | Generally supportive and pleased that land for a South East Relief road is retained. However, It is vital that existing inner relief road's capacity is expanded, consideration of Railway Bridge and Middleton Road/Merton Street junctions and the multi-storey car parks both sides of the railway needed for the redevelopment of this area.   |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath     | Kidlington Parish Council   | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved transport and connections  | Review requirement of a new station at Lyne Mead in Kidlington. Support station at Water Eaton Park.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Supporting text should make reference to public transport networks and bus services. Increased frequency, improved quality and reliability of bus services. Cross-town services in Bicester and Banbury. Commercially self-sustaining. Support reference to new inner relief road within Banbury to reflect Town Movement Strategy. South West Bicester Relief Road should not be called Vendee Drive. Policy should include key interchanges. No reference to Bicester Park & Ride. Growth proposals of London Oxford Airport appear over looked. Intensification of air and ground activity. Expansion of air boundary. LTP3 supports air travel services and facilities. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Policy should reflect Government funding of East west Rail western section improvements. Electrification between Oxford - Bicester Town - Bletchley - Bedford. i.e. Electric Spine. Should bring jobs.  |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England                        | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Unclear how the biodiversity, landscape and amenity value of each site has been considered. The Plan is considered unsound unless the Council demonstrates how it has addressed paragraphs 110 and 165 of the NPPF and paragraphs 98 and 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005 in the process of allocating sites. On biodiversity terms, advise that at least a phase one survey should be undertaken for each allocated site.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                       | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Proposed new link road between A41 and A4421 will be within the setting of the schedule monument of Alchester Roman Town and may cause substantial harm by isolating the monument from its setting. It is unclear whether the proposal will achieve the aims of NPPF in paragraphs 126 and 132. Further consideration needs to be given to the acceptability or otherwise of this proposed relief road.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | There will be a significant growth in traffic caused by growth in the towns   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Commuting will still occur from these towns causing congestion, accidents and pollution in this and neighbouring parishes.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | The Parish would like a Traffic Plan Management Risk Assessment to check the road network and parking problems that will be caused by more development based on the following scenarios: good railway and bus provision, a reduced or delayed provision. |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | There is a problem with on-street parking by commuters in the Parish   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | The County Council has not been monitoring or taking action over the effects of the Controlled Parking Zones in North Oxford introduced in 2004 as recommended by its Committee - Cherwell should press the County to do this.                           |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Lorries are using the unsuitable routes leading to excessive noise and vibration for residents in the Parish   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Through the Local Plan business lorries should sign up to the Oxfordshire County Council's Heavy Lorry Route Partnership Agreement   |
| 298        | Laurence   | Todd        |  | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | There is not enough planning in terms of the use of local key roads to enable people to move around Banbury  |
| 298        | Laurence   | Todd        |  | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | The cost of the Banbury South East link road will be considerable  |
| 298        | Laurence   | Todd        |  | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | It is unrealistic that public transport will be used instead of cars   |
| 298        | Laurence   | Todd        |  | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | The congestion on Middleton Road will be significantly increased with the Canalside development  |
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion           | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Support principle of Bicester South East relief road - is it deliverable?  |
| 382        | Greg       | Atkins      | South Newington A361 Residents' Lobby  | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections  | Attached: SNARL A361 Report September 2012   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)          | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|----------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 184        | Phil           | King          | HS2 Ltd  | Paragraph                          | B.80                               | High Speed Rail 2 - London to Birmingham     | The paragraph contains inaccurate information about the role of the Secretary of State and implies that CDC will be a decision maker in relation to establishing the principle of the HS railway through Cherwell. The representation proposes minor amendments to the text. |
| 132        | Theresa        | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council   | Policy                             | SLE.5                              | High Speed rail 2- London to Birmingham      | Supported  |
| 184        | Phil           | King          | HS2 Ltd  | Policy                             | SLE.5                              | High Speed Rail 2 - London to Birmingham     | Policy contains inaccurate information. Delete policy or make minor amendments to the text.  |
| 330        | Kiran          | Williams      | BNP Paribas Real Estate UK Ltd / Cawdor Capital Ltd                      | Paragraph                          | B.83                               | Introduction                                 | Support para.  |
| 387        | Kiran          | Williams      | BNP Paribas Real Estate UK Ltd / Trustees of Norman Collision Foundation | Paragraph                          | B.83                               | Introduction                                 | Support approach outlined.   |
| 136        | Sarah          | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3                                 | Paragraph                          | B.85                               | Introduction                                 | Land north of Hanwell Fields could accommodate more than 400 dwellings. The word 'about' should be added.  |
| 134        | Theresa        | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council   | Paragraph                          | B.86                               | Introduction                                 | Need to include the retention of 'Green Buffers' between villages  |
| 178        | Andrew         | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP                                     | Paragraph                          | B.86                               | Introduction                                 | The phrase 'Urban Sprawl' is unclear. Does this refer to unplanned growth, high densities or settlement coalescence? Green Buffer should be removed.   |
| 303        | Sarah Caroline | Turner        |  | Paragraph                          | B.86                               | Introduction                                 | Green Buffers need to be wide enough to be effective.  |
| 36         | Reuben         | Bellamy       | CALA Homes Ltd   | Paragraph                          | B.89                               | Policy BSC.1 District Wide Housing Provision | Paragraph B.89 underplays NPPF housing provision. Local Plan should proactively identify housing need.   |
| 156        | Miranda        | Rogers        | Stansgate Planning / P S Coles Will Trust                                | Paragraph                          | B.89                               | Policy BSC.1 District Wide Housing Provision | South East Plan RSS set to be revoked by Government. NPPF requires new housing targets to be base on most up to date household and population projections in 2010 & 2008. Further consultation required.   |
| 157        | Sian           | Holland       | Stansgate Planning / Brasenose College                                   | Paragraph                          | B.89                               | Policy BSC.1 District Wide Housing Provision | South East Plan RSS set to be revoked by Government. NPPF requires new housing targets to be base on most up to date household and population projections in 2010 & 2008. Further consultation required.   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)              | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Paragraph                          | B.89                               | Policy BSC.1: District Wide Housing Distribution | Housing target for Kidlington should be a minimum target & not a maximum target.  |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | B.89                               | Policy BSC.1: District Wide Housing Distribution | Plan should seek a minimum total growth target of 13,400 dwellings reflecting RSS figure.   |
| 80         | David      | Coates        | Kingerlee Homes  | Paragraph                          | B.90                               | Policy BSC.1: District Wide Housing Distribution | Para B.89 - B.90 Delete first sentence and bullet point 3.  |
| 102        | Sam        | Croft         | RPS Planning & Development / Banner Homes Ltd / Rowland Bratt  | Paragraph                          | B.90                               | Policy BSC.1. District Wide Housing Distribution | No justification is given to the delay of Employment land in rural areas to the next DPD. Over reliance on large strategic sites. Prudent to allocate a mix of sites in urban and rural areas to ensure a variety of sites and balanced housing market. Introduce a 20% buffer to housing land supply. Re-word para 90. |
| 156        | Miranda    | Rogers        | Stansgate Planning / P S Coles Will Trust  | Paragraph                          | B.90                               | Policy BSC.1 District Wide Housing Provision     | Support extension of plan period - no justification for capping development at existing rate i.e. 670 dwg per annum. NPPF required updated assessment. Further consultation required.   |
| 157        | Sian       | Holland       | Stansgate Planning / Brasenose College   | Paragraph                          | B.90                               | Policy BSC.1 District Wide Housing Provision     | Support extension of plan period - no justification for capping development at existing rate i.e. 670 dwg per annum. NPPF required updated assessment. Further consultation required.   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | B.90                               | Policy BSC 1. District Wide Housing Distribution | Has the SE Plan been revoked yet? How will it affect development plans?   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | B.90                               | Policy BSC 1. District Wide Housing Distribution | Plan should be amended - once South East RSS is revoked the Council will update future housing requirements.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister    | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | B.90                               | Policy BSC 1. District Wide Housing Distribution | See comment BSC.1 - Housing distribution should reflect RSS   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)              | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 40         | Geoff      | Bolton        | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd       | Paragraph                          | B.92                               | Policy BSC 1. District Wide Housing Distribution | The Plan does not contain contingency measures in the event that strategic housing sites do not come forward within the planned timescales. The deliverability of sites has not been supported by the required evidence and the Plan should not proceed without publishing a SHLAA update, Infrastructure Plan and a viability assessment and there should be then an opportunity for submitting representations. Have concerns with the deliverability/timescale of the following sites: Banbury 1, Banbury 2 and Banbury 4. |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Paragraph                          | B.92                               | Policy BSC 1. District Wide Housing Distribution | Remove from list. Conflicts with likely housing mix.  |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin         | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District wide housing distribution               | The focus on the urban areas is not justified in the Plan.  |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin         | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District wide housing distribution               | Growth is focused on to few large sites, such as NW Bicester, meaning that if there is a problem with delivery then this could cause a lack of housing supply. A more flexible approach should be taken allowing for a more diverse portfolio of sites.   |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin         | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District wide housing distribution               | The number of dwellings allocated to Bicester should be reduced by 10%  |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin         | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District wide housing distribution               | Supports the allocation of 14, 208 additional homes to be provided between 2011 and 2031.   |
| 36         | Reuben     | Bellamy       | CALA Homes Ltd                          | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision                  | The Plan should incorporate flexibility - Over reliance at Banbury - 4,352 dwellings. Concern at windfall allowance at 1.150 units. RSS South East Plan put greater emphasis of housing at Bicester than Banbury. No specific housing figure allocated at Banbury. Over reliance on windfall. Should reflect historic provision by settlement. Past windfall sites on brownfield land - this now excludes garden land.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 36         | Reuben     | Bellamy     | CALA Homes Ltd                              | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision     | Local Plan should adopted locally derived housing figures. Failure to test higher housing figures. RSS South East Plan evidence is out of date and based on earlier household projections. Should rely on 2011 Census data. RSS South East Plan only plans for reasonable levels of housing and not to boost significantly as suggested by the NPPF. Housing target should be based on; population growth, the economy, military changes, labour force ratio, market factors, housing hold projections / demographics, infrastructure and flexibility.   |
| 42         | John       | Braithwaite | South Newington Parish Council              | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support the reduced targets for housing development in rural villages  |
| 49         | Kathryn    | Brown       | Stoke Lyne Parish Council                   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Unconvinced about the need for a massive (10,300) house- building programme. Why is such high proportion focussed on Bicester.   |
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | No evidence of the Duty of Cooperation has been met. No up to date SHMA or SHLAA. Object to inclusion of Windfall sites - should allocate land to meet requirement. Not supported by evidence. No flexibility within the Plan. Plan target should consider Sub-National projections as well as the DCLG Household Projections expected December 2012. Plan is inflexible should 5-year housing land supply fall behind. Canalside development is undeliverable. Suggest reserve allocations approach - reinstate policy. 5-year housing land supply paper demonstrates a 3.1year supply of deliverable sites. Policy should be clear that sites for the rest of the District are to be allocated in a subsequent Site Allocation / Neighbourhood Plan. |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group            | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | The Policy refers to Upper Heyford as the rest of the District which is inaccurate as it should be recognised as a significant brownfield site separately within the settlement hierarchy  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 67         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore / Bovis Homes          | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision     | Concern that the Plan relies on the South East Plan figures. Does not show flexibility or supported by an up to date, objective assessment. Accurate assessment of housing need is required.  |
| 72         | Peter      | Chambers    | David Lock Associates                  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Residential development of 500 homes at Gavray Drive Bicester is supported. The site has planning permission. The housing trajectory indicates delivery over a 7 year period form 2014. Homes are capable of being delivered more quickly   |
| 73         | Colin      | Clark       | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party       | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Plan should consider how housing needs and requirements are changing and not to simply rely on RSS figure of 13,400. Concern that housing allocations at Bicester and Banbury will out strip jobs. New housing should be based on needs assessment. Support affordable housing percentage. Digital connections support home working. Expectation that manufacturing will remain fixed. Citizens should not be digitally disadvantaged. More affordable housing in town centres. Support flats above shops. Flood risk should be considered - e.g. Spiceball.  |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)       | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Should South East Plan be revoked during the Plan perpetration process the Council should have an up to date local evidence base.   |
| 106        | Russell    | Crow        | Barton Willmore / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | No evidence is provided to demonstrate that South East Plan target is sufficient to meet future requirements. SHMA 2012 has not been supplied. Plan does not acknowledge recent evidence on demographic change and mitigation through ONS and CLG population and household projections. Plan does not consider the economic aspirations of the District in setting their housing target and lack of correlation between number of jobs and increase in working age population. Net result will be an increase in commuting. Council should re-consult once evidence base is up to date. Council should reassess housing need. Detailed analysis attached. |
| 106        | Russell    | Crow        | Barton Willmore / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Site analysis of Cropredy, Fritwell, Hook Norton, Sibford Gower / Ferris and Steeple Aston demonstrates issues with growth at these settlement.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 128        | Robert     | Gardner       |   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support strategy of focused growth at the main towns.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Supported. The rural villages are maintained as rural areas and not allowed to coalesce into larger conurbations  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Supports the growth identified for Banbury and the identification of land north of Hanwell Fields.  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District wide housing distribution  | Objects to the reduced growth at Banbury as this is inconsistent with the NPPF and the South East Plan. The Plan period has been extended meaning the annual rate of delivery is lower at Banbury. Banbury is the largest town in the District with the capacity to accommodate more growth. The growth at Banbury should be increased to meet market and local needs and boost housing delivery. The growth figure for Banbury should be pre-fixed with the word 'about'.            |
| 156        | Miranda    | Rogers        | Stansgate Planning / P S Coles Will Trust | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision     | No justification for housing numbers beyond Plan period or distribution of growth between Bicester, Banbury & Rest of the District. No assessment of windfall provision. SHLAA has not been published. Background paper required to consider number of completions, under construction, planning permission granted, SHLAA sites, Windfall anticipated. Detailed justification for split between towns. Greater provision in the rest of the district. Further consultation required. |
| 157        | Sian       | Holland       | Stansgate Planning / Brasenose College    | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision     | No justification for housing numbers beyond Plan period or distribution of growth between Bicester, Banbury & Rest of the District. No assessment of windfall provision. SHLAA has not been published. Background paper required to consider number of completions, under construction, planning permission granted, SHLAA sites, Windfall anticipated. Detailed justification for split between towns. Greater provision in the rest of the district. Further consultation required. |
| 158        | Chris      | Hone          | CPRE Banbury District                     | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision     | The removal of reserve sites in the plan is welcomed; this will increase certainty of delivery on the sites allocated.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 167        | K W        | Janes       |  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Supports the Plan in terms of growth being focussed on Bicester and Banbury  |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones       | Marrons / Hallam Land Management   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Overall housing growth should be based on the most up to date household projects and evidence within a Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Calculate that the Plan target should be raised to 20.560 dpa 2006-2031. Equating to 900 net dpa for the remainder of the Plan period 2011 - 2031.               |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones       | Marrons / Hallam Land Management   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Policy BSC.1 is inconsistent with South East RSS Policies H1, CO3 & AOSR1. Great emphasis of growth now at Bicester. Redistribution strategy proposed at higher and lower growth levels. Windfall should not be included within figures. Plan should deliver 6,160 new homes at Banbury between 2011 - 2031. |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones       | Boyer Planning   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support overall Housing Strategy. If South East Plan is revoked before Plan adoption an up-to-date evidence base will be required.   |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones       | Boyer Planning   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support proposed distribution of growth and the greatest proportion of growth at Banbury & Bicester. This approach is considered consistent with the South East Plan. Support strategic sites approach.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Plan should address imbalance of housing growth between Bicester & Banbury.  |
| 189        | David      | Keene       | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | SHMA 2008 indicates a household change of +27,000 a higher level of growth than the South East Plan or earlier CLG projections. Level of housing provision should be increased.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support approach of 670 dpa beyond Plan period. Object to housing split at Banbury as does not represent RSS approach to central Oxfordshire and North Cherwell. Councils approach to growth at Banbury is unclear. Greater emphasis of growth should be at Banbury.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | BCS1                               | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Growth to the South benefit from; well connected to employment, shopping and community facilities. Halcrow Landscape report notes - area is a permeable edge and a sustainable location. Halcrow transport report para 6.4.4 notes - the south of Banbury has good permeability. Located in the least sensitive location in respect of landscape terms. The south is located on a broad plateau and not limited by a ridge line that would not increase visibility. Would be able to deliver a new cricket pitch securing a green separation between Banbury & Bodicote to the West of White Post Road.  |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support Policy in principle the proposed housing distribution.   |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support district wide housing distribution in principal however object to overall housing provision for the district 16,750 dwg to 2031. District Council is lacking a locally derived housing requirement. Analysis of social-economic, demographic and unmet housing need suggests a higher target. Evidence base for South East RSS has been superseded and latest housing projections indicate a significant increase. 2008 based household projections suggest an increase of 20,000 new households over the plan period (800 per annum). Total district completions between 2001 - 2011 equates to 5,664 dwg, household size of 1.78. An indication of the trend towards decreasing household size and the development of smaller dwellings in the District. |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Greater emphasis towards larger dwg for families. Draft SHMA & Housing Needs Estimates identify significant latent housing demand 831 dwg & 7962 dwg and 'concealed' households. Increase District housing requirement & Banbury requirement. This would also address the level of net-in commuting into the town providing a better balance of houses and jobs. Suggest housing target of 20,000 or 800 dwg per annum. Banbury target too be increased by 1,100.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                      | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd                 | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | No objection in principle to district wide housing distribution.   |
| 227        | Louise     | Morton      | Quadrant Town Planning Ltd                         | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District wide housing distribution  | There is uncertainty over whether the large urban extensions can be delivered so more development should be allocated elsewhere                                  |
| 231        | Steven     | Neal        | Boyer Planning / Redrow Homes & Wates Developments | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support rate of growth. Revocation of South East Plan could however happen at any time. In this instance up to date evidence will be required.                   |
| 231        | Steven     | Neal        | Boyer Planning / Redrow Homes & Wates Developments | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support proposed distribution of housing set out in the Plan with the focus of growth at Banbury & Bicester.   |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision     | Growth proposed at Banbury is satisfied by existing approved schemes.  |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision     | Unclear why West of Warwick Road removed as an allocation.   |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision     | Better sites exist - West of Warwick Road, Kraft, Old Alcan & Bankside, land adjoin Banbury 3  |
| 238        | Cathleen   | Nunn        |  | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Provision     | Housing numbers are over inflated.   |
| 242        | Jane       | Olds        | Caversfield Parish Council                         | Policy                             | BSC1                               | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Supports the overall principle so long as the principles in both areas are adhered to.   |
| 244        | Robin      | Parker      |  | Policy                             | BSC1                               | District wide housing distribution  | There are other areas that could be developed that are within the town limits or next to existing industrial areas which would avoid spoiling rural communities. |
| 246        | Jonathan   | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land                   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Housing numbers should be based on objectively assessed needs for Market and Affordable Housing.   |
| 248        | Jonathan   | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land                   | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Housing numbers should be based on objectively assessed needs for Market and Affordable Housing.   |
| 274        | Tom        | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Leda Properties                      | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing provision     | Object to the inclusion of windfall sites within housing target as undeliverable. In particular the low delivery at Bicester.                                    |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                        | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Bicester 12 is proposed immediately adjacent to the scheduled monument of Wretchwick Deserted Medieval Settlement and may cause significant harm to its significance contrary to NPPF paragraphs 126 and 132. EH seeks the revision of the proposed development area which may affect the total number of houses given for Bicester in Policy BSC1. Need to identify the extent of the setting where no development should be permitted to be consistent with NPPF paragraph 157.   |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Object to proposed housing target of 670dpa on the basis that latest demographic evidence suggests at least 850dpa will be needed to provide for household formation rates. Economic evidence suggests around 340-480 dpa will be needed to house the expected growth in the areas employment base and that this estimate does not take into account new workers to replace retired workers. The 2007 SHMA suggests between 611-744 dpa are needed to meet demand for affordable housing . Other issues include; loss of economic growth potential, deterrence of future business investment, increasing house prices, increased over crowding & displacement of future jobs. Clawing back out commuters, attracting in-commuting, increasing workforce participation among older workers, attracting a younger resident workforce and increase housing supply. Additional 8,000 to 11,300 jobs could be created by 2031. |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Object to target, should be a minimum figure. The rest of the district figure should be qualified - i.e. next to villages. Policy should introduce flexibility so that priority is given to overall Plan target. Object to reference to windfall in Policy. Amendment supplied.   |
| 293        | Oliver     | Taylor      | Framptons / The Banbury AAT Academy     | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Support policy and allowance for 1,150 windfall. Consider Council's Strategy is too focused on Strategic Allocations. Concern regarding delivery. Figure should be minimum and not maximum.   |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Object. Figures over inflated.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Disagree with need calculation. No requirement for additional sites beyond Bankside & Canalside.   |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Coalition Government has introduced a series of housing support reforms. Cherwell District Council is failing to finance.  |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | No Market needs forecast, key approved sites not in Plan, fixed 25 years not 5 year annual up date, no 5 year plan for deliverable houses, no competition for land, no implementation strategy, finance is the key, no allowance for windfall. |
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion            | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Reliance on the South East Plan housing targets lacks flexibility to respond to the revocation of RSS. Council should supplement with an up to date assessment of need. Report on need attached.   |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police              | Policy                             | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Plan does not have an up-to date evidence base as neither SHMA or SHLAA has been published. No evidence to justify extension of South East Plan target by 5 years. Windfall allowance is unjustified. Query inclusion of Gavray Drive.         |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)        | Paragraph                          | B.99                               | Policy BSC.2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land & Housing Density | Flexibility is noted in Paragraph B.99 and should be added to policy BSC.2. Alternative wording supplied.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                | Paragraph                          | B.100                              | Policy BSC.2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land & Housing Density | Support development on previously developed sites over undeveloped sites. Add: The use of undeveloped land will only be considered after demonstration that previously developed sites are inappropriate'                                      |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | B.100                              | Policy BSC.2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land & Housing Density | Replace 'generally' by 'always'.  |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)                              | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land & Housing Density               | Support approach - note overall level of growth directed towards rural areas needs to meet the local needs.   |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)                              | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land & Housing Density               | Support release of Green field sites early in the Plan period. 30% Brownfield target is too prescriptive; regard should be had for character, landscape & townscape.  |
| 102        | Sam        | Croft       | RPS Planning & Development / Banner Homes Ltd / Rowland Bratt | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield land and housing Density             | Re-word.  |
| 106        | Russell    | Crow        | Barton Willmore / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd                        | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield land and housing density             | Unclear weight to be afforded between efficient use of land and character and appearance. Unclear if 30% applies to gross site area or developable area? Amendment to text supplied. Remove specific mention of 30% target unless evidence is supplied. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                 | Policy                             | BSC2                               | The Effective and Efficient use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council                   | Policy                             | BSC2                               | Effective and efficient use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density     | Should have the qualification: 'unless individual circumstances indicate a lower number'   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council                   | Policy                             | BSC2                               | The Effective and Efficient use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density | Agree  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density | Support 40% target - concern with PDL land in respect of delivery.   |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density | Policy BSC 2 seeks 30dwg a ha, should be modified to ensure that in sustainable locations a higher housing density will be expected. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones       | Marrons / Hallam Land Management | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective & Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield land and Housing Density   | Policy BSC.2 should reflect Paragraph B.99 by recognising individual circumstances on design density.  |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones       | Boyer Planning                   | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective & Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield land and Housing Density   | Support the use of Greenfield sites to meet housing need. Requirement for housing at a density of at least 30% is considered to be prescriptive. Wording supplied.   |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath     | Kidlington Parish Council        | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and efficient use of land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density | Expect higher densities in sustainable locations   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                    | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density | Policy should not assume Brownfield land is less diverse than Greenfield land.   |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council         | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | Effective Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density                   | Object to building not less than 30 dph. Does not reflect character of the area. Density may not be appropriate on the edge of villages or infill developments within policies. Amend policy to reflect character of the area and Policy ESD.16. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield land and Housing Density | Object to Phasing policy - with the exception of where it relates to key infrastructure.   |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District                  | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density | PDL target of 40% is not very ambitious. Support a sequential approach.  |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | BSC.2                              | The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Density | Insufficient brownfield target at Banbury. Most sites are on Greenfield land.  |
| 36         | Reuben     | Bellamy     | CALA Homes Ltd                          | Paragraph                          | B.102                              | Policy BSC.3 Affordable Housing   | Proposed plan target does not meet affordable housing need as set out in the SHMA. Under supply of housing identified.   |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)        | Paragraph                          | B.102                              | Policy BSC.3: Affordable Housing  | Little justification for tenure split 30/70%. Consider on a case by case basis. Lack of flexibility.   |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing  | Supports the requirement for affordable housing to be provided   |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing  | There is no evidence to require a higher proportion of affordable homes in the rural areas   |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing  | Considering the increasing amount of infrastructure that is being asked for by the LPA for development sites the affordable housing requirement is to onerous effecting viability. |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing  | Local Plans should be deliverable and individual site circumstances should be taken into account   |
| 36         | Reuben     | Bellamy     | CALA Homes Ltd                          | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing  | Affordable housing should only be requested where the scheme is viable and deliverable.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 42         | John       | Braithwaite | South Newington Parish Council         | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Support policies to improve affordability of housing and provide social rented and intermediate housing to meet identified needs including availability of housing in rural areas.   |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group       | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | There has been no publication of the updated SHMA 2012 referred to in the document   |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group       | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | There has been no publication of the affordable housing viability study  |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group       | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | The policy is not justified as there is no published evidence which takes account of the NPPF  |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group       | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | The Plan does not take account of the Local Housing Delivery Group chaired by Sir John Harmon in terms of Plans being deliverable. It should not require such a scale of obligations on sites that means they are undeliverable. There should be a more flexible approach to affordable housing provision. |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group       | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | There is no evidence to support the Plan which allows for 35% of housing to be affordable in the rural areas.  |
| 67         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore / Bovis Homes          | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Support general approach. Policy should be based on up to date evidence base. Support flexibility in Policy and reference to viability.  |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)       | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Support general approach to affordable housing however lack of clarity within first paragraph. Replace maximum with up to.   |
| 77         | David      | Coates      | Kingerlee Homes                        | Policy                             | BSC3                               | Affordable Housing                  | Policy BSC.3 should refer to 'net' housing & not 'gross'. Delete first sentence and 'otherwise'.   |
| 106        | Russell    | Crow        | Barton Willmore / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Updates to SHMA & Affordable Housing Viability study have not been made publically available. Policy should be flexible to reflect site circumstances. Council should re-consult on new evidence.  |
| 112        | Keith      | Dixon       | Launton Parish Council                 | Policy                             | BSC3                               | Affordable Housing                  | The 35% affordable housing requirement will not be effective as it will just prevent smaller housing schemes   |
| 112        | Keith      | Dixon       | Launton Parish Council                 | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Supports the affordable housing exception policy   |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                            | Policy                             | BSC3                               | Affordable Housing                  | The Council should work with the Parish Council to determine affordable housing need   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council               | Policy                             | BSC3                               | Affordable Housing                  | 5th para appear to lack justification, in a rural area where a large or rural occupation dwelling is proposed on a substantial piece of land.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                 | Policy                             | BSC3                               | Affordable Housing                  | 4th para appear to lack justification, in a rural area where a large or rural occupation dwelling is proposed on a substantial piece of land.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                 | Policy                             | BSC3                               | Affordable Housing                  | Supported - Subject to comments under soundness and legality  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council                   | Policy                             | BSC3                               | Affordable Housing                  | 4th para. In rural areas where there are 3 or less dwellings it would make sense to stipulate that the dwelling would be suitable for shared ownership only.  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council                   | Policy                             | BSC3                               | Affordable Housing                  | Policy does not show the transport strategy or water supply to work in harmony with the indication to allocate 35% of affordable housing into villages.   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | BSC3                               | Affordable Housing                  | Object to the affordable housing requirement. There is no published evidence to support this and it does not take account of John Harmon's report or the NPPF. It is not take account of NPPF paras 47, 159, 173 and 174. A more flexible approach should be taken to the affordable housing percentages. |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman       | Middleton Stoney Parish Council          | Policy                             | BSC 3                              | Affordable Housing                  | The threshold 1:3 or 35% will be unworkable. The previous threshold was 1:6 and it should remain at that level.   |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Set Kidlington threshold to 3.  |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Affordable Housing threshold for Kidlington should be lowered.  |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council        | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | It must take into account additional overheads of travelling to employment in Banbury. The bus service does not provide such service for normal working hours; entertainment in Banbury would be very difficult without personal transport.   |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones         | Marrons / Hallam Land Management         | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Delivery of 30% affordable housing should be subject to an assessment of viability. In addition a further clause should allow for off-site provision and / or equivalent financial contribution where appropriate. Wording supplied.  |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones         | Boyer Planning                           | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Support 30% requirement. Dis-like term 'maximum' suggest 'up to'. Object to proposed social / affordable & intermediate split of 70 / 30 %. Should consider on a case by case basis.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                      | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 177        | Vic        | Keeble      | Chesterton Parish Council                          | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Policy should include 'departure sites' that provide opportunities for affordable housing alongside market housing - inline with NPPF. More provision should be made in villages for affordable housing to prevent young people leaving. Introduce a rural exception site policy.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP               | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Remove requirement for charging applicants to pay for the Council's scrutiny of viability assessment. Remove high level of prescription from the policy as to the proportion of affordable housing.  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                              | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Concern that affordable housing threshold of 10 dwg will not prevent back garden and small brownfield development coming forward and not contributing to the delivery of affordable homes and open space.  |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd                 | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Support principle of affordable housing including acknowledgement of viability. Consider each site should be considered on a case by case basis. Little justification for the proposed split of affordable housing.  |
| 231        | Steven     | Neal        | Boyer Planning / Redrow Homes & Wates Developments | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Support 30% requirement. Dis-like term 'maximum' suggest 'up to'. Object to proposed social / affordable & intermediate split of 70 / 30 %. Should consider on a case by case basis.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                               | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | The 30% figure is supported. The district and Banbury are in need of more affordable housing.  |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath     | Kidlington Parish Council                          | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Developments of 3 or more dwg should reach at least 35% housing delivery as affordable at Kidlington.  |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council                           | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Requirement to provide 35% affordable housing on sites of 3 or more dwellings (gross) is not compatible with provision of self build schemes within rural areas. Policy is onerous and will impact on cost of serviced plots. Policy should be amended to encourage affordable self builds and serviced plots in rural areas. Not compatible with NPPF para 54. No evidence of cooperation with neighbouring local authorities to address settlements on the boarder of district boundaries. Definition of affordable housing should be extended to include subsidised low cost sale, entry level housing for sale, private rented accommodation & intermediate. |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                           | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Delete first paragraph and replace with minimum affordable housing target.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations                               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|----------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 304        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |   | Policy                             | BSC 3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Concern that 35% affordable housing target in rural areas is not based on where people prefer to live. Target should be reduced accordingly.   |
| 324        | Malcolm        | Watt        |   | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Support Policy BSC3  |
| 334        | Alex           | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion                | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Support flexibility within policy to reflect viability constraints.  |
| 342        | Helen          | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police                  | Policy                             | BSC.3                              | Affordable Housing                  | Plan does not have an up-to date evidence base as neither SHMA or SHLAA has been published.  |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations      | Paragraph                          | B.122                              | Policy BSC.4 Housing Mix            | Mix should not inhibit viable development .  |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations      | Paragraph                          | B.123                              | Policy BSC.4 Housing Mix            | Support extra care housing.  |
| 81         | David          | Coates      | Kingerlee Homes                             | Paragraph                          | B.125                              | Policy BSC.4: Housing Mix           | Para B.125 - B.127 refer to 45 extra care dwellings. This assumes a 7% mix and a total minimum site capacity of 640 dwg.   |
| 189        | David          | Keene       | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates   | Paragraph                          | B.126                              | Policy BSC.4: Housing Mix           | Requirement for 45 self contained extra care dwellings is not evidenced. Paragraph should be removed.  |
| 81         | David          | Coates      | Kingerlee Homes                             | Paragraph                          | B.127                              | Policy BSC.4: Housing Mix           | Para B.125 - B.127 refer to 45 extra care dwellings. This assumes a 7% mix and a total minimum site capacity of 640 dwg.   |
| 20         | Peter          | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd     | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | The Policy is too prescriptive and should be deleted. There are many factors that will determine the housing mix on a particular site.   |
| 36         | Reuben         | Bellamy     | CALA Homes Ltd                              | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy is too prescriptive and should be amended to reflect the NPPF and emphasis on market demand. Housing type should vary by specific location and reflect market demand and not district wide prescriptions. Policy should also take account of design and site viability. |
| 56         | Steven         | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy should be a guide only. Needs will change over time. Mix should be determined on a site by site basis, up to date SHMA & discussion with Housing Officer.   |
| 57         | Paul           | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group            | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | There is no evidence to support this mix of housing. The Policy could be prefixed with the word 'about'  |
| 57         | Paul           | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group            | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | The Policy does not take account of the John Harmon report or the NPPF.  |
| 67         | Gemma          | Care        | Barton Willmore / Bovis Homes               | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy not informed by an up to date assessment of population growth and infrastructure.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 75         | Phil       | Clark         | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)          | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy categories; shared. Up sizers etc. Is ambiguous, complex , rigid and ineffective and should be base on bed room numbers. Alternative Policy wording supplied. Remove reference to extra care facilities.  |
| 81         | David      | Coates        | Kingerlee Homes                           | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Object to Policy BSC4 Housing Mix - should only apply to developments of circa 200+. Policy should only distinguish between 'Family Housing' & 'Other' types of accommodation.   |
| 106        | Russell    | Crow          | Barton Willmore / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd    | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Update to SHMA has not been made publically available. Policy should be flexible to reflect site circumstances. Council should re-consult on new evidence. Separation of up sizing and downsizing is confusing. Does mix apply across the whole site? i.e. does policy apply to affordable and market housing. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                  | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council                    | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | For most downsizers a minimum of 2 bedrooms would be required. They may have family to stay or require a live-in carer.  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3  | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing mix                         | The approach to housing mix is too prescriptive and should be more flexible. There is no published evidence to support this. The NPPF states that Plans should be realistic and take account of viability and deliverability. The Policy should be pre-fixed with the word 'about'.                            |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones         | Marrons / Hallam Land Management          | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy should be a guide to decision making and subject to discussions. Wording supplied.  |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones         | Boyer Planning                            | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Proposed policy is too complex. Should not reference extra care facilities. Wording supplied.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP      | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy is overly prescriptive - should be flexible and subject to assessments of need and demand.  |
| 189        | David      | Keene         | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy unduly prescriptive. Housing mix depends on location and character of site together with market conditions. Remove Policy.  |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward               | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Link to Housing Needs Assessment to strengthen the policy.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                      | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd                 | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy is inconsistent with local market evidence. Policy is too prescriptive and should be much simpler, identifying the size of the units through its bed numbers and % split. Flexibility should be built into policy.   |
| 231        | Steven     | Neal        | Boyer Planning / Redrow Homes & Wates Developments | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Proposed policy is too complex. Should not reference extra care facilities.   |
| 240        | Ellen      | O'Grady     | Defence Infrastructure Organisation                | Policy                             | BSC 4                              | Housing mix                         | BSC4 is unsound as it is unclear, lacking definition of key terms to the extent that it is ineffective and unjustified. It must be redrafted to include a clear mix of dwelling types, bedroom numbers, justified by an accessible SHMA.                          |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations             | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy does not define size of shared housing or up sizing in terms of bedrooms. Nor split between 1 or 2 beds. Policy is trying to match mix of new housing with mix of life stage of householder. Unenforceable.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Social & Communities Services                | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Local Plan adequately refers to ECH including at Strategic Sites. Plan does not mention ageing population. OCC have identified a need for 120 units of special needs / disabled housing for adults by 2020. With similar requirement for the following ten years. |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council             | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | A recent affordable housing development at Gosford means that it is considered that it has fulfilled its requirements   |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council                           | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Policy gives a District wide mix but does not allow for local variations. For example in Ambrosden a military settlement the housing mix is very uniform. The need is for larger housing.   |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                           | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Object - Policy should be much more general and should relate to the provision of a mix of market housing and affordable housing that meets the needs in each locality and has regards to the location of each settlement. Section could also consider windfalls. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | SHMA does not include an up to date assessment of population growth and structure. Policy not founded on a robust evidence base. Policy should have regard to local circumstances and character of the site. To distinguish between occupiers rather than downsizers is confused. Housing mix should be applied across the whole scheme and not just private sale. No monitoring of policy has occurred to date.                     |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police   | Policy                             | BSC.4                              | Housing Mix                         | Plan does not have an up-to date evidence base as neither SHMA or SHLAA has been published.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council     | Policy                             | BSC.5                              | Area Renewal                        | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council       | Policy                             | BSC.5                              | Area Renewal                        | Agree  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council         | Policy                             | BSC.5                              | Area Renewal                        | Keen to support policies seeking to secure area renewal in furtherance of the aims of the Brighter Futures in Banbury project, of which the Town Council is an active partner.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council     | Policy                             | BSC.6                              | Travelling Communities              | Supported- Unless sites are not sensitively located and effectively managed there will be strong opposition from large areas of affected settlements   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council       | Policy                             | BSC.6                              | Travelling Communities              | Agree  |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward  | Policy                             | BSC.6                              | Travelling Communities              | Should not treat Travellers as a homogeneous group as this may influence the practicalities of providing sites.  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency           | Policy                             | BSC.6                              | Travelling Communities              | Welcome this policy and advises that 'areas of flood risk' are to include Flood Zone 2 and 3 in line with NPPF.  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council         | Policy                             | BSC.6                              | Travelling Communities              | The existing site in Banbury is within Canalside and an alternative as well as additional provision will be needed. Would like to see the site at Bloxham expanded. Would like to note that the site in Banbury has not necessarily been used for traditional gypsies or show people. We would be concerned if additional sites were places at the edge of Banbury, they could well be in the way of future development if the town. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport | Policy                             | BSC.6                              | Travelling Communities              | Should consider proximity to public transport services.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|----------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| 279        | Martin         | Small         | English Heritage                         | Policy                             | BSC.6                              | Travelling Communities                | EH supports the inclusion of a criterion requiring consideration of potential harm to the historic and natural environment when assessing the suitability of sites for gypsies, travellers and travelling show people.  |
| 280        | Carl           | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council   | Policy                             | SLE.4                              | Improved Transport and Connections    | The proposal for a new station at Water Eaton is not disputed but it is queried about the amount of traffic which is likely to be created on the County road network  |
| 280        | Carl           | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council   | Policy                             | BSC.6                              | Travelling Communities                | The Parish Council believe that the travelling community are adequately provided for in this part of Cherwell due to recent planning permissions in the Green Belt and the Parish Council will object to any further developments   |
| 305        | Sarah Caroline | Turner        |  | Policy                             | BSC 6                              | Travelling Communities                | Policy should exclude traveller pitches within the Green Buffer. Wording supplied.  |
| 342        | Helen          | Lease         | RPS / Thames Valley Police               | Policy                             | BSC.6                              | Travelling Communities                | Plan does not have an up-to-date evidence base - GTAA has not yet been published.   |
| 136        | Sarah          | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Paragraph                          | B.142                              | Meeting Educational Needs             | Objects to this paragraph concerning the draft Planning Obligations SPD. They state that the SPD should be compatible with likely economic viability of the associated Local Plan proposals. The SPD should reflect the need for the assessment of viability to be iterative and relevant draft policies must be based on assumptions which are agreed with local partners. An SPD concerning Planning Obligations should be prepared so that it can demonstrate its capacity to provide viable solutions over time reflecting the local geography and economy. |
| 194        | James          | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward              | Paragraph                          | B.142                              | Policy BSC.7: Meeting Education Needs | Officer commitment to the county School Organisation Stakeholder Group has not, to date, been forthcoming.  |
| 47         | David          | Brooks        |  | Policy                             | BSC.7                              | Meeting Education Needs               | Object to paragraph B.142 suggest reference should be made to the redevelopment of Blessed George Napier School as a suitable development site. Plan should include a strategic allocation for Secondary Education at Banbury, suggested site in the South-west quadrant.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                 | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)          | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 63         | Peter      | Burrows     | Adderbury Conservation Action Group           | Policy                             | BSC 7                              | Meeting Education Needs                      | Christopher Rawlings school Adderbury is close to capacity and expansion is constrained by the size of the site. The school should be relocated near to the centre of the village. Bussing children out to other nearby schools is not acceptable. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                      | Policy                             | BSC7                               | Meeting Education Needs                      | Growth will increase education needs and some villages may need to relocate their school to allow for increased demand. Will financial planning allow for this need?   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                      | Policy                             | BSC7                               | Meeting educational Needs                    | Supported - Subject to comments under soundness  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                        | Policy                             | BSC7                               | Meeting Education Needs                      | Policy needs to take into account what the future provision would be. Space needs to be sought to expand the school footprint and lower the class number.  |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward                   | Policy                             | BSC 7                              | Meeting Education Needs                      | Needs stronger support of the necessary up-skilling of the District. Include supporting Warriner 6th form, Upper Heyford Free School and improving secondary education to an acceptable level in Bicester.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations        | Policy                             | BSC..7                             | Meeting Education Needs                      | OCC has a statutory duty to ensure a sufficiency of school places.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Education & early Intervention Services | Policy                             | BSC.7                              | Meeting Education Needs                      | Very brief.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                  | Policy                             | BSC.7                              | Meeting Education Needs                      | Sustainable travel and health and well-being.  |
| 293        | Oliver     | Taylor      | Framptons / The Banbury AAT Academy           | Policy                             | BSC.7                              | Meeting Education Needs                      | Policy fails to acknowledge 'the need to create, expand or alter schools'.   |
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion                  | Policy                             | BSC.7                              | Meeting Education Needs                      | Requirement for robust assessment of population structure and housing supply. For example to determine appropriate school provision.   |
| 65         | Tim        | Byrne       | Jones Lang LaSalle / Horton General Hospital  | Paragraph                          | B.147                              | Policy BSC.8: Securing Health and Well-Being | Agree with statement 'The Health Sector is currently undergoing radical change' although suggest this underplays financial and economic pressures.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                      | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 65         | Tim        | Byrne       | Jones Lang LaSalle / Horton General Hospital | Paragraph                          | B.147                              | Policy BSC.8: Securing Health and Well-Being             | Support statement Council will continue to work closely with the healthcare provider, partners and the NHS across its delivery bodies.  |
| 65         | Tim        | Byrne       | Jones Lang LaSalle / Horton General Hospital | Policy                             | BSC.8                              | Securing Health and Well-Being                           | Policy consistent with NPPF.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                     | Policy                             | BSC8                               | Securing Health and Wellbeing                            | Supported   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                       | Policy                             | BSC8                               | Securing Health and Wellbeing                            | Agree   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson      | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council            | Policy                             | BSC.8                              | Securing Health and Well-Being                           | There is no reference to consider the extra provision and upgrading to be made by the Horton Hospital to accommodate the influx of population in the Banbury area.                                    |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police                   | Policy                             | BSC.8                              | Securing Health and Well-being                           | Policy is a statement of intent and not fit for purpose. Policy should be widened to comply with Section 8 of the NPPF. Combine Policies BSC.7, 8 & 9.  |
| 34         | Carmelle   | Bell        | Thames Water                                 | Policy                             | BSC.9                              | Public Services and Utilities                            | Whilst supporting the inclusion of this policy, do not consider it effective. It should be amended to require the successful delivery of all types of development sites and not just strategic sites. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                     | Policy                             | BSC.9                              | Public Services and Utilities                            | Supported   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward                  | Policy                             | BSC 9                              | Public Services and Utilities                            | Needs to be more specific in rejecting inadequate waste developments in unsustainable locations.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations       | Policy                             | BSC.9                              | Public Services and Utilities                            | OCC will work with the District to identify impacts of new development on demand for Council providing services and new improvements.   |
| 8          | Vicky      | Aston       |  | Paragraph                          | B.159                              | Policy BSC.10: Open Space , Outdoor Sport and Recreation | Support underlining evidence base PPG17 assessment and Playing Pitch Strategy note that these documents are four years old and would suggest that they are updated.                                   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 9          | Vicky      | Aston         |   | Paragraph                          | B.160                              | Policy BSC.10: Open Space , Outdoor Sport and Recreation           | Support Councils intention to resist the loss of open space, outdoor sport and recreation provision. Suggest text is more closely aligned with NPPF paragraph 74. (Suggested text supplied) |
| 239        | Nicole     | O'Donnell     | Oxfordshire Playing Fields Orgainsation | Paragraph                          | B.160                              | Policy BSC.10 : Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision | Support.  |
| 162        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Paragraph                          | B.162                              | Policy BSC.10 Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision   | Refer to Kidlington Masterplan.   |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council               | Paragraph                          | B.162                              | Policy BSC10. Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision   | Support Kidlington Masterplan.  |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council       | Paragraph                          | B.163                              | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision                 | Will sports facilities, present and proposed meet the lack of sports facilities in Banbury?   |
| 16         | Vicky      | Aston         |   | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision                 | Support commitment to protect existing sports facilities and planning for new development in Policy BSC10.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                       | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 73         | Colin      | Clark         | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party   | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Public Open space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision | Support new libraries at Banbury & Bicester. Concern that no theatre is planned for Banbury. Support general principals determining improvements in recreational provision including close working partnerships. Concern at the lack of post Olympic Legacy. Village and community halls inadequate size for indoor sport. PPG17 assessment states this is a priority. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council   | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Spaces, Outdoor and recreation provision             | Supported  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3   | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision        | Same comments as to para B.142   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council  | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision        | Will sports facilities, present and proposed meet the lack of sports facilities in Banbury?  |
| 175        | Gareth     | Jones         |  | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Space, Sport and Recreation Provision                | The plan is seeking to address deficiencies for indoor sport and recreation. Future facilities need to meet the challenges of population growth, expectation and demand pressures. The representation details the specific need of facilities for a number of sports.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision        | Approach is overly prescriptive - remove detail and include within SPD.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister    | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Space, Outdoor sport and Recreation Provision        | Support policy approach but further clarity needed to explain how open space, sports and recreation will be secured. Considered undeliverable.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 239        | Nicole     | O'Donnell   | Oxfordshire Playing Fields Orgainsation | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision | Support.  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                    | Policy                             | BSC10                              | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision | Whilst the aims are supported, the TC feels that an earlier involvement in securing appropriate provision through the development process to meet deficiencies is essential. Outdoor sports provision needs adequate changing facilities. There remains a shortfall in allotment land, with growing waiting lists at Council sites. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                           | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Bicester Gateway                                   | Support natural /semi natural green space and standards. Should also include biodiversity and wildlife features in other green space such as amenity green space and corridors.   |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England                         | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation  | Linear public right of way network should be considered as part of the recreation resource, and referred to within the supporting text as such.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council  | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision | It may be commendable to have more open space but the Parish are struggling with existing maintain costs. Existing facilities in Gosford should be redeveloped. Developers should contribute towards this.  |
| 318        | Chris      | Wardley     | The Inland Waterways Association        | Policy                             | BSC.10                             | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision | Policy does not recognise the importance of the Oxford Canal.   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP    | Table                              | Table 8                            | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation  | Approach is overly prescriptive - remove detail and include within SPD.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 239        | Nicole     | O'Donnell     | Oxfordshire Playing Fields Orgainsation  | Table                              | Table 8                            | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation  | Object to open space standards below recommended amount of 1.15 ha per 1000 people for outdoor sports provision, 0.80 ha per 1000 people for children's play space.   |
| 64         | Terry      | Byrd          | Merton Parish Council                    | Table                              | Table 9                            | Qualitive Standards of Provision                   | The concept of clustering is good but its proposed implementation in Table 9 Chapter 8 is significantly less so.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP     | Table                              | Table 9                            | Qualitive Standards of Provision                   | Approach is overly prescriptive - remove detail and include within SPD.   |
| 17         | Vicky      | Aston         |  | Policy                             | BSC.11                             | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation  | Support the inclusion of standards for different types of outdoor sports provision in Policy BSC11.   |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell       | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group         | Policy                             | BSC.11                             | Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation provision | The Policy is requiring too much open space. Typically policies should seek 2.4 hectares per 1000 dwellings. The Plan should be revised taking into account the John Harmon viability work and the NPPF requirements. The Council's 2006 and 2008 evidence base is out of date and not consistent with national policy. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                 | Policy                             | BSC.11                             | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation  | Supported   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | BSC.11                             | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor recreation  | Too much recreation is being sought which is not justified, effective or consistent with the NPPF. The evidence base for this is considered not to be up to date. The Plan should be revised to take account of viability testing for Local Plans by John Harmon and the NPPF requirements.                             |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                              | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP    | Policy                             | BSC.11                             | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation                | Approach is overly prescriptive - remove detail and include within SPD.  |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd      | Policy                             | BSC.11                             | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation                | Support thrust of policy. Policy should clarify overtly that exceptions can be made to minimum standards which may lead to instances where a financial contribution is not the default to address deficiencies in on site provision. |
| 239        | Nicole     | O'Donnell   | Oxfordshire Playing Fields Organisation | Policy                             | BSC.11                             | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation                | Support General principle subject to comment RE: Table 8.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport            | Policy                             | BSC.11                             | Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Recreation                | Does not consider transport and accessibility e.g. cycle parking   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson      | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council       | Paragraph                          | B.169                              | Policy BSC.12: Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities | Will sports facilities, present and proposed meet the lack of sports facilities in Banbury?  |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson      | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council       | Paragraph                          | B.170                              | Policy BSC.12: Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities | Have the surveys been completed and when will the results be made available?   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                        | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                              | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 175        | Gareth     | Jones       |                                      | Paragraph                          | B.170                              | Policy BSC.12: Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities | Lists a number of potential suitable sites for indoor hub facilities including Banbury 12.  |
| 10         | Vicky      | Aston       |                                      | Paragraph                          | B.171                              | Policy BSC.12: Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities | Support the Council's commitment to undertake further work on the need for indoor facilities in the District.                                   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP | Table                              | Table 10                           | Local Standards of Provision - Indoor Recreation                 | Approach is overly prescriptive - remove detail and include within SPD.   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP | Table                              | Table 11                           | Local Quality Standards  | Approach is overly prescriptive - remove detail and include within SPD.   |
| 18         | Vicky      | Aston       |                                      | Policy                             | BSC.12                             | Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities                | Support the intention to protect existing built sports facilities and to ensure new ones are provided when they are needed within Policy BSC12. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council             | Policy                             | BSC12                              | Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities                | Supported   |
| 175        | Gareth     | Jones       |                                      | Policy                             | BSC12                              | Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities                | Lists a number of potential suitable sites for indoor hub facilities including Banbury 12.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                    | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport             | Policy                             | BSC.12                             | Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities      | Does not consider sustainable modes.   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | BSC.12                             | Indoor Sport, Recreation and Community Facilities      | Policy not supported by up to date evidence. The requirements of BSC12 and table 10 should be revised having regard to the Harmon report and NPPF. The cumulative impact of the plan's requirements on viability needs to be assessed. |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards       | Corylus Ltd                              | Theme                              | Theme 3                            | Theme 3: Policies for ensuring sustainable development | Support the aim of securing sustainable design   |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers      | Wendlebury Parish Council                | Paragraph                          | B.175                              | Introduction   | The proposed relief road crosses a large BAP habitat, will abut a Scheduled Ancient Monument and damage the setting of Wendlebury countryside.   |
| 94         | John       | Colegrave     |  | Paragraph                          | B.175                              | Introduction   | and to the north of the proposed buffer is already developed and does not represent a strategic development area.  |
| 73         | Colin      | Clark         | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party         | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and adapting to Climate Change              | Oppose any plans for large recycling facility next to Oxford Airport / Kidlington. Minimise vehicle movements - recycling centres should be located at District Centres. Separation of food and garden waste should be justified.      |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                 | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change              | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council                   | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change              | Agree  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)       | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change | Object to Policy ESD1 as it relies upon the SPD and does not consider the cumulative impact of policies in the Plan. The Plan should be revised to take account of Viability Testing in Local Plans by John Harmon and the NAPPY requirements.   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran        | Environment Agency                       | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and adapting to Climate Change | Welcome this policy , in particular the reference to minimising flood risk and use of SuDs   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport             | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change | Reduce dependence on private cars.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council   | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and Adapting to climate change | There is concern that it is not clear how climate change should be taken into account in flood risk assessments.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council   | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and Adapting to climate change | The Council should ensure an FRA is completed by Chiltern Railways   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council   | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and Adapting to climate change | The Local Plan needs to distinguish between Pluvial and Fluvial flooding and define who is responsible for flooding  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council   | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and Adapting to climate change | It is unfair that the EA expect the owners to take responsibility for drainage and flooding. Developers should make contributions.   |
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney       | BioRegional Development Group            | Policy                             | ESD.1                              | Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change | Additional points suggested; district wide target for carbon reduction, monitoring, cross reference to ESD2. A clear breakdown of standards expected, requirements for climate change and mitigation, address emissions. Reducing the need to travel, public transport improvements, promoting walking and cycling. Commitment to retro fit initiatives. |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark         | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)         | Policy                             | ESD.2                              | Energy Hierarchy                          | Support approach. A fabric lead approach is preferred over renewable energy technology which can fail.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                 | Policy                             | ESD.2                              | Energy Hierarchy                          | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council                   | Policy                             | ESD.2                              | Energy Hierarchy                          | Agree  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3                      | Policy                             | ESD.2                              | Energy Hierarchy                    | Support fabric first approach. The Policy should enable a more flexible approach to be applied and recognise that viability is a key factor. (Reference made to Local Housing Delivery Group report)  |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild         | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | ESD.2                              | Energy Hierarchy                    | Objection to the requirement to consider decentralised energy systems in strategic sites. Density is too low. Preference to an approach that considers fabric efficiency on a dwelling by dwelling basis would be more effective.   |
| 363        | P          | Keywood       |   | Policy                             | ESD.2                              | Energy Hierarchy                    | Object to energy assessment for small developments. No targets for reduction of carbon emissions are stated.  |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin         | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd                       | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | The policy should not try and introduce higher standards than the building regulations require. It is not accordance with the NPPF which states design policies should avoid unnecessary prescriptive or detail.  |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin         | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd                       | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | The Council could ask for higher standards on a scheme but other requirements would have to be reduced.   |
| 36         | Reuben     | Bellamy       | CALA Homes Ltd  | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Support principal of policy to deliver high levels of sustainable development and climate change. Consistent with para 93 of the NPPF. Policy inconsistent with Para 47 & 205 of NPPF. Objection to policy which should balance the need for sustainable development against site viability.  |
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton      | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors            | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | The aspiration of the policy is supported subject to there being explicit reference to the viability of schemes having to be taken into account in the application of standards. The costs of meeting the standards may be too onerous in some cases and therefore there needs to be recognition that a flexible approach will be taken where the viability of a scheme is compromised. This is in the interests of the policy being effective. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 56         | Steven     | Brown         | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Objection to Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. Requirement already set out in latest Building Regulations - policy should reflect this. Policy will quickly be superseded given life of plan period . Inclusion of Policy is unjustified by evidence. Viability concerns.   |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell       | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group            | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | The Plan should not set standards beyond the Building Regulations and should take account of the NPPF, the John Harmon report and the Governments budget announcement. The Local Housing Delivery groups 'A review of Local Standards for the Delivery of new homes, June 2012 concludes that .. 'it is unnecessary to set energy standards beyond building regulations. If Policies are included they should be fully costed and justified'. They believe the highest code level requirements have been superseded by the Budget announcement, Treasury/BIS Plan for Growth dated 23 March 2011 para 2.296 |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark         | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)            | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | What evidence support the requirement for all homes to meet Code for Sustainable Homes Level 4 and higher standards than Building Regulations? Code Level 4 is too prescriptive and potentially impractical. May effect housing supply.   |
| 78         | David      | Coates        | Kingerlee Homes                             | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Object to Policy ESD.3 does not provide a clear distinction between development in the Eco-town and other standard developments. Policy should be subject to viability assessment.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                    | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Supported   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council                      | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Agree - Should increase standard to a higher code and state aiming for code 6 by a stated date.   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3    | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | The policy is too onerous and it is unnecessary to set standards beyond the Building Regulations. The Policy should be more flexible.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones         | Marrons / Hallam Land Management          | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Object to requirement for all homes to meet Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes. This is an unrealistic aspiration - would suggest development is instead directly linked to the Building Regulations which over time will reflect the Code for Sustainable Homes. Wording supplied.   |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones         | Boyer Planning                            | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Requirement for all homes to meet Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes is too prescriptive. What evidence is there that this is deliverable?  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP      | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Policy approach could prove unviable - delete reference to higher than national standards and instead include requirement for viability testing.  |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society                     | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Support polices. Emphasis should be on reuse of buildings. Object to word 'consider'.   |
| 189        | David      | Keene         | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Requirement for all homes to meet code level 4 of the code for sustainable home is inappropriate given lack of viability considerations. Reference to A review of Local Standards for the Delivery of New Homes by Standards Working Group. Amend policy to reference prevailing National standards.  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran        | Environment Agency                        | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable construction            | Fully support this policy. In particular, the higher code levels in the water use category. Cherwell is located in an area of water stress and minimising water ruse is extremely important.  |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey     | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd        | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Support sentiment of policy. Standards above Building Regulations is not consistent with national policy. Should consider Economic Viability. Object to specific reference to BREEAM for non-residential development as other criteria exist. BREEAM methodology favours urban locations. Should be minimum threshold - approach does not favour small buildings. Costs will be passed onto the home owner. Should distinguish between outline / detailed applications. Suggest local sustainability checklist. Concern at exponential cost of achieving the targeted BREEAM. Policy should promote cost effective development. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 240        | Ellen      | O'Grady     | Defence Infrastructure Organisation                           | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable construction            | It is not justified or consistent with national policy to apply Eco Town standards to non Eco Town developments. The first paragraph should be amended to read: All new homes will be encouraged to meet code level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, unless exceeded by national standards.<br>Paragraphs 3 and 4 do not align with the government's zero carbon timetable, makes no mention of off-site 'allowable solutions' and the policy does not justify a higher standard. They conflict with paragraph 95 of the NPPF.                        |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology   | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Support requirement for Code Level 4.   |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Policy should provide more definite criteria.   |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams    | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors          | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Support aspiration. Should include reference to viability of scheme in the application of standards.  |
| 364        | P          | Keyword     |   | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | Object to Policy ESD3 - No National requirement to achieve level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes or BREEAM 'Very Good' for non-residential.   |
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney     | BioRegional Development Group                                 | Policy                             | ESD.3                              | Sustainable Construction            | In terms of minimum energy performance requirements, a clear timeline aligned to the building regulations zero carbon trajectory is important. Requesting higher standards for development than building regulations in particular residential areas may place undue burden on the developer and in some cases will not represent the most cost effective means to carbon reduction. In our view the pathway towards zero carbon in 2016 is ambitious enough. Will the SPD Sustainable Buildings cover sustainable construction too? Should be reference. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton      | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors              | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralised energy systems        | The aspiration of the policy is supported subject to there being explicit reference to the viability of schemes having to be taken into account in the application of standards. The costs of meeting the standards may be too onerous in some cases and therefore there needs to be recognition that a flexible approach will be taken where the viability of a scheme is compromised. This is in the interests of the policy being effective. |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell       | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group                                | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralised Energy Systems        | The Policy should recognise the John Harmon report and the NPPF and be flexible and deliverable   |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark         | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)                                | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralised Energy System         | Question feasibility of District Heating and Combined Heat and Power on all sites over 400 dwg or 50 dwg in off-gas area. Not every site will be appropriate due to location, existing infrastructure and character. The need to produce a feasibility assessment is abortive.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralised Energy Systems        | Object to Policy EDS4, threshold for non domestic developments is too low. And should be raised from 1000sqm to 75,000 sqm.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralized Energy Systems        | Supported - Only economically viable for large conurbations but reduces consumer choice   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralized Energy Systems        | Agree   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3                        | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralized Energy Systems        | Object to policy ESD.4. Policy should be flexible.  |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones         | Boyer Planning  | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralise Energy Systems         | Question the need to produce a feasibility assessment for District Heating and Combined heat and Power on sites over 400 units. Work would be abortive and inappropriate.   |
| 195        | Serena     | Page          | WYG / LXB Properties  | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralised Energy Systems        | Threshold of 100m2 is set too low and can not be justified. Should be changed to 2,500m2.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd                            | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralised Energy Systems        | Policy favours Combined Heat & Power / District Heating Systems but does not specify feasibility assessment is required. Other technologies maybe more appropriate. Policy wording inconsistent between encourage or required. Costs associated with management of DHS. Ownership rights can discourage users. Dependent on supply of non-renewable energy fuels and sufficient deliveries. Extreme weather could result in fuel failure. Back up systems will be required for maintenance. Policy ESD4 and ESD5 should be combined. Policy should include flexibility. Evidence based justification for threshold should be provided. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Waste Management  | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralised Energy Systems        | Plan should explore potential for Combined Heat & Power, Also support reference to CHP in Polices ESD.1 - ESD.5.   |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralised Energy Systems        | Unclear what is feasible - refer to technical and financial considerations.  |
| 365        | P          | Keywood     |   | Policy                             | ESD.4                              | Decentralised Energy Systems        | Object to Policy ESD4 duplicates Policy ESD2. Threshold for District Heating System set too low to be viable.  |
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton    | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors            | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable energy                    | The aspiration of the policy is supported subject to there being explicit reference to the viability of schemes having to be taken into account in the application of standards. The costs of meeting the standards may be too onerous in some cases and therefore there needs to be recognition that a flexible approach will be taken where the viability of a scheme is compromised. This is in the interests of the policy being effective.  |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)                              | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Question requirement to provide a feasibility assessment for on-site renewable energy on all sites over 400 dwg or 50 dwg in off-gas areas. Not every site will be appropriate to accommodate wind turbines or solar PV due to location and surrounds. The need to produce a feasibility assessment is abortive.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                                      | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Supported  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | The policy is too onerous and it is unnecessary to set standards beyond the Building Regulations. The Policy should be more flexible.  |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones         | Hanwell Village Residents                | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Strongly Support this policy.  |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones         | Hanwell Village Residents                | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | The Policy should be revised to mention wind monitoring masts and other associated engineering works will be subject to the same assessments as wind turbines and mention the cumulative impacts of wind farm development  |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones         | Boyer Planning                           | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Question the need to produce a feasibility assessment for on site renewable energy on all sites over 400 dwg. Not every site is appropriate for PV or wind technology. The need to produce a feasibility assessment would be abortive.   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward              | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Should minimise environmental damage by adopting the Council's Residential Amenity Impacts of Wind Turbine Developments and by recognising that large scale solar arrays are industrial developments and treated as such when deciding appropriate locations.  |
| 195        | Serena     | Page          | WYG / LXB Properties                     | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Threshold of 100m2 is set too low and can not be justified. Should be changed to 2,500m2.  |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey     | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd       | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | No National requirement to provide on-site renewable energy systems irrespective of feasibility report. Policy does not define target for exceeding National Building standards or bench mark for which reductions can be calculated. Policy aims conflicts with Policy ESD.4 and does not encourage the most sustainable options. No justification for 400 dwg / 100m2 threshold. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport             | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Should expand on aviation activities.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small         | English Heritage                         | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable energy                    | 3rd bullet point should be amended to read: 'Impacts on the historic environment including designated and non designated assets'. The importance of these assets is recognised in NPPF 128,129 and 132.  |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne      | CPRE Bicester District                   | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Minimum distance between dwellings and wind turbines is set too low.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 328        | Tom        | Whild       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Unclear what is feasible - refer to technical and financial considerations.   |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams    | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors          | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Support aspiration. Should include reference to viability of scheme in the application of standards.  |
| 366        | P          | Keywood     |   | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Object to Policy ESD5 duplicates Policies ESD3 & ESD4.  |
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney     | BioRegional Development Group                                 | Policy                             | ESD.5                              | Renewable Energy                    | Wording in Policy does not convey a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Wording supplied. Supporting text should make reference to best practice guidelines on renewable energy development that places low carbon localism at its heart. Also refer to best practice public engagement with wind farms. Policy also requires an assessment to be undertaken of renewable energy potential - concerns are raised as this does not apply to all developments and that it is only an assessment not a requirement. Policy should be clear what contribution from renewable energy is expected i.e.align with building regulations. Format of the feasibility assessment should be provided. |
| 34         | Carmelle   | Bell        | Thames Water  | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | Policy ESD 6 should include reference to sewer flooding and an acceptance that flooding could occur away from the flood plain as a result of development where off site infrastructure is not in place ahead of development. Without this reference the policy is not consistent with national policy (technical Guidance to the NPPF)  |
| 130        | Jennifer   | Glynn       |   | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | Concern of flooding.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                                      | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | Supported   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | Agree   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency                     | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | Welcome this policy which will ensure flood risk is considered appropriately for all new development coming forward. Found some policies for 'Cherwell's Places' unsound as some of the wording contradicts the principles in ESD 6 and the NPPF. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable flood Risk Management   | Should define sequential approach. - Work with EA.  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | There needs to be policies for dealing with peoples homes being flooded   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | There are properties in Kidlington which may still flood despite flood defences being put in place  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | Development at Banbury and Bicester could increase flooding at Kidlington and therefore there should be more defences here.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | There should be liaison between Chiltern Railways and other authorities when they complete their flood risk assessment for the railway proposals between Bicester and Oxford  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | There should be agreement between all authorities to allow for climate change in the provision of SUDs and monitoring of their effectiveness  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | The Plan does not cover adequately the issue of run-off into rivers, the local plan needs to explore ways of holding back run-off.  |
| 285        | Victor     | Smith       |  | Policy                             | ESD.6                              | Sustainable Flood Risk Management   | Concern that housing will be built on the flood plain and the associated risk, damage to properties, clean up costs and obtaining house insurance. Building on flood plains should not be permitted unless there are no other alternatives.       |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council               | Policy                             | ESD.7                              | Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds) | Supported   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council           | Policy                             | ESD7                               | Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds) | Agree  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency               | Policy                             | ESD.7                              | Sustainable Drainage Systems (Suds) | Welcome this policy.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport     | Policy                             | ESD.7                              | Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) | SuDS should be used in 'all' new development. Highways SuDS will be adopted by OCC. Non-Highway SuDS will be adopted by the Local Lead Flood Authority (LLFA). Minor wording amendments.                   |
| 34         | Carmelle   | Bell        | Thames Water                     | Policy                             | ESD.8                              | Water Resources                     | Support this policy and its reference to the use of phasing of development to enable water infrastructure ahead of development where appropriate.  |
| 73         | Colin      | Clark       | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party | Policy                             | ESD.8                              | Water Resources                     | New Agricultural-Chemical exclusion zone required for River Cherwell & Oxford Canal expanding where near railway line. Concern that Bankside contains toxic material and could be leaching into the Canal. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council         | Policy                             | ESD.8                              | Water Resources                     | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council           | Policy                             | ESD.8                              | Water Resources                     | Agree  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency               | Policy                             | ESD.8                              | Water Resources                     | Fully support this policy and welcome reference to the Water Framework Directive in para. B.218.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council         | Policy                             | ESD.9                              | Protection of Oxford Meadows SAC    | Supported  |
| 203        | Rebecca    | Micklem     | BBOWT                            | Policy                             | ESD.9                              | Protection of Oxford Meadows SAC    | Welcome the approach taken to biodiversity protection but have concerns with regards to lack of ecological survey work in relation to some of the allocated sites.   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency               | Policy                             | ESD.9                              | Protection of Oxford Meadow SAC     | Fully support this policy and are pleased that the importance of water quality on the Oxford Meadow SAC has been recognised.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                    | Policy                             | ESD.9                              | Protection of the Oxford Meadow SAC | Policy should include a map of coverage to show where impact on Oxford Meadows could occur. To avoid individual planning applications missing this constraint.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                    | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 73         | Colin      | Clark         | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party         | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment | Plan should promote more eco-friendly farming practices. In town areas should be left to grow flowers, butterflies and other wildlife. Water meadows should be preserved. Farms should be encouraged not to flail hedges so regularly. Introduce a no-chemical protection zone running the length of the of the river Cherwell and Oxford Canal should become a designated wildlife site. Plan should prevent light pollution. |
| 73         | Colin      | Clark         | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party         | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment | Food security. Plan should consider agriculture; welcome support of Oxfordshire Woodland Project, Plan should encourage locally grown products for schools & hospitals. Cherwell should become a hub of farming innovation. Plan should encourage small farm holdings to prevent large scale agro-industry.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council                 | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment | Supported  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council                   | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment | Agree  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the natural environment | Object as a net gain in biodiversity is being sought which is unviable. A more flexible approach should be applied to recognise that viability is a key factor.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                        | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                       | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment    | A net gain in biodiversity may not always be possible. Policy should state instead 'wherever possible'. Development Management should not be about scrutiny but about improving our environment. Bullet points suggested. |
| 203        | Rebecca    | Micklem     | BBOWT                                | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment    | Welcome the approach taken to biodiversity protection but have concerns with regards to lack of ecological survey work in relation to some of the allocated sites.  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency                   | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment    | Pleased with the wording of this policy but it could potentially include test to ensure that there is protection for all watercourses, in line with the Water Framework Directive   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                        | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection of the Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment | Support policy - exception bullet point 6 should be expanded to reference biodiversity / natural environment of the local area.   |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England                      | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment    | It does not make reference to the avoidance-mitigation-compensation hierarchy set out in NPPF. Unclear how the Plan is consistent with paragraph 118 of the NPPF, and hence sound.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                    | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.10                             | Protection and Enhancement of biodiversity and the natural environment | There should be protection of birds by facilities being provided   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council               | Policy                             | ESD.11                             | Conservation Target Areas  | Supported  |
| 203        | Rebecca    | Micklem     | BBOWT                                  | Policy                             | ESD.11                             | Conservation Target Areas  | Welcome the approach taken to biodiversity protection but have concerns with regards to lack of ecological survey work in relation to some of the allocated sites.   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency                     | Policy                             | ESD.11                             | Conservation Target Areas  | Fully support this policy and welcome the commitment to secure biodiversity enhancements.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                          | Policy                             | ESD.11                             | Conservation Target Areas  | Support. Expand to allow other forms of biodiversity offsetting.   |
| 320        | Malcolm    | Watt        |  | Paragraph                          | B.244                              | Policy ESD12: Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)      | Should read 'Cotswold Conservation Board' not 'Cotswold AONB Board'  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council               | Policy                             | ESD.12                             | Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)                     | Supported  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Policy                             | ESD.12                             | Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)                     | Requirement for development to support local economy, improve access to local services and increase opportunity for people to leave and work in local communities duplicates other policies in the Plan. Policy should seek high quality design that respects specific quality of natural beauty identified in the AONB. |
| 319        | Malcolm    | Watt        |  | Policy                             | ESD.12                             | Cotswold Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB)                     | Support Policy ESD12.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                       | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society  | Paragraph                          | B.247                              | Policy ESD.13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Paragraph is miss leading - re-wording suggested.   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | B.249                              | Policy ESD.13 Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement  | Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment (September 2010) is misrepresentative of the area south of Salt way. Delete fifth bullet point and its reference to the setting of Salt Way.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister    | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | B.249                              | Policy ESD.13 Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement  | Object to statement that because of topographical and physical constraints at Banbury 'only a limited number of strategic development sites are available for new housing growth'. Evidence base indicated otherwise; landscape impact assessment, CDC options for growth (August 2008). The Salt way is considered an historic and ecological corridor to be safeguarded as a Green Corridor but not by way of an additional buffer. Previous rejections of developments on this site were due to need rather than sensitivity. The South of Banbury is the least sensitive direction for growth in landscape terms. |
| 279        | Martin     | Small         | English Heritage   | Policy                             | B.249                              | Policy ESD.13 Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement  | EH supports the recognition of historic features of particular value around Banbury and Bicester in paragraph B.249   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | B.252                              | Policy ESD.13 Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement  | Wroxton is a conservation village, any development will take place in the conservation area, what restrictions will that put on developments?   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)        | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers      | Wendlebury Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | The proposed relief road crosses a large BAP habitat, will cause undue visual intrusion in open countryside, harm the setting of the settlement of Wendlebury and potentially harm the setting of Alchester Roman Town.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Supported   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council    | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Agree   |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                           | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | ESD 13 should make reference to leisure value.  |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon        | Hanwell Parish Council    | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Object to policy ESD.13. Support in principle but Policy omits the open countryside and landscape north of Banbury from list of area of 'particular value'. Consider Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment 2009 work was based on subjective local opinions and planning issues. Consider mitigation measures such as Green Buffers offer insufficient protection. Land to the North of Banbury should be reassessed as 'particular high value'. |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon        | Hanwell Parish Council    | SA                                 | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Consider Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment 2009 are flawed documents and don't provide sufficiently robust evidence to base an SA of sites around Banbury. Further evidence and careful assessment is required.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)        | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |  | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Object to policy ESD.13. Support in principle but Policy omits the open countryside and landscape north of Banbury from list of area of 'particular value'. Consider Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment 2009 work was based on subjective local opinions and planning issues. Consider mitigation measures such as Green Buffers offer insufficient protection. Land to the North of Banbury should be reassessed as 'particular high value'. |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |  | SA                                 | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Consider Landscape Character and Sensitivity Assessment 2009 are flawed documents and don't provide sufficiently robust evidence to base an SA of sites around Banbury. Further evidence and careful assessment is required.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Policy Banbury 2 is located in an area of high visual sensitivity. Very nature of development is likely to cause visual intrusion. Policy should better reflect the balance of the landscape impact against other factors in favour of development.   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward  | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Add protection to the setting of Conservation Areas.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Policy ESD13 is supported and is considered sufficient to protect the separate identity of the villages and setting of locally -valued features.  |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Policy should not override strategic allocations. This should be clarified.   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)        | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 257        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Wording supplied highlighting leisure value of Oxford Canal and requirement to protect towpath and hedgerows.  |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh         | Natural England           | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Unclear where the areas with a high level of tranquillity are and therefore question whether the policy is deliverable, and hence sound.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small         | English Heritage          | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | EH supports the requirements of Policy ESD 13 relating to the historic environment.  |
| 285        | Victor     | Smith         |                           | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | NPPF states existing open space should not be built on unless the land is surplus to requirements. Land should be preserved because of its beauty and tranquillity. The Plan should protect and enhance valued landscape. Concern that approval is still being given to land within the countryside.                           |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne      | CPRE Bicester District    | Policy                             | ESD.13                             | Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement | Support.   |
| 333        | Rachel     | Williams      | Oxford City Council       | Paragraph                          | B.255                              | Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt           | The City Council disagrees that "there is no suggestion at this stage that a wider review is required". The City Council will continue to press for an urban extension to the south of the city but until this is secured the City would wish the option for a selective review in other areas around the city to be retained. |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                           | Paragraph                          | B.256                              | Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt           | Restricts new housing to exception sites. Seek an appropriate mix of housing.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)            | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 190        | Nik        | Lyzba       | JPPC / Oxford University Press              | Paragraph                          | B.256                              | Policy ESD.14<br>Oxford Green Belt             | Support limited review of Green Belt at Langford Lane.   |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath     | Kidlington Parish Council                   | Paragraph                          | B.256                              | Policy ESD.14:<br>Oxford Green Belt            | Include mixed use.   |
| 271        | Ian        | Scargill    | Oxford Green Belt Network                   | Paragraph                          | B.256                              | Policy ESD.14:<br>Oxford Green Belt            | The small scale review of the Green Belt in the Langford Lane area is noted. The Network is pleased a review is not considered necessary to accommodate local housing needs.   |
| 64         | Terry      | Byrd        | Merton Parish Council                       | Paragraph                          | B.257                              | Policy Villages 5:<br>Former RAF Upper Heyford | The Oxford Green Belt with respect to Merton is not compliant with NPPF para 85.   |
| 271        | Ian        | Scargill    | Oxford Green Belt Network                   | Paragraph                          | B.257                              | Oxford Green Belt                              | Support the reference to the Kidlington Gap in particular; the gap is especially vulnerable in the vicinity of the Gosford Grain silo and between Pear Tree and Yarnton.   |
| 24         | Suzanne    | Bangert     | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Mr & Mrs P Ashworth | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                              | Policy should allow for small-scale (non-strategic) development in rural areas where there is a defined need and not cause harm to the Green belt. South Glos Core Strategy Examination report found that there should be more flexibility for villages to accommodate small scale development changes. New policy wording supplied. |
| 24         | Suzanne    | Bangert     | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Mr & Mrs P Ashworth | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                              | Green Belt Boundary at Merton should be altered to reflect well defined boundaries as per the NPPF para 85 & 86. Re-align to follow course of the Motorway. Map attached of proposed boundary.   |
| 82         | David      | Coates      | Kingerlee Homes                             | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                              | Object to Policy ESD.14, should be amended to reflect the requirements for a small scale boundary review as a requirement to achieve sustainable settlements as a consequence of economic growth.  |
| 100        | Suzi       | Coyne       | Suzi Coyne Planning / Worton Farms Ltd      | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                              | Land at Worton farm should be removed from the Local Green Space designation (Green Belt?).  |
| 100        | Suzi       | Coyne       | Suzi Coyne Planning / Worton Farms Ltd      | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                              | Land at Worton farm should be removed from the Local Green Space designation (Green Belt?).  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Object to ESD14 Oxford Green Belt and the basis that the evidence base does not explicitly state 'exceptional circumstances' exist for a Green Belt Review. Exceptional circumstances include; proposal is within the national, regional and local interest, urgent economic need, the limited harm to the Green Belt is outweighed by economic benefits and that a small scale local review will produce defensible, permanent Green Belt Boundary. Amendment suggested,        |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Supported  |
| 185        | Michael    | Lea         | Jones Land LaSalle / Bonhams 1793 Ltd                           | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Support approach to Green Belt review in very exceptional circumstances.   |
| 190        | Nik        | Lyzba       | JPPC / Oxford University Press                                  | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Support limited review of Green Belt at Langford Lane. And should be reflected in Policy ESD14 and tie in with Policy Kidlington 1. Area of search should be widened to include the North West in order to not restrict unreasonably the area subject to review.   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward                                     | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Should rectify the anomaly where all proposals within the Green Belt need to preserve the open character of the Belt, even when the proposal is for infill within villages where this is patently impossible.  |
| 252        | Dennis     | Price       |   | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Green belt should be protected.  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council                          | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Supports Green Belt Protection   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council                          | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Objects to the relocation of Chilterns sidings into the Green Belt at Water Eaton  |
| 286        | Emily      | Sparrow     | JPPC / Merton College   | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Merton College (Oxford) maintain there is a requirement to undertake a review of the Oxford Green Belt to accommodate future growth. No evidence or justification to why a review of the Green Belt has not been carried out. NPPF states Local Plan should be prepared on the basis of an up to date evidence base. Green Belt review should focus on sustainable locations at Kidlington, Yarnton & Begbroke. Dispersal of development beyond the Green belt is unsustainable. |
| 291        | Neville    | Surtees     | Barton Willmore / J A Pye Ltd                                   | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                   | Support aim to undertake a Limited Green Belt Review. Review should be expanded to include residential land.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)       | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District   | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                         | Support. Precise boundary 'inset' villages should be clarified.  |
| 318        | Chris      | Wardley     | The Inland Waterways Association   | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                         | Review of Green Belt should extend to the boundaries of the Oxford Canal at Kidlington.  |
| 330        | Kiran      | Williams    | BNP Paribas Real Estate UK Ltd / Cawdor Capital Ltd  | Policy                             | ESD.14                             | Oxford Green Belt                         | Small scale review of the Oxford Green Belt should include Land Off Camp Road, Upper Heyford.  |
| 40         | Geoff      | Bolton      | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd  | Para                               | B.258-261                          | Policy ESD.15: Green Boundaries to Growth | Objects to the designation of much of the Broughton Road site as a green buffer. The policy and related designation on the Proposals Map should be deleted and replaced with a new policy relating to areas of separation. The 'green buffer' surrounding most of Banbury is a new and arbitrary designation and not based on any evidence. A detailed landscape assessment is required. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council   | Paragraph                          | B.258                              | Policy ESD.15: Green Boundaries to Growth | Fails to ensure that buffer zones are required to maintain the distinctive identity between villages as well as between Banbury and its surrounding villages.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council   | Paragraph                          | B.260                              | Policy ESD.15: Green Boundaries to Growth | The Green Buffer zone indicated at Bodicote suggests that it has been absorbed into Banbury and cannot as consequence take its share o the proposed rural homes allocation under C234. This would mean a disproportionate and unfair effect on the other villages.   |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones       | Marrons / Hallam Land Management   | Paragraph                          | B.260                              | Policy ESD.15: Green Boundaries to Growth | The Green Buffer zone indicated at Bodicote suggests that it has been absorbed into Banbury and cannot as consequence take its share of the proposed rural homes allocation under C234. This would mean a disproportionate and unfair effect on the other villages.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | B.260                              | Policy ESD.15: Green Boundaries to Growth | The alleged historical and ecological significance of Salt Way is not supported by evidence nor the landscape sensitivity around Banbury.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations                     | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)       | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|----------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 306        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |                                   | Paragraph                          | B.261                              | Policy ESD.15: Green Boundaries to Growth | Objection to the reduction of the Green Buffer at Launton from draft Plan stage as it in effect allows Launton to be coalesced.   |
| 38         | Rachael        | Blakey      | Bucknell Parish Council           | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth                | The status of these is not clear  |
| 40         | Geoff          | Bolton      | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth                | Objects to the designation of much of the Broughton Road site as a green buffer. The policy and related designation on the Proposals Map should be deleted and replaced with a new policy relating to areas of separation. The 'green buffer' surrounding most of Banbury is a new and arbitrary designation and not based on any evidence. A detailed landscape assessment is required.                  |
| 42         | John           | Braithwaite | South Newington Parish Council    | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth                | Support Green Buffers between Banbury and Bicester and nearby villages  |
| 43         | Rowland        | Bratt       |                                   | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth                | Objection to Green Buffer at Cotefield Farm, Bodicote on the grounds that it fails to prevent coalescence with existing settlement given development at Bankside Phase 1 and housing allocations at Banbury 12 & 4. Proposed Green Buffer is not land that is of valuable landscape of historic significance. This view is supported by recent Planning Application and Appeal decision on adjacent site. |
| 43         | Rowland        | Bratt       |                                   | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth                | Proposed Green Buffer provides limited scope for the growth of Bodicote given its allocation for 500 new homes as a Category A village within the Plan.   |
| 43         | Rowland        | Bratt       |                                   | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth                | Green Buffer policy is not supported by the NPPF. The NPPF instead refers to Local Green Spaces which should be in Local Character and not an extensive track of land. Appears policy is intended to be a Green Belt without following the correct process.   |
| 49         | Kathryn        | Brown       | Stoke Lyne Parish Council         | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth                | Concerned about the nature of the proposed "buffer zones", specifically between Bucknell and NW Bicester housing estate. What is its purpose? Would it be of any use for residents?   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 53         | Peter      | Brown       | Drayton Parish Council                       | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Support concept of Green Boundaries, concern raised at their width which is not considered wide enough on higher ground, for example at Drayton.  |
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Policy not justified by evidence. Existing Countryside policy already protects land identified in the Green Buffer. Note that land at Warwick Road has high landscape capacity to accommodate development within Halcrow Study. Land at Warwick Road should be excluded from Policy Area.   |
| 63         | Peter      | Burrows     | Adderbury Conservation Action Group          | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | The definition of a "green boundary" needs to be included; the NPPF only defines Green Belt and Green space. The concept of an area between conurbations which remains undeveloped is supported but it needs to be observed.  |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | No objection to part of the Pringles Fields forming part of the Green Buffer.   |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council                    | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | No Green Boundary has been proposed for Wendlebury to protect it from the proposed relief road or to protect it from further development of Bicester towards the M40 along the A41.   |
| 94         | John       | Colegrave   |  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Object to the proposed Green Buffer Zone adjacent Salt Way on the grounds that the nearest village to the south of the farm is Bloxham and therefore the matter of coalescence does not arise. Land at Salt Way is farm land and is therefore neither of high landscape nor historic value. |
| 94         | John       | Colegrave   |  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Object to the proposed Green Buffer Zone adjacent Salt Way on the grounds that the nearest village to the south of the farm is Bloxham and therefore the matter of coalescence does not arise.  |
| 94         | John       | Colegrave   |  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Green Buffer policy is not supported by the NPPF. The NPPF instead refers to Local Green Spaces which should be in Local Character and not an extensive track of land. Appears policy is intended to be a Green Belt without following the correct process.                                 |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 102        | Sam        | Croft       | RPS Planning & Development / Banner Homes Ltd / Rowland Bratt | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Policy is inappropriate and conflicts with Policy Villages 1 & 2 which direct growth to Bodicote. Policy conflicts with the Council's landscape evidence base. Delete policy and rely on Policy ESD.13 instead. |
| 112        | Keith      | Dixon       | Launton Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Supports green boundaries to growth   |
| 112        | Keith      | Dixon       | Launton Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Objects as the Green Buffers should be properly defined   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                                      | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | NPPF does not define a Green Boundary. This policy does not appear to be in accordance with law and it is therefore illegal.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                                      | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | NPPF does not define a Green Boundary. This policy does not appear to be in accordance with law and it is therefore illegal.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                                      | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Supported - subject to comments on not being legally compliant and soundness  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | There is no mention of Green Buffers in the NPPF. The Green Infrastructure should be used in maintaining discreet boundaries to villages.   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | NPPF does not define a Green Boundaries . The only reference is to Green Infrastructure.  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Supported - subject to qualification previously mentioned   |
| 158        | Chris      | Hone        | CPRE Banbury District   | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | CPRE support the provision of green buffers.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council           | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Support principle of ESD.15 as a method of constraining growth. Unclear how policy can be delivered when land is in the control of developers or landowners who are not willing to cooperate. Examples of problems, developers are not interested in the gap between Hanwell and Banbury 5 where Green Buffer is proposed and it is misleading to suggest physical buffers such as woodland can be expected. Green Buffer is missing from north-west of site Banbury 2 West of Southam Road adjacent the cemetery as it does not seem to provide a continuous buffer for the urban boundary. Green Buffer should be reassessed. |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                                  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Support principle of ESD.15 as a method of constraining growth. Unclear how policy can be delivered when land is in the control of developers or landowners who are not willing to cooperate. Examples of problems, developers are not interested in the gap between Hanwell and Banbury 5 where Green Buffer is proposed and it is misleading to suggest physical buffers such as woodland can be expected. Green Buffer is missing from north-west of site Banbury 2 West of Southam Road adjacent the cemetery as it does not seem to provide a continuous buffer for the urban boundary. Green Buffer should be reassessed. |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                                  | SA                                 | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Not in this context.  |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones       | Marrons / Hallam Land Management | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Policy ESD.15 replicates the role of Policy ESD.13 and is therefore redundant. Policy constrains long term housing growth. Not based on evidence. Delete policy.  |
| 177        | Vic        | Keeble      | Chesterton Parish Council        | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Support proposed Green Buffer zone. Query extent of Buffer Zone at Gagle Brook flood plain - inconsistent with Bicester Master Plan. Does it include flood plain? CDC should discuss with the Parish Council the extent of the 'Community Woodland'.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | No evidence in support of Green Buffers. Buffers not related to surrounding villages or proposed new development. Evidence suggests Crouch Hill is subject to landscape sensitivity and not Salt Way. Disagree with analysis that Salt Way is Historic or has a heritage value. Delete Policy and map reference.  |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Support policy.   |
| 189        | David      | Keene         | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Policy is unjustified. False expectations for residents. Duplicate policy layers. Banbury must continue to expand. Policy ESD.13 provides sufficient protection. Delete policy.   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Should be a Green Boundary defined for Upper Heyford and villages would benefit from specifying a village envelope to clarify what is in the village and what is countryside.   |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister    | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Justification for Green Buffers at Banbury is unclear. Avoiding coalescence with villages is unnecessary for Banbury except for at Bodicote which is allocated for growth at Bankside Ph1 and Banbury 4 and 12. There is no evidence in terms for protection of landscape features at Crouch Hill at Saltway. Insufficient evidence of the historic environment. Approach will constrain growth. Policy should be deleted and amended from proposals map. |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey     | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Support principle of Policy.  |
| 241        | Jane       | Olds          | Stratton Audley Parish Council   | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Supports the zoning of the quarry areas as Local Wildlife site and the adjacent Landscape Buffer Zone between Stratton Audley and RAF Bicester  |
| 252        | Dennis     | Price         |  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Green Buffer at Bicester is too narrow.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council     | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Need to avoid coalescence is supported. Green buffers will enable the town to remain within an attractive setting and preserve historic boundaries such as the Salt Way, features such as Crouch Hill and retain the independence of nearby villages such as Hanwell.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology            | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Woodland should not be planted without first assessing existing biodiversity value. Green Buffers should be retained in perpetuity and management mechanisms put in place.  |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Green Buffer at South of Salt way - Support from expanding further.   |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Expand Green Buffer around Bodicote to include recreation ground and country park. See Map 229.   |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council  | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Bodicote-Bankside Site - extend green buffer across north-eastern part of the site, keep recreation and country park clearly separated.   |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Note difference in boundaries between Local Plan map and Bicester Masterplan. Masterplan includes intensive chicken farm and a group of residential dwellings   |
| 297        | Robert     | Thompson    |                          | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Object to proposed Buffer Zone along the Southern and Western edge of Banbury. Buffer zone does not prevent coalescence with the village of Broughton as suggested, given its distance (2km). Landscape to the west of Banbury is not of any significant value and therefore does not require protection. Position of Banbury besides the Motorway to the East suggest future growth will be to the West of the town and therefore no long term requirement for a Buffer Zone. Housing need in the short term is expected to add additional pressure for growth in this location. |
| 297        | Robert     | Thompson    |                          | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | The proposed Green Buffer at Broughton does not comply with the definition of Local Green Spaces within the NPPF as they should endure beyond the end of the Plan period and should be special to local communities.  |
| 298        | Laurence   | Todd        |                          | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth          | Supports Green Boundaries to growth   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations                  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)    | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|----------------|-------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 299        | Bruce          | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District         | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth             | Unclear why Green Buffer has not been applied to Wendlebury?  |
| 307        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |                                | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth             | Supporting wording that Green Buffer will be kept free from built development.  |
| 380        | Brian          | Little      | Local History Group            | Policy                             | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth             | Favour a north-south zone rather than a series of buffers.  |
| 308        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |                                | Paragraph                          | B.263                              | The Character of the Built Environment | Should include RAF Bicester Airfield & Upper Heyford Airfield.  |
| 279        | Martin         | Small       | English Heritage               | Paragraph                          | B.264                              | The Character of the Built Environment | EH supports para B.264 in principle. However, EH would welcome an explanation of why the historic environment is a resource for the District, a mention of conservation area appraisals and management plans and the redrafting of the second sentence as follows: ' Heritage assets (including designated and undesignated assets) form part of the ...' |
| 279        | Martin         | Small       | English Heritage               | Paragraph                          | B.267-B.268                        | The Character of the Built Environment | EH supports paragraphs B.267 and B.268  |
| 42         | John           | Braithwaite | South Newington Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | Support requirement for high quality design especially when bordering conservation areas or affecting historic or landscape features.   |
| 53         | Peter          | Brown       | Drayton Parish Council         | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | Support concept of Green Boundaries, concern raised at their width which is not considered wide enough on higher ground, for example at Drayton.  |
| 132        | Theresa        | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council       | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character to the built Environment | Supported   |
| 134        | Theresa        | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council         | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character to the built Environment | Agree   |
| 158        | Chris          | Hone        | CPRE Banbury District          | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | The Conservation and Urban Design Strategy should be incorporated into the Local Plan so that both run concurrently for the Local Plan period. Sustainable construction, the use of locally distinctive materials and design is commended.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)    | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward            | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | Add preserving and enhancing the character and appearance of Conservation Areas.  |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd     | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | Support thrust of Policy. Should refer to outline or detailed planning application. Should not be applied to Strategic Allocations which have their own policies.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                   | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | It is pleasing to note that the Local Plan recognises the importance of the individual character of the district's urban centres and aims to protect it.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology                      | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | Change title. Additional policy wording supplied.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                          | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | Support policy.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | Sustainable access to and from development. Compliant with LTP3.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                       | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | EH supports the content of Policy ESD 16 but considers it does not go far enough to meet the requirements of the NPPF in paras. 126 and 156. The Historic environment needs to be a clear fundamental element of the policy. EH proposes changes to the policy and offers to work with the District Council to render the policy compliant with the NPPF. |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of Built the Environment | Buildings in Kidlington need assessing for protection   |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council               | Policy                             | ESD.16                             | The Character of the Built Environment | Policy conflicts with BSC.2 & BSC4. With respect of Design Codes - section should be re-written to T&PC specific input.   |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                            | Paragraph                          | B.272                              | The Character of the Built Environment | Urges caution in respect of use of manual for streets as local character could be lost  |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                            | Paragraph                          | B.272                              | The Character of the Built Environment | Supports this paragraph   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency                     | Paragraph                          | B.274                              | Policy ESD.17: The Oxford Canal        | Include 'water quality' alongside 'landscape, ecological and recreational resource.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council    | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | Supported   |
| 144        | Jane       | Hennell       | Canal and River Trust       | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | ESD17 conflicts with ESD18. The canal towpath is not suitable for use by horse riders and due to restricted width, historic operational structures may not be suitable without significant improvement and investment. May also conflict with conservation area designation and result in conflict between users. Request ESD17 is amended to read "protect and enhance" and either remove the term horse rider or insert horse riders where appropriate.   |
| 144        | Jane       | Hennell       | Canal and River Trust       | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | Amend the policy to allow for greater flexibility and the location of facilities not restricted to within and immediately adjacent to settlements. The restriction is ok for recreation facilities for users of the canal but such sites may not be suitable for boating facilities and moorings. These are dependent on being next to the canal, topography, distance between facilities and land values. Amend the policy to refer to residential moorings or insert a new policy on residential moorings and boating facilities. The Trust would like to advise on wording to ensure consistency with their national policy. |
| 162        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                             | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | Protection of Oxford Canal should cover towpath and hedgerows.  |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | The towpath is not a right of way for walkers and cyclists and riders have never had the right to use it.   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran        | Environment Agency          | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | Welcome this policy   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council        | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | Support the designation of the Canal as a Conservation Area. Attention should be given to maximising the visual appearance of the Canal as it passes through Banbury's town centre. Castle Quay does not embrace the Canal and it is a missed opportunity.  |
| 257        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council   | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | Include towpath and hedgerows.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Ecology               | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | Policy should refer to protect and enhance biodiversity,  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | Wording suggested. Compliant with LTP3.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                       | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | EH supports Policy ESD17.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | It is not clear who is responsible for the Canal now that British Waterways doesn't exist.  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | ESD.17                             | The Oxford Canal                    | The Local Plan is not clear on how it will deal with the proposal for a marina north of Kings bridge  |
| 3          | Alec       | Arrol       | Kennet Properties / Thames Water       | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | The policy is not explicit as to how designations for green infrastructure are annotated in the Banbury Proposals Map (Appendix 5). KPL assumes that the policy relates to the designations in the Key Proposals Map of "existing green spaces" and "new green space/parks and managed environmental space". There is no explanation as to how sites have been chosen .         |
| 38         | Rachael    | Blakey      | Bucknell Parish Council                | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | A network of green spaces should be introduced at Bicester  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council               | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | Supported   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                 | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | Agree   |
| 144        | Jane       | Hennell     | Canal and River Trust                  | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green infrastructure                | The Trust welcome ESD18 but is concerned that the canal is being promoted for use by horse riders as it may not be possible or desirable. It is not clear if maintenance means retention of the existing GI or the upkeep of the network in the future. The Trust suggest GI is maintained as part of a development proposal. Further definition needs to be given in the text. |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency                     | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | Support the wording of this policy. Particular support green infrastructure being maintained whilst protecting 'sites of importance for nature conservation'.   |
| 241        | Jane       | Olds        | Stratton Audley Parish Council         | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | Strongly supports the proposal for a bridleway which circumnavigates the airfield from Audley to Launton Road roundabout  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                   | Policy                             | ESD18                              | Green Infrastructure                | Supports forming a green link to create a connected network of green infrastructure through the town.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                          | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | Support.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | Add 'Sustainable'   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 279        | Martin     | Small         | English Heritage                             | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | Heritage assets can also form part of a green infrastructure network. Policy ESD 16 could be referenced within Policy ESD18.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council       | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | There is no need for more Green infrastructure   |
| 318        | Chris      | Wardley       | The Inland Waterways Association             | Policy                             | ESD.18                             | Green Infrastructure                | Policy should recognise the role of the canal as Green Infrastructure.   |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care          | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association | Paragraph                          | C.1                                | Introduction                        | Supported.   |
| 67         | Gemma      | Care          | Barton Willmore / Bovis Homes                | Paragraph                          | C.1                                | Introduction                        | Support approach.  |
| 133        | Theresa    | Goss          | Milcombe Parish Council                      | Theme                              | Theme C                            | Policies for Cherwell Places        | Agree with ensuring sustainable development. Not sure that CDC does this in the rural areas. Agree with review of Green Buffer areas as well as Kidlington. It is hoped that both (Banbury and Bicester) will provide employment - not just retail but manufacturing industries as well. It is imperative that CDC stick to its policy regarding villages and rural areas. |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council       | Policies for Cherwells Places      | Policies for Cherwells Places      | Policies for Cherwells Places       | Support the new hospital for Bicester  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council       | Policies for Cherwells Places      | Policies for Cherwells Places      | Policies for Cherwells Places       | The Horton Hospital is a useful facility   |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care          | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association | Paragraph                          | C.3                                | Introduction                        | Support Bicester Masterplan.   |
| 67         | Gemma      | Care          | Barton Willmore / Bovis Homes                | Paragraph                          | C.3                                | Introduction                        | Support the use of Masterplans for Banbury & Bicester.   |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards       | Corylus Ltd                                  | Paragraph                          | C.5                                | Policies for Cherwell's Places      | Supports the aim for living not dormitory towns  |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care          | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association | Paragraph                          | C.6                                | Introduction                        | Support - Full integration of new business and residential areas. Securing mixed use development.  |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | Paragraph                          | C.6                                | Introduction                        | Minor change.  |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                    | Section                            | C.6                                | Introduction                        | Support selective Green Belt Review at area identified on the map for up to 11.3ha of employment land. Review should also include housing to support new jobs. Concern that employment only allocation will lead to in commuting. Wording supplied.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 317        | Robert     | Tustain     |   | Section                            | C.6                                | Banbury                             | Suggest employment allocations should be for small / medium sized businesses and not distribution outlets.  |
| 22         | Tony       | Baldry MP   |   | Other                              | C.2                                | Bicester                            | Bicester should seek to become a 'garden city'. The availability of significant amounts of former MOD land provides the opportunity for a coherent and sensible strategy.   |
| 22         | Tony       | Baldry MP   |   | Other                              | C.2                                | Bicester                            | A considerably amount of new housing is likely to be built and this needs to be matched by opportunities for jobs in and around Bicester and the greatest 'buy-in' involvement of residents in designing what will continue to be the faster growing town in the country. |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association                    | Paragraph                          | C.7                                | Bicester                            | Support listed objectives. Comply with NPPF.  |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw    | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON)                               | Paragraph                          | C.7                                | Bicester                            | Object to expansion at Bicester Village. Delete Reference   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | C.7                                | Bicester                            | Support Bicester Masterplan but concerned that growth in the North West is in the wrong location, that the eco-development is appropriately phased and the South East Bicester Relief Road is supported.  |
| 166        | Ben        | Jackson     | Bicester Chamber  | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester                            | The impact of growth at Bicester on the surrounding villages including Upper Heyford, and the impact of developing Upper Heyford on Bicester, could be better represented in the Local Plan.  |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward                                     | Paragraph                          | C.2                                | Bicester                            | Policies are silent on proposed town boundaries for Bicester. It would be useful to set up limits to development.   |
| 200        | Richard    | McCulloch   |   | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester                            | Traffic implications of development at Bicester have not been adequately assessed and in particular the wider network, the impact on surrounding villages, the operation of M4 Junction 10 and the relationship with Oxford as a commuter town.                           |
| 242        | Jane       | Olds        | Caversfield Parish Council                                      | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester                            | Particular concern with the junction of Howes Lane and Bucknell Road, which will not be appropriate or usable in terms of a ring road and in its current state could have a detrimental effect on the village.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 243        | Placi      | O'Neil-Espejo | Bicester Vision              | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester                            | <p>There is little reference to the regeneration of existing employment areas and potential rejuvenation of employment estates. CDC list of sectors desirable to concentrate upon is too restrictive. Areas of land allocated for employment use should not be restricted to certain classes of employment but should be annotated as Employment Zones'.</p> <p>Bicester should have a similar LDO to Science Vale UK to achieve a clear presumption for development and increased employment. There is not sufficient land allocated for employment and no mention of the employment catchment area which could fulfil some employment requirements.</p> |
| 252        | Dennis     | Price         |                              | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester                            | Concern of increased traffic - rat running  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester                            | <p>All Strategic site should consider; master plan, vehicle access arrangements, residential layouts, commercial specifications, strategic improvements, pedestrians and cycle routes, public transport links, drainage, rights of way, transport infrastructure. Car &amp; Cycle standards. Transport Assessment /Transport Plan. Pedestrian and safety audits. S106 / S278 Agreements. Construction traffic management plan. Routing agreement.</p>   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester                            | <p>List of town needs should list transport. South East relief will enable sustainable movement in the direction of the town. Improvements to Junction 9 M40 should be added to list of initiatives. Section on transport need should include improving the connectivity and attractiveness of pedestrian, cycle and public transport networks across Bicester. Benefits need to be clearer. New development will maximise opportunities to create an efficient and attractive public transport network within the town. Section should mention Garden City concept. Expand reference to EWR - electrification plans.</p>                                 |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                 | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport  | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester                            | Spelling & typo's. Inconsistent - town centre taking the focus of growth. Unclear text regarding town centre cores.   |
| 333        | Rachel     | Williams    | Oxford City Council           | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester Employment development     | The City Council has some concerns about the shift in the type of employment provision at Bicester e.g. to the knowledge economy as this overlaps significantly with the key sectors of the city's economy.   |
| 333        | Rachel     | Williams    | Oxford City Council           | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester Village                    | Future growth in the short term is being directed towards Bicester Village, an out of town centre location, which appears contrary to the NPPF advice which seeks to direct such growth to town centres. The City Council is concerned that the proposed expansion at Bicester Village could seriously impact on the potential of the Westgate shopping centre redevelopment in Oxford. |
| 333        | Rachel     | Williams    | Oxford City Council           | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester transport implications     | The City Council wish to be reassured that adequate infrastructure funding will be in place to mitigate the impact of growth at Bicester e.g. on the A34. A programme of measures and funding schemes should be identified to properly mitigate any additional demand arising from future housing and jobs growth.  |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police    | Paragraph                          | C.7                                | C.2 Bicester                        | Support strategic objectives. Suggest amendment to bullet point a safe and caring community.  |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police    | Section                            | C.2                                | Bicester                            | Thames Valley Police support the Masterplan process as a targeted form of community engagement. Object to the use of the Masterplan as an SPD as it contains policy consideration appropriate in the Local Plan. For Example the proposed road. Masterplan should also not be use to add unnecessary financial burdens. Should form part of the Local Plan evidence base.               |
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney     | BioRegional Development Group | Paragraph                          | C.7                                | C.2 Bicester                        | Scope for greater integration. NW Bicester site with the rest of the town, complementary innovation in sustainable development - retro fitting etc.. Extending the towns tourism offer through complementary attractions. E.g. RAF Bicester. Securing sustainable growth through new job opportunities,   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                    | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 66         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association                    | Paragraph                          | C.8                                | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester  | Para C.8 - C.12 - Agree with key challenges.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | C.8                                | Meeting the Challenges of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester | Paragraph C.8 should reference Oxford and Silverstone.                                     |
| 166        | Ben        | Jackson     | Bicester Chamber  | Paragraph                          | C.8                                | Developing a sustainable economy                                       | Supports recognition of specialist skills that exist in Bicester                           |
| 252        | Dennis     | Price       |   | Section                            | C.8                                | Bicester   | Development at Bicester will compound flooding at Otmoor - issue insufficiently addressed. |
| 317        | Robert     | Tustain     |   | Section                            | C.8                                | Bicester   | Suggest Free short term parking and pay for long term.                                     |
| 214        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Albion Land PLC                                     | Paragraph                          | C.11                               | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester  | Objection. Failure to understand market Place.   |
| 166        | Ben        | Jackson     | Bicester Chamber  | Paragraph                          | C.12                               | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester  | Welcomes the potential for developing the low carbon skills area                           |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association                    | Paragraph                          | C.13                               | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester  | Par C.13 - C.24 - Agree with statements.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                         | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 166        | Ben        | Jackson     | Bicester Chamber                      | Paragraph                          | C13                                | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester | The need to balance employment land with the increase in houses is supported but the plan should not be overly prescriptive on types and uses.   |
| 214        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Albion Land PLC           | Paragraph                          | C.13                               | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester | Objection. Failure to understand market Place.   |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw    | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON)     | Paragraph                          | C.14                               | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester | Object to expansion at Bicester Village on the grounds that as a major tourist attraction it is in an unsustainable location and inconsistent with the objectives of the Eco-town. Delete reference. |
| 377        | Richard    | Foot        | GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) | Paragraph                          | C.14                               | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester | Support promotion of the sustainable expansion of Bicester Village.  |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council             | Paragraph                          | C.15                               | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester | No mention of what nature or form the appropriate mitigation for Wendlebury would form in the Local Plan. The Masterplan does not mention Wendlebury at all.   |
| 377        | Richard    | Foot        | GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) | Paragraph                          | C.15                               | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester | Support improved links Bicester Village and Town Centre . Better access by Train through Evergreen 3 project.  |
| 378        | Richard    | Foot        | GVA / Bicester Business Park          | Paragraph                          | C.15                               | C.2 Bicester  | Support improved links between Bicester Business Park, Bicester Village and Town Centre . Better access by Train through Evergreen 3 project.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                    | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 340        | Dominic    | Woodfield   | Bioscan   | Paragraph                          | C.17                               | Meeting the Challenge of Building a Sustainable Community in Bicester  | Opportunity to increase green space at Gavray Drive.  |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police                                      | Paragraph                          | C.17                               | Meeting the Challenges of Building a Sustainable Community in Bicester | Additional challenge suggested. Police infrastructure.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | C.19                               | Meeting the Challenges of Building a Sustainable Community in Bicester | Paragraph C.19 should put greater emphasis in respect of connectivity to the South and the Oxford Regional Hub. Amendment suggested.  |
| 166        | Ben        | Jackson     | Bicester Chamber  | Paragraph                          | C.19                               | Meeting the Challenges of Building a Sustainable Community in Bicester | The durability of the town centre is under increasing pressure from out of town/edge of town retail outlets and internet shopping. The impact of proposals should be considered not just on the town centre but on the cumulative effect. |
| 340        | Dominic    | Woodfield   | Bioscan   | Paragraph                          | C.21                               | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Bicester  | Opportunity to increase Green Infrastructure.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology   | Paragraph                          | C.22                               | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Bicester  | Challenges should list archaeological deposits. Should also list Para C.122 bullet point 1.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                    | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology   | Paragraph                          | C.22                               | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Bicester  | SACs are designated for European Infrastructure and should be protected, Green Infrastructure can contribute towards reducing deprivation, promoting healthy living and reducing obesity. |
| 340        | Dominic    | Woodfield   | Bioscan   | Paragraph                          | C.22 First Bullet                  | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Bicester  | Concern regarding the severing effect of SE Ring Road. Suggest a more co-ordinated Green Infrastructure Strategy.   |
| 340        | Dominic    | Woodfield   | Bioscan   | Paragraph                          | C.22 Third Bullet                  | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Bicester  | Concern that development at Gavray Drive includes the destruction of a Local Wildlife site. Suggest change to reserved matters.   |
| 340        | Dominic    | Woodfield   | Bioscan   | Paragraph                          | C.22 Forth Bullet                  | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Bicester  | See Green Infrastructure comment  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | C.24                               | Meeting the Challenges of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Bicester | Support para C.24   |
| 340        | Dominic    | Woodfield   | Bioscan   | Paragraph                          | C.24 First & Third Bullet          | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Bicester  | See Green Infrastructure comment  |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association                    | Paragraph                          | C.25                               | Bicester in 2031   | Broadly supported.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|----------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 377        | Richard        | Foot        | GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village)                           | Paragraph                          | C.25                               | Bicester in 2031                    | Support expansion of Bicester Village and Town Centre as a more important retail and leisure centre as part of the improvement to Bicester's self sustaining economy.   |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations                          | Paragraph                          | C.26                               | Bicester in 2031                    | Housing figure 6,997 does not match housing trajectory 6,579. NW Bicester has some way to go before completed. Site is expected to contribute to strategic infrastructure.  |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                                    | Paragraph                          | C.26                               | Bicester in 2031                    | New aspiration - sustainable transport network. Wording supplied.   |
| 309        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |   | Paragraph                          | C.28                               | Bicester in 2031                    | Should refer to new Hospital at Bicester.   |
| 340        | Dominic        | Woodfield   | Bioscan   | Paragraph                          | C.28                               | Bicester in 2031                    | See Green Infrastructure comment  |
| 340        | Dominic        | Woodfield   | Bioscan   | Paragraph                          | C.30                               | What will happen and where          | Suggest change to reserved matters.   |
| 107        | Richard        | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | C.42                               | Employment                          | Object to para C.42 should refer to Gateway.  |
| 34         | Carmelle       | Bell        | Thames Water  | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | It is TW understanding that the eco town aims to achieve water neutrality. TW suggests to add new wording requiring liaison with Thames Water and Environment Agency to agree a water strategy with the objective of achieving a water neutral development.   |
| 36         | Reuben         | Bellamy     | CALA Homes Ltd  | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Concern regarding the risk associated with the delivery of few number of strategic sites at Bicester. Failure of 5-year housing land supply requires a 20% buffer brought forward in the Plan period. Preference for smaller sites. Suggest current delivery rate of 680 units against the Council's trajectory of 1,290 unit.            |
| 36         | Reuben         | Bellamy     | CALA Homes Ltd  | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Eco-town site identified after South West RSS Plan published in May 2009. Case therefore for higher growth at Bicester. Question if the Eco-town site is available and deliverable. Will Eco-town criteria prove viable? Significant infrastructure cost e.g. distributor road. Flood zone 2 & 3. Propose a dispersed approach to growth. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                     | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 38         | Rachael    | Blakey      | Bucknell Parish Council           | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Questions who is leading the project. Concern regarding increased traffic, noise and light pollution.   |
| 76         | Diane      | Clarke      | Network Rail                      | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | NR wishes clarification that the appropriate crossing is a footbridge or road bridge crossing to a specification agreed with NR. Level crossing is not acceptable. NR made representations to the planning application on the north east part of Bicester 1 seeking contributions towards railway / station improvements.   |
| 79         | David      | Coates      | Kingerlee Homes                   | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Policy is unclear in respect of the exact infrastructure requirements for the Bicester Eco-town.  |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw    | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | Housing target for Bicester up to 2026 is significantly greater than the South East Regional Plan target. Object to allocation of North West Bicester. Policy does not reflect an aging population and high percentage of over 60s anticipated. Policy Bicester 1 should make provision for housing designed for older people and care homes and recognise that they may have special needs to be met in development. |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw    | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | Object to the proposed development at North West Bicester on the grounds that there is no need for development here within the Plan period, loss of countryside, coalescence of Bucknell, reasonable alternatives have not been considered and failure to meet PDL target. Delete Policy.   |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw    | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | Concern that Eco-town standards will not be met at North West Bicester. Suggest phasing standards more gradually and applying town wide. Delete Policy.   |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw    | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | Object to North West Bicester on the grounds that it is remote from the town centre, existing secondary schools, main employment areas and the stations and linkages are poor. Suggest the Plan outlines improvements to the towns road links and public transport.   |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw    | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | Consider a new Secondary School is required as part of the planned growth and the location and timing should be considered in the Plan.   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 119        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons  | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | Local Plan should reassess design & place shaping principals due to economic climate. Should reflect Garden Suburbs rather than Eco-town principals.   |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman     | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                      | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco Town        | The reduction in houses for the plan period from 5000 to 1794 is welcomed but this site in the rural area outside the existing perimeter road should not be developed.   |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman     | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                      | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco Town        | Planning permission for an exemplar village has been permitted although a masterplan for the whole site has not been delivered. Without the masterplan there seems to be a lack of planned infrastructure to serve this development.   |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman     | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                      | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco Town        | Projections have been based on unrealistic land values and it is not certain where total funding will come from. We must assume that the intention is to ultimately build 5000 houses and financial viability for the whole should be established.   |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman     | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                      | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco Town        | The majority of the site is productive agricultural land with DEFRA and others highlighting the need for food production it is questionable whether this land should be used for housing.  |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman     | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                      | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco Town        | It is unrealistic to expect that the residents of NWB will work in the employment areas proposed. Many will commute away and there will also be commuting to the employment areas when created.  |
| 165        | Antony     | Ives        | Bicester (and villages) Against Sham Eco-town (BASE) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Object to Bicester 1; scale of development over 1,000 acres, no consultation, no environmental appraisal. No study of alternatives, no public Inquiry, would harm Bicester and nearby villages, more vehicles and school children, Eco-town process is unlawful, 100% agricultural farm land, alternative site are available on Brownfield land, South East Plan target is only 5,000 dwg why have more? , additional car trips will be generated, unlikely to be 5,000 new jobs, new shops will damage town centre, Plan devised by Councillors from outside the area, site does not have Minster approval. |
| 165        | Antony     | Ives        | Bicester (and villages) Against Sham Eco-town (BASE) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Site capacity is likely to be near 8,000 homes rather than advertised 5,000 homes given modern density standards.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 165        | Antony     | Ives        | Bicester (and villages) Against Sham Eco-town (BASE) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Concern at scale of Bicester growth - 30,000 unto 60,000 population.  |
| 165        | Antony     | Ives        | Bicester (and villages) Against Sham Eco-town (BASE) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Surplus MOD land preferred for residential growth. Close to railway stations.   |
| 165        | Antony     | Ives        | Bicester (and villages) Against Sham Eco-town (BASE) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | There is no requirement to allocate an eco-town if a better way of meeting future needs exists.   |
| 165        | Antony     | Ives        | Bicester (and villages) Against Sham Eco-town (BASE) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Do not consider Eco-town is viable and therefore undeliverable.   |
| 165        | Antony     | Ives        | Bicester (and villages) Against Sham Eco-town (BASE) | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Insufficient public consultation or public meetings have been carried out by the Council.   |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                                | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Policy is incomplete. Health and Utilities have not been specified. Timing of education provision will be key and needs to be integrated into the build out and delivery of new homes.  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency                                   | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | Not consistent with National Policy (Eco-towns - A supplement to PPS1). If CDC is seeking to future proof the Local Plan should PPS1 eco towns supplement be removed, all elements of the PPS1 eco town policy should be included within the Local Plan policy. |
| 214        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Albion Land PLC                          | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | Object to reference to 'Use Classes: Sustainable Lifestyle Employment as it is not a use class. Should refer to B1, B2 & B8.  |
| 214        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Albion Land PLC                          | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | Policy is too prescriptive re design & jobs created.  |
| 231        | Steven     | Neal        | Boyer Planning / Redrow Homes & Wates Developments   | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Concern at the early delivery of site.  |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency                                      | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Broadly supportive of Eco-town development have concerns as to the operation of M40 Junctions 9 & 10 when Eco-town is developed. Minor wording changes suggested.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name    | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|----------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 261        | Michael    | Richards (Rtd) | Rep form                               | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Objection to the mixed use housing and employment allocation at Site R2 as it was previously allocated green space / eco-town housing in the 2009 Eco-town Plan. Land is unsuitable for employment uses (Business / Warehouse) as roads and infrastructure are not suitable. Consider western boundary of allocation is arbitrary and has not been based on sound Planning arguments. Suggest any development in this location is sympathetically designed to respect existing properties, Site R2 should be residential only and should reflect Farrells document June 2009. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round          | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | School at heart of community  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round          | OCC - Archaeology                      | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Potential for archaeological deposits should be should be noted. Wording supplied.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round          | OCC - Ecology                          | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Existing habitats should also be protected. Does Code Level 6 require high quality biodiversity mitigation, compensation and enhancement. Masterplanning exercise should consider biodiversity.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round          | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Growth should be concentrated near B4030, B4100 & A4095. Should mention the emphasis on sustainable modes including public transport. Should be more than one bridge / sub way to cross railway line. Effective movement strategy required. Connectivity to existing town important. Commercially self sustaining service. LTP3 refers to Rapid Bus Route. 4th Bullet point should be removed.  |
| 273        | Kate       | Skingley       | David Lock Associates                  | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Gallagher Estates as landowner support Policy Bicester 1 as deliverable and contributing to the District's Housing supply.  |
| 274        | Tom        | Smailes        | Kemp & Kemp / Leda Properties          | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Discrepancy between Bicester 1 & Bicester Plan in respect of housing provision.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                 | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage              | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Town        | It will be important to consider impacts (positive and negative), upon the wider area to be in accordance with NPPF paras 126, 128, 129 and 138. Add new principle: 'Retention of and respect for the historic significance of heritage assets within and adjacent to the development area, particularly the Grade II listed structures at Hinley Farm and Home Farmhouse, the Grade II* listed church of St Lawrence at Caversfield, the historic town centre and RAF Bicester.   |
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion  | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Support identification of North West Bicester. Concern at the level of prescriptive detail within policy. Insufficient flexibility. Further work required regarding inter-relationship between strategic sites and infrastructure.   |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police    | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Evidence base appears to be missing. Policy is vague in many areas including employment provision. Question what sustainable lifestyle employment is? Masterplan should demonstrate how the eco-town standards set in the Eco-town PPS will be achieved. Education provision is unclear and should be based on up to date population projections. Little guidance on health, access and movement & utilities. Code level 6 is unjustified. Not viable or deliverable. Most of the design principles are general and not site specific. One job opportunity per new dwelling. |
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney     | BioRegional Development Group | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Reference to Garden City should be expanded. Perhaps Garden Suburb is more appropriate given its size, mix of uses and residential character. This may not be appropriate to the level of innovation and ambition the project presents. Tension between Eco-town and garden cities concepts are not resolved i.e. focus on sustainability or environmental quality. Title should go beyond location and instead communicate its sustainable development intent.  |
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney     | BioRegional Development Group | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | For the avoidance of confusion the development standards should be set out once only and we recommend the following standards to be included or taken from the Eco-town PPS. Standards set out.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney       | BioRegional Development Group   | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Infrastructure Needs - Should refer to code level 5 and not 6. Reflecting Eco-Bicester One Shared Vision.  |
| 381        | Conor      | Moloney       | BioRegional Development Group   | Policy                             | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-town        | Access and Movement - Should state importance of connecting the whole NW Eco-town site with the existing town and town centre.   |
| 1          | A S        | Adams         |                                 | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Objection to 1,900 new homes at Graven Hill (Policy Bicester 2), demand met by Kingsmere and Eco-town development.   |
| 1          | A S        | Adams         |                                 | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Objection to line of proposed ring road and link with existing A41 on the grounds that it does not respect the countryside or the people living in the area. Other issues; increased noise and pollution at Wendlebury, rat running / safety concerns, inevitable coalescence of Wendlebury, Flooding of Wendlebury, additional access to village, further isolation of village between major routes. Suggest link connects at traffic island outside Bicester. Route will impact on Green Belt & will be more expensive to construct due to length. |
| 36         | Reuben     | Bellamy       | CALA Homes Ltd                  | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Delivery concerns. Preference for dispersed growth over strategic sites. Significant infrastructure costs.   |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers      | Wendlebury Parish Council       | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | WPC does not object to the development of Graven Hill into mixed use. However, the criteria that it requires a relief road to enable its development and that the development contributes to the cost are unsustainable along the proposed route. The scheme has not considered the transport movements it will create and their effect on the existing transport network.   |
| 150        | Tim        | Hibbert       |                                 | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Plan is out of date. Map does not show Wendlebury or new ring road. Route options were not made available. Format of questionnaire was predicated to support the proposal. No thought on how to protect rural communities.   |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman       | Middleton Stoney Parish Council | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Welcome the allocation   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society           | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Sites heritage has not been mentioned. Possible National Centre for Military Railways.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                      | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                              | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Policy is incomplete. Health and Utilities have not been specified. Timing of education provision will be key and needs to be integrated into the build out and delivery of new homes. Connectivity of transport links must be maximised. No mention of Evergreen 3 and other rail improvements. Perimeter road needs further investigation to minimise impact on Arcott. |
| 231        | Steven     | Neal        | Boyer Planning / Redrow Homes & Wates Developments | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Concern at the early delivery of site.  |
| 240        | Ellen      | O'Grady     | Defence Infrastructure Organisation                | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | The land uses listed are unduly prescriptive. Land uses A1, A2, A3, A5 ,C1 and D1 should be encouraged. HCA figures indicate that 2070 new jobs could potentially be generated . It is unclear from where the 2470 figure in the Policy was derived.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                       | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 240        | Ellen      | O'Grady     | Defence Infrastructure Organisation | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | <p>Bullet point 8 - MOD recognise the aspiration to provide a perimeter road and can facilitate it within the confines of the site and provide a bridge over the railway sidings but cannot provide infrastructure on land outside the MOD boundary.</p> <p>Bullet point 11 - Redevelopment of Graven Hill shall provide suitable connectivity to the town centre and when appropriate the PROW networks. MOD cannot control access over land outside its ownership. The site cannot link the Bicester Business Park due to land ownership constraints and the railway embankment.</p> <p>Bullet point 14 - Ecological studies have been produced as part of the Graven Hill planning application. MOD or its successors should not have to produce a survey examining the effects of any other developments .</p> <p>Bullet point 21 - The Council has failed to provide sufficient evidence to validate the requirement for self build.</p> <p>Bullet point 22- No justification to require exemplary standards more onerous than those set at national level.</p> <p>Bullet point 25 - A scheme for SuDS can only be developed at Reserved Matters stage. Information is not sufficiently detailed to justify specifications of particular techniques in particular parts of the site.</p> |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency                     | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Policy text suggestion - improvements to local and strategic road network.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                       | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Graven Hill Local Wildlife Site contains Great Crested Newts, a European Protected Species. Ancient Woodland with notable rare species. Concern that new residents will disturb site. Plan should include an Ecological strategy. Bicester Wetland Reserve Local Wildlife Site (located between Bicester 10, 4 & 2) contains many rare species. Cumulative impact of development should be assessed include potential isolation of the LWS and disruption of to the wildlife. Impact on River Ray Conservation Target Area must also be assessed and must not harm the integrity of the ecology.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 274        | Tom        | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Leda Properties   | Map                                | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Amend map to include Langford Park Farm within Bicester 2 Graven Hill.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Proposed new link road between A41 and A4421 will be within the setting of the schedule monument of Alchester Roman Town and may cause substantial harm by isolating the monument from its setting. It is unclear whether the proposal will achieve the aims of NPPF in paragraphs 126 and 132. Further consideration needs to be given to the acceptability or otherwise of this proposed relief road. |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council        | Policy                             | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Policy title is misleading - should be re-titled Ambrosden North West.  |
| 36         | Reuben     | Bellamy     | CALA Homes Ltd                  | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Delivery concerns. Preference for dispersed growth over strategic sites.  |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman     | Middleton Stoney Parish Council | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Welcome the allocation  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council           | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Policy is incomplete. Health and Utilities have not been specified. Timing of education provision will be key and needs to be integrated into the build out and delivery of new homes. Support policy.  |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency                 | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Seek assessment and mitigation on the SRN of Policy.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology               | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Archaeological potential should be noted in Key Site Specific Design.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                   | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Support assessment - site has relatively low ecological value other than small number of hedgerows and trees. Boundary includes rare species of butterflies.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport    | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Delete extend phase 1 bus service. Improve walking and cycle instead.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | EH supports the key principles relating to Chesterton Conservation Area, cultural heritage and archaeology.   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 328        | Tom        | Whild       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Support inclusion of South West Bicester Phase 2 within the Local Plan. Remove farm buildings at Whitelands Farm from the strategic allocation, site subject to of separate planning application and conversion.  |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Object to the inclusion of 2.8ha of B1 employment land - provision has been elsewhere within the Plan. Represents 18 year supply or 35 years at depressed rates. Could cause visual harm to residential development. Lead to over provision. Could reduce housing density infrastructure delivery, reduce viability, housing supply. Negative impact on character and design. |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Object to proposed housing capacity of 650 dwg site has potential for up to 750 dwg. Capacity testing set at 700 dwg. Enable flexibility.   |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Object to requirement for two form entry primary school, analysis demonstrates need for only one form with a site are of 1.2ha. Suggest a continuous site of 1ha for future demand. Masterplan will identify 2.2ha of land but only expect a one form school to be provided.  |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Object to Health - requirement to be confirmed. Countryside are already delivering a 2.69ha health village with sufficient capacity to meet additional demand. Do not consider additional health facilities are required. Insufficient detail.  |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Object to requirement for community centre. Phase 1 provides a community centre within easy walking distance. A centre in phase 2 would likely compete. Suggest a local store operator could be attracted - would only require a population of 2,000-5,000 to support rather than 5,000-10,000.   |
| 328        | Tom        | While       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Support provision of land for a community wood land - object to the sole responsibility for management, preference partnership relationship.  |
| 328        | Tom        | While       | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Policy                             | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2         | Support requirement for Extra care housing / self build. Requirement should form part of affordable housing contribution.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                 | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                    | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 45         | Gemma      | Brickwood   | Turley Associates / Sainsbury | Policy                             | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park   | Unclear definition of appropriate and complementary uses and how these will help to secure office floorspace. Further evidence required.   |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council         | Policy                             | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park   | Support policy. Prestige gateway should reflect high status jobs. Want to see road links improved to further cement position.  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency            | Policy                             | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park   | The policy wording needs to be stronger and be amended to read: 'There will be no built development within flood zone 3'. Ideally would prefer the policy wording to include not having built development in Flood Zone 2 either but appreciate that this is aspiration and not explicitly stated in the NPPF. |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency               | Policy                             | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park   | Seek assessment and mitigation on the SRN of Policy.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                 | Policy                             | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park   | Permission granted - no comment.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport  | Policy                             | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park   | Amendment to text suggested. Policy should be clearer about pedestrian / cyclist access between sites in Southern Bicester.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage              | Policy                             | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park   | EH supports that there should be a staged programme of archaeological work in liaison with statutory consultees.   |
| 367        | P          | Keywood     |                               | Policy                             | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park   | Object to Policy Bicester 4 use class B1 not appropriate in location. Suggest more flexible approach including town centre uses e.g. C1 & A1. Policy conflicts with existing Planning Permission.  |
| 378        | Richard    | Foot        | GVA / Bicester Business Park  | Policy                             | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park   | Wording at para B.62 should be incorporated into Policy Bicester 4. Proposed Tesco application at Bicester Business Park is considered to complement existing Business uses, and will provide a new access road.   |
| 371        | P          | Keywood     |                               | Paragraph                          | C.67                               | Strategic Development: Bicester 5 - Strengthening Bicester Town Centre | Object to para C.67 on the grounds that it is not based on up to date evidence. 2012 Update Retail Study has not yet been published.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                         | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                    | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 45         | Gemma      | Brickwood   | Turley Associates / Sainsbury         | Paragraph                          | C.68                               | Strategic Development: Bicester 5 - Strengthening Bicester Town Centre | Unclear how expansion to Town Centre is justified. Further evidence required.  |
| 166        | Ben        | Jackson     | Bicester Chamber                      | Paragraph                          | C.68                               | Strategic Development: Bicester 5 - Strengthening Bicester Town Centre | This paragraph should be strengthened; a town centre needs to be created to meet the needs of 50,000+ residents as the town grows and to compete with other local retail centres.                        |
| 45         | Gemma      | Brickwood   | Turley Associates / Sainsbury         | Policy                             | Bicester 5                         | Strengthening Bicester Town Centre                                     | Unclear how expansion to Town Centre is justified. Further evidence required.  |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw    | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON)     | Policy                             | Bicester 5                         | Strengthening Bicester Town Centre                                     | Concern at the lack of proposed retail proposals in the town centre. In Policy Bicester 5 insert a clear framework for future development of the town centre.  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                 | Policy                             | Bicester 5                         | Strengthening Bicester Town Centre                                     | Support policy. Commitment required to provide shopping and leisure opportunities for growing town. Welcome commitment to replace any town centre green spaces lost. Prefer Bicester Masterplan version. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                         | Policy                             | Bicester 5                         | Strengthening Bicester Town Centre                                     | Opportunities should be pursued for Green Infrastructure, SuDS & biodiversity in buildings.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport          | Policy                             | Bicester 5                         | Strengthening Bicester Town Centre                                     | Access to town centre & movement within area.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                      | Policy                             | Bicester 5                         | Strengthening Bicester Town Centre                                     | EH would like to see a reference to the Conservation Area, potential archaeological interest and listed building in this policy.   |
| 377        | Richard    | Foot        | GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) | Policy                             | Bicester 5                         | Strengthening Bicester Town Centre                                     | Support policy. Extension to Town Centre Boundary should be extended further to encompass Bicester Village. This approach would reflect WYG Masterplan for Specialist Retail Quarter.                    |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                 | Policy                             | Bicester 6                         | Bure Place Town Centre Redevelopment Phase 2                           | Strongly support policy.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                                | Policy                             | Bicester 6                         | Bure Place Town Centre Redevelopment Phase 2  | Opportunities should be perused for Green Infrastructure, SuDS & biodiversity in buildings.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                 | Policy                             | Bicester 6                         | Bure Place Town Centre Redevelopment Phase 2  | Access to town centre & movement within area.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                             | Policy                             | Bicester 6                         | Bure Place Town Centre Redevelopment Phase 2  | EH would like to see a reference to the Conservation Area, potential archaeological interest and listed building in this policy.   |
| 11         | Vicky      | Aston       |  | Paragraph                          | C.80                               | Strategic Development: Bicester 7 - Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation | Support the Council's commitment to undertake further work on the need for sports facilities in Bicester.  |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association | Paragraph                          | C.83                               | Strategic Development: Bicester 7 - Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation | Support statement that there is a need to relocate facilities at Oxford Road site. Concern at the inconsistency between Local Plan and Masterplan. The Masterplan identifies Pringle Fields within Town Centre Action Area and in the Civic and Cultural Quarter.  |
| 337        | Roger      | Wise        |  | Paragraph                          | C 83                               | Strategic Development: Bicester 7 - Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation | The proposed New Town Park- Pingle Field, Oxford Road Site is in a inappropriate location as it adjoins the Pingle Drive Road. The road carries the majority of visitors to Bicester Village (5.5 million). These vehicles will give toxic emissions which will be a health threat to the new town park users. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 262        | Donald     | Robinson    | Royal Pioneer / Stratton Audley Quarry       | Paragraph                          | C.85                               | Strategic Development<br>Bicester 7 - Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation | Object to the proposed development at Stratton Audley Quarry as a new Country Park on the grounds that wildlife would be disturbed, safety concerns reflecting the deep water & disturbance to anglers. Quarry should continue to be used as and be looked after by the Royal Pioneer Angling Association. Area outside the fishing lake should be developed as a Nature Reserve. Long distance footpath is unrealistic. |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association | Policy                             | Bicester 7                         | Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation                                       | Support principle of relocating existing facilities at Oxford Road (Pringle Fields) and proposals to concentrate facilities to one site at Chesterton. Enabling cost effective management. Higher quality facilities.  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                        | Policy                             | Bicester 7                         | Meeting the need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation                                       | Strongly support policy. In particular commitment to open up green spaces to the wider public for leisure pursuits.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                 | Policy                             | Bicester 7                         | Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation                                       | Wording suggested.   |
| 340        | Dominic    | Woodfield   | Bioscan                                      | Policy                             | Bicester 7                         | Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation                                       | Outline proposal at Gavray Drive compromise delivery of Green Infrastructure along railway line.   |
| 112        | Keith      | Dixon       | Launton Parish Council                       | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester  | Supports the preservation of RAF Bicester  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                        | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester  | Town Council support the continuation of flying at RAF Bicester. Support heritage tourism on the site with associated benefits.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations                       | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 203        | Rebecca        | Micklem     | BBOWT                               | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester                        | RAF Bicester is a proposed Local Wildlife Site thought likely to support habitats and/or species of County importance. However, this is not mentioned in the contextual text and it would appear that no ecological assessment of the area has been undertaken. This is needed to ensure that the policy is appropriate in terms of biodiversity impacts, to identify requirements for biodiversity protection, mitigation and enhancement, and to ensure compliance with NPPF paragraph 165. |
| 240        | Ellen          | O'Grady     | Defence Infrastructure Organisation | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester                        | No new assessments have been prepared/consulted on to include a policy which appears to contradict the existing Planning Brief (2009) for the site. It should be amended to state 'It will support employment, tourism, leisure, recreation, and community uses.' Although built in this period, RAF Bicester is not an inter-war airfield. The whole site is to be sold and therefore reference to the domestic site should be deleted.  |
| 241        | Jane           | Olds        | Stratton Audley Parish Council      | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester                        | RAF Bicester and quarry to the north should be categorised as leisure. Support Technology Park but would like to see limitations on the size and style of building. Supports bids which maintain heritage, integrity and function of airfield. Concerns with any plans to increase number and size of powered aircraft regularly using the airfield.  |
| 242        | Jane           | Olds        | Caversfield Parish Council          | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester                        | Would have concerns with any plans to increase the number and size of powered aircraft regularly using the airfield.  |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Ecology                       | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester                        | Sites should be given same level of protection as Local Wildlife Sites. Habitat and species survey's required. Pipistrelle Bat, Great Crested Newts at Stratton Audley Quarry. Survey required.   |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport        | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester                        | Policy should mention access to the site by public transport via Caversfield Turn bus stops which are on the Oxford - Cambridge Corridor.   |
| 279        | Martin         | Small       | English Heritage                    | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester                        | EH supports this policy for its recognition of the important historical significance of the airfield.   |
| 310        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |                                     | Policy                             | Bicester 8                         | RAF Bicester                        | RAF Bicester, buildings and open flying field are preserved.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency  | Paragraph                          | C.92                               | Burial Site in Bicester             | Support the commitment to survey land to establish the suitability of ground conditions.  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council   | Policy                             | Bicester 9                         | Burial Site in Bicester             | Support commitment on all future development to support burial provision. Feel wording is not robust enough. Prefer Bicester Masterplan text.   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency  | Policy                             | Bicester 9                         | Burial Site in Bicester             | It must not be established in an area than this likely to have a negative impact on ground water.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology   | Policy                             | Bicester 9                         | Burial Site in Bicester             | Native and local provenance planting and sowing should be encouraged within the landscape.  |
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion                                    | Policy                             | Bicester 9                         | Burial Site in Bicester             | Desire for a burial ground should be tested further. Need and options for its location should be fully explored.  |
| 71         | Brett      | Chambers    | Wendlebury Parish Council                                       | Policy                             | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                    | Although the opportunity to create more employment sites in Bicester are welcomed this is a clear example of Bicester spreading towards the M40 Junction 9 absorbing agricultural land. Access to the Roman Road is inadequate to high volume traffic and the knock on effect on Wendlebury and Chesterton need to be assessed.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Policy                             | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                    | Support Bicester 10. Amendment suggested - policy should apply early in the Plan period. Should make reference to car parking ratios e.g. 1:35.   |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council   | Policy                             | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                    | Support policy and in particular hi tech businesses and enterprise. Gateway should be iconic. Bicester Masterplan sets out principles more clearly.   |
| 203        | Rebecca    | Micklem     | BBOWT   | Policy                             | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                    | The policy recognises that investigation of the biodiversity of this site is needed This information needs to be available to determine whether the allocation is appropriate. An ecological survey of the area needs to be undertaken. This is needed to ensure that the policy is appropriate in terms of biodiversity impacts, to identify requirements for biodiversity protection, mitigation and enhancement, and to ensure compliance with NPPF paras. 109 and 165 |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency  | Policy                             | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                    | The policy wording needs to be stronger and be amended to read: 'There will be no built development within flood zone 3'. Ideally would prefer the policy wording to include not having built development in Flood Zone 2 either but appreciate that this is aspiration and not explicitly stated in the NPPF.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                           | Policy                             | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                    | Potential for significant harm from proposal. Bicester Wetland Reserve Local Wildlife Site (Located Between Bicester 10, 4 & 2) contains rare species. Bird interested. Water quality y& quantity should not be impacted upon. Indirect and cumulative impacts should be assessed. Potential for LWS to become isolated. Eastern part of site on the flood zone should be kept free from built development. Amend bullet point 8 to refer to 'priority'. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport            | Policy                             | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                    | Consistency of approach. Direct bus services unlikely. Emphasis on improving walking and cycling links to Chesterton Park development. No requirement for pedestrian crossing at A41.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                        | Policy                             | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                    | The policy should include a principle to conserve the setting of the schedule monument by adding: 'Conservation and enhancement of the setting of Alchester Roman Town Scheduled Ancient Monument and seek opportunities to better reveal its significance.'   |
| 378        | Richard    | Foot        | GVA / Bicester Business Park            | Policy                             | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                    | Support focus. Policy should be more stringent in requiring Science and high tech industry only. Approach would be consistent with the WYG Masterplan. Wording supplied.   |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | Stop this. Should be for industry incubators.  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                   | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | Support policy.  |
| 203        | Rebecca    | Micklem     | BBOWT                                   | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | The site falls within RAF Bicester proposed Local Wildlife Site. Despite the likely ecological value of the site, it would appear that no ecological assessment of the area has been undertaken. This is needed to ensure that the policy is appropriate in terms of biodiversity impacts, to identify requirements for biodiversity protection, mitigation and enhancement, and to ensure compliance with NPPF paras. 109 and 165                       |
| 241        | Jane       | Olds        | Stratton Audley Parish Council          | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | Supports need for new employment locations but would like reassurance that buildings will not be high enough to be seen from Stratton Audley nor restrict the use of the airfield.   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations                                      | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|----------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Archaeology                                  | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | Archaeological survey should be noted in Key Site Specific Design. Wording supplied.   |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Ecology                                      | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | Biodiversity should be protected and enhanced. Airfield is a proposed Local Wildlife Site, unimproved grassland and value for invertebrates and birds. Pipistrelle Bat (European Protected Species) roost recorded.  |
| 264        | Daniel         | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                       | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | New stops and walking routes.  |
| 281        | Hannah         | Smith       | Indigo Planning Ltd / Albion Land                  | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | Object to land area identified on proposals map. A map is attached showing the required change. Omission Site - Land north of Skimmingdish Lane.   |
| 281        | Hannah         | Smith       | Indigo Planning Ltd / Albion Land                  | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | Policy should be widened to include B1, B2 and B8 Business uses to allow greater flexibility. Approach supported by ELS (2012).  |
| 281        | Hannah         | Smith       | Indigo Planning Ltd / Albion Land                  | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | Key site specific design and place shaping principles - should be subject to viability assessment to ensure allocation is deliverable.   |
| 311        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |  | Policy                             | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park   | Concern at traffic congestion associated with new employment site. Less jobs should be pursued.  |
| 193        | Susan          | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                              | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Support policy.  |
| 223        | Peter          | Frampton    | Framptons / Barwood Developments                   | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Policy should allow for use classes B1, B2 & B8 to allow greater flexibility. Policy could make a South Eastern link road unviable.  |
| 231        | Steven         | Neal        | Boyer Planning / Redrow Homes & Wates Developments | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Support principle of the allocation of East Bicester. Consider allowance of 150 dwg in the Plan period is an under estimate. Developer has calculated the site is capable of approximately 700 dwg in the Plan period. Including early delivery of a South East link road. At a density of 34.4 dph the 22 ha site could supply 760 dwg. Site should be phased to allow early release in the first part of the Plan period. Benefits include the release of the roundabout at A41. Employment allocation of 18ha is not all expected to come forward in the Plan period. Policy should be more flexible. Changes supplied. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology            | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Key site specific designation should acknowledge non-designated heritage asset - Medieval village of Wretchwick. Associated ridge and furrow form part of setting. English Heritage should be consulted on any parts of the Plan that effect the setting.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Site partly within Ray CTA. Hydrological impact concern. Advice supplied by Thompson Ecology still relevant.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Development which could harm a CTA should be resisted, Detailed habitat and species surveys should be carried out. North-eastern part of Bicester 12 is within the Ray Conservation Target Area and is part of BAP Priority Habitat.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Sustainable under bullet point 6.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage             | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Bicester 12 is proposed immediately adjacent to the scheduled monument of Wretchwick Deserted Medieval Settlement and may cause significant harm to its significance contrary to NPPF paragraph 126. Need to redraw the proposal's boundaries to provide a greater buffer zone and conserve the setting of the scheduled monument. May need amendments to the development area and other figures in the policy. |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council     | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Policy title is misleading - should be re-titled Ambrosden North.   |
| 340        | Dominic    | Woodfield   | Bioscan                      | Policy                             | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                       | Function of green buffer and Green Infrastructure could be improved by amendments to Gavray Drive.  |
| 22         | Tony       | Baldry MP   |                              | Other                              | C.3                                | Banbury                             | Important that the Local Plan seeks to define clear boundaries for Banbury. Including using long established natural boundaries such as the Salt Way.   |
| 22         | Tony       | Baldry MP   |                              | Other                              | C.3                                | Banbury                             | There will be public debate as to exactly which sites for development should be included within Banbury Town, but the overall proposal seems sensible and proportionate.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                      | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton    | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors | Section                            | C.3                                | Banbury                             | There should be an analysis of retail capacity figures to ensure the plan is compliant with the requirements of the NPPF. Once this is completed an assessment of the likely retail capacity for the town centre development sites can be identified within each site specific policy. This would be a more robust position to defend against out of centre development. The figures should be identified as Gross External Area and Net Sales Area.  |
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land        | Paragraph                          | C.102 - C.128                      | Banbury                             | Object to the de-allocation of land at Warwick Road in favour of land at Hardwick Farm. Objection to Hanwell Farm being allocated in the plan rather than a reserve behind Warwick Road. Contrary to evidence base which is also incomplete. No justification for changes in Council Committee Reports. The Council's reasons for de-allocation relates to Landscape Sensitivity conflicts with evidence base. Further evidence is supplied to support objectors view - Review of Landscape work by Woolf Bond Planning and by FPCR. Unsure if criteria of Urban Form has been applied. Development at Bretch Hill has potentially greater impact on the separation of Drayton. |
| 142        | Paul       | Harris      |  | Section                            | C.3 Banbury                        | Banbury                             | Concern at the large scale development at Banbury on two grounds; traffic congestion in particular at the A423 & A422 & B4100 and Visual landscape impact at North of Hanwell Fields on views within Stratford District.  |
| 143        | Theona     | Harrop      |  | Section                            | C.2 Bicester                       | Bicester                            | Objection to line of proposed ring road and link with existing A41 on the grounds that it will increase traffic, sits outside the proposed development area for Bicester and is outside the Green Buffer Zone   |
| 143        | Theona     | Harrop      |  | Section                            | C.3 Banbury                        | Banbury                             | No consideration give to the public meeting and proximity to Wendlebury Village.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP               | Paragraph                          | C.102                              | Banbury                             | Support statement.  |
| 189        | David      | Keene       | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates          | Section                            | C.3                                | Banbury                             | Development strategy for Banbury relies on the delivery of Canalside. Comprises 34% of towns supply of land. Omission Site - Wykham Park Farm can be delivered.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Section                            | C.3                                | Banbury                             | Object to growth locations at Banbury & allocation at Canalside. Southern option is preferred as low to moderate landscape sensitivity, links to the town centre.  |
| 317        | Robert     | Tustain     |  | Section                            | C.3                                | Banbury                             | Object to the growth proposals at Banbury on the grounds that; development is distant from the town centre, no future provision for a ring road, coalescence of surrounding villages (Hanwell, Bourton, Bloxham, Twyford, Adderbury), more distribution sheds. Development is too large.   |
| 317        | Robert     | Tustain     |  | Section                            | C.3                                | Banbury                             | All Bankside developments are disproportionate for the area.   |
| 317        | Robert     | Tustain     |  | Section                            | C.3                                | Banbury                             | Suggest that two new junctions onto the M40 need to be built at Nell Bridge and Great Bourton to alleviate traffic from Alcan and Oxford Road respectively. Concern at traffic congestion caused by accidents on M40.  |
| 317        | Robert     | Tustain     |  | Section                            | C.3                                | Banbury                             | Suggest avoiding building on the flood Plain and include Flood relief proposals .  |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams    | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors   | Section                            | C.3                                | Banbury                             | Should be analysis of retail capacity figures to ensure Plan is compliant with NPPF. Then assessment of retail capacity for the town centre development sites can be identified within each site specific policy. Figure should be identified as Gross External Area and Net Sales Area.   |
| 380        | Brian      | Little      | Local History Group  | Section                            | C.3                                | Banbury                             | Plan has a clear distinction between the old town (Parsons Street and the lane together with the High Street from the Cross to the former White Lion Hotel) and the new town (referred to as Castle Quay). Established pattern in continental Europe and should feature in the future plan. Clearly market place with its historic frontage is pivotal to the whole town centre. |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | C.104                              | Banbury                             | Salt Way is not an historic town boundary but a route way. This function is reinforced by the Sustrans Route 5. Earlier options reports make no reference to boundary. Delete paragraph.   |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | C.104                              | C.3 Banbury                         | The alleged historical and ecological significance of Salt Way is not supported by evidence nor the landscape sensitivity around Banbury.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | C.107                              | Meeting the Challenges of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Banbury | Support first bullet point. Green Buffer policy will restrict growth.  |
| 65         | Tim        | Byrne       | Jones Lang LaSalle / Horton General Hospital   | Appendix                           | Appendix 1                         | Background to Cherwell's Places                                       | Para 1.19 - Reference to numbers of employees should be removed as prone to fluctuations over such a time frame.   |
| 126        | Rose       | Freeman     | The Theatres Trust   | Paragraph                          | C.118                              | Meeting the Challenge of Building a Sustainable Community in Banbury  | Para C.119 bullet point 6 states improved cultural facilities are also needed in Banbury. No policy includes this aspiration.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | C.119                              | Meeting the Challenges of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Banbury | Local Plan should recognise that not just affordable housing but all forms of housing including market housing is a key issue. Amend bullet point 5.   |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | C.119                              | Meeting the Challenge of Building a Sustainable Community in Banbury  | Support para C.119, C.170 & C.176 and the requirement for further Cricket Pitch provision. Plan should recognise the merger of two cricket clubs at Banbury and have regard to land ownership & availability for circ 150 dwellings at White Post Road, adjoin the Banbury Cricket Club site and thereby secure a separation of Banbury from Bodicote. |
| 65         | Tim        | Byrne       | Jones Lang LaSalle / Horton General Hospital   | Paragraph                          | C.120                              | Meeting the Challenges of Building a Sustainable Community in Banbury | Incorrect reference to hospital and does not meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements. Does not reflect future health care provision. The retention of healthcare provision at the Horton Hospital is secured through alternative mechanism and should not be referenced in the Plan.                                     |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                  | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport   | Paragraph                          | C.121                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Banbury | Access to services should be defined. Key environmental challenges. Second bullet point unclear. Managing traffic congestion duplicate. Traffic management should be travel. Expand to include Electric Spine and its benefits.   |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | C.122                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Banbury | Protection of Salt Way is not a key environmental challenge.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | C.122 & C.124                      | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Banbury | The alleged historical and ecological significance of Salt Way is not supported by evidence nor the landscape sensitivity around Banbury.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology  | Paragraph                          | C.122                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Banbury | Support wording at Bullet Point 1. Apply to all other Strategic Sites.  |
| 94         | John       | Colegrave   |  | Paragraph                          | C.124                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Banbury | It is considered inevitable that further growth will be required at Banbury after 2031 and if some residential developments prove unviable. In both instances it is important that all options (including land at Salt Way) remain available for further consideration. Delete reference. |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Paragraph                          | C.124                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Banbury | Object to Green Buffer Policy - Unnecessary and unjustified by evidence. Delete reference and change to landscape setting and new edge of Banbury.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                 | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP          | Paragraph                          | C.125                              | Banbury in 2031                     | Disagree with analysis that by 2031 that there will be more opportunities for travel by foot, bicycle and bus. Banbury 2 & 4 are some of the most remote locations while land to south of Salt way is not. Banbury 2 should be reduced and allocate for employment.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                          | Paragraph                          | C.126                              | Banbury in 2031                     | Support the strategy for Banbury but would have liked to see specific reference to the need for a new cemetery as referred to in Para C.119 (key community issues facing Banbury)   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Education & early Intervention Services | Paragraph                          | C.126                              | Banbury in 2031                     | Bullet point 8 amendment.   |
| 40         | Geoff      | Bolton      | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd             | Paragraph                          | C.127                              | What will Happen and Where          | The Council has failed to undertake a proper assessment of the reasonable alternative options for major development at Banbury. The Local Plan seeks to provide a significant change in the number of dwellings over the plan period and should have triggered a further Options for Growth consultation. The Council failed to assess Land at Broughton Road as a separate site. The emerging Masterplan presents an opportunity to undertake detailed assessment of potential development sites as it has been the case with Bicester. The Local Plan should not proceed without the publication of the Banbury Masterplan. |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |   | Paragraph                          | C.129-C.132                        | Banbury Canalside                   | Strongly support the policy. It is vital to promote brownfield sites such as Canalside and Bolton road to assist regenerating the town and reduce the need to consider green field sites.   |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |   | Paragraph                          | C.129-C.132                        | Banbury Canalside                   | Strongly support the policy. It is vital to promote brownfield sites such as Canalside and Bolton road to assist regenerating the town and reduce the need to consider green field sites.   |
| 12         | Vicky      | Aston       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Object to Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside, Policy does not make reference to outdoor sports provision under infrastructure or the impact on Banbury FC. (Suggested text supplied)  |
| 19         | Ken        | Atack       | Croprey Ward                                  | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Concerned with the issue of where business will relocate. Presume that this issue will be covered by the Banbury Master plan.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 22         | Tony       | Baldry MP   |   | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | It will be good to see Canalside development take place. It should be recognised that a significant amount of public capital investment in making the site capable of development (i.e. flood defence work) and one looks to the private sector to take forward development. However, CDC may have to use statutory powers of compulsory purchase to ensure a coherent land assembly. |
| 26         | Ed         | Barrett     | Turley Associates/ Scottish Widows / Scottish Widows Unit Funds Ltd | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Proposed scale and town centre / commercial uses is not justified by commercial analysis or retail in respect of likely mix. Provision of significant commercial uses within an extended town centre boundary has the potential to adversely impact on vitality and viability of the established retail core. Recommend an assessment of the impact on the existing town centre uses. |
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton    | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors                  | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Bullet point 5- the reference to "not including any significant convenience retail": It should be clarified what "significant" means. The use of appropriate quantum's of retail floorspace for each of the sites would address this issue.   |
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land                         | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Lack of evidence (SHLAA) in respect of delivery of Canalside. Site is contrary to NPPF para 47. Delivery concerns - site in multiple ownership, public investment needed, existing business require relocation, flooding, funding issues, site assembly. Housing allocation at Canalside should be reduced and Warwick Road allocated. Reserve site approach should be reinstated.    |
| 76         | Diane      | Clarke      | Network Rail  | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Banbury 1 could provide some station benefits or a revised interchange. The Chilterns MSCP is separate from the Canalside scheme and it is currently part of an application by Chiltern Railways.   |
| 104        | Robert     | Cronk       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Needs further detail relating to the station car parking provision. The 2009 draft SPD proposes at least 1000 rail user car spaces distributed to either side of the railway line. This should be supported by the Local Plan.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 144        | Jane       | Hennell     | Canal and River Trust                  | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | The Trust supports the regeneration of Canalside and wishes to work with the Council to deliver. The canal towpath should be improved and made more accessible. The quality of development fronting that canal and areas of public access will be crucial to the success of the project and the Trust wish to be involved in any future master planning of the site. |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Support regeneration of Banbury Canalside, concerns regarding viability of scheme. Support greater flexibility of phasing of the redevelopment of individual land holdings. Concern at prescriptive design criteria.   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Object to 30% affordable housing - inflexible - should be subject to viability   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Requirement for education - primary school is unjustified.   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Health - uncertain   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Open space - ineffective   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Access & movement - first part of sentence unnecessary   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Community Facilities - Unjustified   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Utilities - not based on evidence  |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Design - 'Innovative architecture' and 'locally distinctive materials' subjective  |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Live / work units but no B uses conflicts with Banbury 1 Policy (Use Class B1) - Vision not clarified. Policy does not reflect existing uses.  |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Noise Survey - Should be considered before allocating site not at application stage  |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Public art - unjustified   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Code for sustainable homes - unjustified   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett       | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | SPD assumes Masterplan site is in single ownership and homogenous - however made up of many distinct sites   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett         | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities    | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Additional requirements for this large complex site include: Paragraph 3 Arrangement between landowners and freeholders is not under the remit of the LPA  |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett         | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities    | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Additional requirements for this large complex site include: Paragraph 5, Policy fails to identify donor sites to decant businesses from the Canal site - paragraph should be deleted.   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council         | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Support for the redevelopment of the Crest Hotel within the Canalside Plans.   |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon        | Hanwell Parish Council                    | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Support the policy. It is vital to promote Brownfield sites such as Canalside and Bolton road to assist regenerating the town and reduce the need to consider green field sites.   |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones         |   | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Strongly support the policy. It is vital to promote Brownfield sites such as Canalside and Bolton road to assist regenerating the town and reduce the need to consider green field sites.  |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones         | Marrons / Hallam Land Management          | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Proposal is unviable and undeliverable. Subject to relocation of many small and medium sized businesses.   |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones         |   | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Strongly support the policy. It is vital to promote Brownfield sites such as Canalside and Bolton road to assist regenerating the town and reduce the need to consider green field sites.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP      | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Site is undeliverable; it is in multiple ownerships, unviable, and further work is required to relocate existing businesses and flooding issues. Amend policy to refer to long-term delivery.  |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society                     | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Support policy. Welcome inclusion of listed and locally listed buildings within the Conservation Area. Object to bullet point 21. Enlarge site to include Railway Station & Grundon Site. Deliver a minor road bridge. Link road to Banbury 6. |
| 189        | David      | Keene         | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Banbury Canalside is undeliverable. No mechanism is in place. Complex site. Long term supply - only.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Canalside development is undeliverable in Plan period due to multiple ownerships and work yet to be completed. A development brief, development partner, public money investment, use of CPO powers, relocation sites & flooding issue.   |
| 204        | Stewart    | Mitchell    | Grundon  | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | The area of the Banbury Canalside Allocation should be extended to include the Grundon Site to the east of the railway given proximity to Station and Town Centre.  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency   | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Allocating areas of the site for specific development uses would only be appropriate if supported with evidence from the L2 SFRA. The Level 2 SFRA was completed after submission of the Local Plan and we have not had time to review whether or not it supports the policy wording evidence. We cannot be sure that the policy does not contravene paragraph 100 of the NPPF. Need more time to review the submitted L2 SFRA. |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | No objection in principle however Banbury Canalside suffers from multiple ownership, flood issues, and relocation of existing businesses. Banbury 2 Southam Road in contrast is in single ownership and deliverable.  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council   | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Strongly support Canalside as our top priority for future housing growth. We recognise that due to number of landowners deliverability is difficult. CDC needs to show a firm commitment including options for providing employment land for relocations and willingness to use CPO powers if necessary.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology  | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Rare or notable species include Barn Owl, Grass Snake & Kingfisher.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport                         | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Question delivery of pedestrian bridge / cycle bridge over railway line. Improvements to Railway Station forecourt. High quality route from the Station to the town centre. Bus route through Canalside to serve Banbury Rail Station via Station approach and Tramway Road. New bullet point proposed. 11th Bullet point - consideration of bus movement. 14th bullet - bus route through site. New bullet point key site specific design and place shaping principles. |
| 279        | Martin     | Small         | English Heritage                                     | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | EH supports the policy but considers that the historic buildings/structures to be retained should be identified (Old Town Hall and bridge over Mill Stream) in addition to locally listed buildings  |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts         | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group              | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Ned to deliver.  |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams      | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Policy Banbury 5 - Bullet 5. What is significant retail? Quantum's of retail floor space would address issue.  |
| 336        | Melissa    | Wilson        | Drivers Jonas Deloitte / CEMEX UK                    | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | The boundary of Banbury Canalside should be extended to factor in other adjacent deliverable sites to the east of the canal, including the CEMEX site, to increase the allocated housing delivery figure in the District's principle urban area.   |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease         | RPS / Thames Valley Police                           | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Require on-site police presence. Additional bullet point under key infrastructure.   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran        | Environment Agency                                   | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Having reviewed the updated Level 2 Canalside SFRA, the EA no longer find Policy Banbury 1 unsound   |
| 380        | Brian      | Little        | Local History Group                                  | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Important to retain features of historic interest. E.g. a former town hall. Reference to Birmingham University study 'Industrial archaeology Survey of the Oxford Canal corridor 2001.   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3             | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Support Banbury Canalside - Note Delivery Issues.  |
| 169        | Heather    | Johnston      |  | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Support for the redevelopment of the Crest Hotel within the Canalside Plans.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Ecology  | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                   | Advice supplied.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 276        | Tom        | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Minns Pension Scheme          | Policy                             | Banbury 1                          | Banbury Canalside                           | Support allocation of Banbury Canalside. Concern at statement that suggests the best means of bringing the site forward is through an outline planning application and masterplan. Instead suggest site comes forward as discrete sites so that they do not prejudice the masterplan. Aiding deliverability. Amend last paragraph to allow for individual planning applications.  |
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Object to allocation of Hardwick Farm. Land west of A423 identified as Site B has high sensitivity to development. SA (Feb 2010) acknowledges distance from services, and problem of severance by employment site at Grimsbury. Land west of Southam Road is likely to have a visual impact. Site has archaeological value. SA (2012) reiterates issues. No evidence to support allocation of site in preference to Warwick Road. |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG                                       | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Banbury's northern boundary is unsound. Dukes Meadow Drive link road was specified to be a permanent limit to the northern boundary of Banbury within the Hanwell Fields Design Brief 1997 and planning applications have been turned down in the past for that reason (2007). The proposed plans will affect house values and take away the right to open space from the residents of Hanwell Fields.                            |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG                                       | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The site is unsuitable due to concerns with: visual and landscape impact, noise pollution, much of site considered unsuitable and could cause flood risk, development beyond Banbury's northern boundary, not contiguous to any other residential development, loss of agricultural land, increase pollution levels due to distance from town, poor transport and access, tranquillity of the cemetery would be destroyed.        |
| 139        | Rachel     | Hanbury     | Turley Associates                           | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The employment proposals at the former SAPA site will create a noise nuisance for the new development   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 139        | Rachel     | Hanbury     | Turley Associates         | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The policy does not comply with paras 109 and 123 of the NPPF  |
| 139        | Rachel     | Hanbury     | Turley Associates         | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | There may be a risk that unreasonable noise restrictions would be placed on the former Sapa site due to the new housing development  |
| 139        | Rachel     | Hanbury     | Turley Associates         | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The Policy should be revised to take account of the noise impacts of the new employment uses on the SAPA site and to avoid any future noise complaints. (wording is suggested)   |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones       | Hanwell Village Residents | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Object to policy as the inclusion of sites Banbury 2: East and West of Southam Road and Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields, and the exclusion of West of Warwick Road, have not been justified. Contradicts the conclusions of the Draft Core Strategy on the relative sustainability of these sites.  |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones       | Hanwell Village Residents | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Altering the clear, defensible urban boundary to the north of Banbury is not justified. The Plan does not explain how an effective, defensible long-term urban boundary will be provided, how Hanwell village and its rural setting will be protected, nor how the suggested Green Buffers will be achieved. Moving the boundary requires justification and further detailed assessment. |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones       | Hanwell Village Residents | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The Southam Road site would create a poor environment for new housing and may be more suitable for sensitively designed employment uses.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 170        | Alan       | Jones       | Hanwell Village Residents | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The Plan does not justify why development south of Salt Way would be more harmful than development to the north of Banbury. The strategic decision to offer greater protection to the Salt Way area is highly questionable and needs proper justification and further assessment.  |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones       | Hanwell Village Residents | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | If the proposed housing sites to the north of Banbury are approved, there needs to be the strongest protection for Hanwell village and its setting and a well defined boundary with effective green buffers where appropriate.   |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council    | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Strongly object to the policy. The Plan does not justify why Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 (North of Hanwell Fields) are now included and West of Warwick Road is excluded.  |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council    | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The Plan does not justify why the clear, defensible boundary to the north of Banbury which now defines the limit of built development should now be significantly altered. Nor how the new edge will constitute an effective, defensible long term boundary, how this will protect Hanwell village and how the 'Green Buffers' will be achieved. |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council    | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Plan does not justify the inclusion of East & West Southam Road. Site constrained by noise, heritage and other environmental constraints. Adjoins industrial area to the south. Might be suitable for long term employment use.  |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council    | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Banbury 2 is less sustainable than other sites and create a poor environment for new housing. It is not clear that the detrimental visual impacts have been properly balanced. The site is more suitable for long term employment.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The Plan does not justify a radical shift from the Draft Core Strategy 2010 and why development south of Banbury at Salt Way is deemed more harmful than the housing development proposed north of Banbury.  |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                        | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Strongly object to the policy. The Plan does not justify why Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 (North of Hanwell Fields) are now included and West of Warwick Road is excluded.  |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                        | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The Plan does not justify why the clear, defensible boundary to the north of Banbury which now defines the limit of built development should now be significantly altered. Nor how the new edge will constitute an effective, defensible long term boundary, how this will protect Hanwell village and how the 'Green Buffers' will be achieved. |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                        | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Plan does not justify the inclusion of East & West Southam Road. Site constrained by noise, heritage and other environmental constraints. Adjoins industrial area to the south. Might be suitable for long term employment use.  |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                        | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Banbury 2 is less sustainable than other sites and create a poor environment for new housing. It is not clear that the detrimental visual impacts have been properly balanced. The site is more suitable for long term employment.   |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                        | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The Plan does not justify a radical shift from the Draft Core Strategy 2010 and why development south of Banbury at Salt Way is deemed more harmful than the housing development proposed north of Banbury.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                        | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |                                      | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Strongly object to the policy. The Plan does not justify why Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 (North of Hanwell Fields) are now included and West of Warwick Road is excluded.  |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |                                      | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The Plan does not justify why the clear, defensible boundary to the north of Banbury which now defines the limit of built development should now be significantly altered. Nor how the new edge will constitute an effective, defensible long term boundary, how this will protect Hanwell village and how the 'Green Buffers' will be achieved. |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |                                      | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Plan does not justify the inclusion of East & West Southam Road. Site constrained by noise, heritage and other environmental constraints. Adjoins industrial area to the south. Might be suitable for long term employment use.  |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |                                      | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Banbury 2 is less sustainable than other sites and create a poor environment for new housing. It is not clear that the detrimental visual impacts have been properly balanced. The site is more suitable for long term employment.   |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |                                      | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The Plan does not justify a radical shift from the Draft Core Strategy 2010 and why development south of Banbury at Salt Way is deemed more harmful than the housing development proposed north of Banbury.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Allocation of Hardwick farm does not flow from the evidence. Site more suited to employment. Land is undulating and sensitive. Development area should be reduced.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society  | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Site should not be viable from conic view point looking north from Oxford Road / South Bar.   |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister    | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East & West)   | Development site is undeliverable as site is in an archaeologically sensitive location and close to listed buildings, affected by noise from the motorway & low landscape capacity. There is recognised need for a new cemetery at adjoin site - development here   |
| 203        | Rebecca    | Micklem       | BBOWT  | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | It would appear that no ecological assessment of the area has been undertaken. This is needed to ensure that the policy is appropriate in terms of biodiversity impacts, to identify requirements for biodiversity protection, mitigation and enhancement, and to ensure compliance with NPPF paras. 109 and 165  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran        | Environment Agency   | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Welcome the wording of much of the policy. However, bullet point of place shaping principles is in conflict with NPPF. Advise to amend the policy to read: 'There will be no built development within flood zones 2 and 3. Also issues of access and aggress regarding Normal Way need to be discussed with CDC emergency planners as there is a risk in allocating a site where safe access could not be achieved. |
| 225        | Sinéad     | Morrissey     | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Site Location Plan Attached.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                      | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Bedworth Trading Ltd support allocation of Banbury 2 for residential development for approx 800 dwg. Site in single ownership. EIA indicates no physical or environmental constraints. Infrastructure requirements supported. Sustainable location. Site is integral to Plan Strategy & Vision.   |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Support in principle Banbury 2 however request minor wording change to Policy. Development area is 43ha in size. Number of homes to be built is 800. 'Approximately' should refer to a 10% margin of error. Delete reference to health provision. Delete reference to off-site contributions. Place shaping principles should be proportionate to application (if outline or detailed). Opportunity to connect to Country park should only refer to land in developers control. Development description should acknowledge Banbury 2 is close to employment & residential uses, that landscape/ visual impact and historic sensitivity can be addressed through applications. |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |                                    | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Objection to Ban 2 on the grounds of visual impact, loss of agricultural land, setting of Banbury, noise pollution from M40, flood risk, poor transport,  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council               | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Whilst supporting the allocation, it has increased 'hope value' for residential development attached to the land to the north of Hardwick Hill Cemetery which is needed to secure the extension to the existing cemetery. TC would like to see an additional allocation of the field to the north of the cemetery for a cemetery extension.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                      | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hard wick Farm, Southam Road (East and Wes) | Potential BAP Priority Habitat outside site boundary to the east and north-east. Great Crested Newt Survey required.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                      | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport       | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hard wick Farm, Southam Road (East and Wes) | New bullet points proposed. Public transport link to service other strategic developments, the town centre, railway station, commercially self-sustaining. New bullet point - transport assessment / travel plans.                                    |
| 272        | Graham     | Simpkin     | The London crematorium Company plc | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The policy fails to recognise the importance of Banbury Crematorium and the associated Garden of Remembrance and is unsound, unjustified and not effective.   |
| 272        | Graham     | Simpkin     | The London crematorium Company plc | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Alternatives which would have less impact on the crematorium have not been considered   |
| 272        | Graham     | Simpkin     | The London crematorium Company plc | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | This is a sub-regional facility and it is likely that the impact of development has not been recognised by neighbouring authorities   |
| 272        | Graham     | Simpkin     | The London crematorium Company plc | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | It is essential that the setting of the Garden of remembrance is preserved for mourners   |
| 272        | Graham     | Simpkin     | The London crematorium Company plc | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | New housing will intrude and dominate the views within the Garden of Remembrance  |
| 272        | Graham     | Simpkin     | The London crematorium Company plc | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | The policy is worded to allow for mitigation to be provided to protect new residents from the crematoria which means that if interpreted literally the policy will allow development to take place close to the Crematorium and Garden of Remembrance |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)          | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 272        | Graham     | Simpkin     | The London crematorium Company plc      | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)  | The Policy could be made sound if there was a fifty metre buffer between the crematorium and new development to the south and if this was planted and made accessible for the public. (wording is suggested)                          |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                        | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)  | EH supports the key principles relating to and archaeological survey, Hardwick House and the Hardwick Medieval Village. However, EH is concerned with the potential impact of development on the heritage assets close to the site.   |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)  | Remove from Plan - Green Belt   |
| 326        | Maggie     | Watts       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)  | Object to the proposed development at Dukes field.  |
| 380        | Brian      | Little      | Local History Group                     | Policy                             | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm , Southam Road (East and West) | Important to ensure Hardwick lost village and Hanwell do not lose their identity.   |
| 50         | Peter      | Brown       | Drayton Parish Council                  | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                          | Development at West of Bretch Hill will be impossible to meet the requirements of ESD 15 & ESD16 & Paragraph C.136. No justification for site over others. Development will impact on the setting of Wroxton Abbey & Withycombe Farm. |
| 51         | Peter      | Brown       | Drayton Parish Council                  | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                          | Development at West of Bretch Hill will be impossible to meet the requirements of ESD 15 & ESD16 & Paragraph C.136. No justification for site over others. Development will impact on the setting of Wroxton Abbey & Withycombe Farm. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones         | Boyer Planning/Bloor Homes   | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | Support allocation of land at Bretch Hill as residential mixed use development. Site is allocated 400 dwg early in the Plan period. Environmental features will be protected.   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society  | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | Site should not be visible from Wroxton Abby Parkland.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister    | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | Site is high landscape value, would ruin Wroxton Abbey, Grade II Wroxton Abbey Park and Wroxton and Drayton Conservation Area. It would extend visual edge of Banbury Skyline / urban views. Land is remote from transport corridor and would have significant accessibility and traffic impact issues. Reliant on junction at Warwick Road and the triple roundabouts at Cromwell Road, Ruscombe Avenue and Orchard Way. |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey     | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | No objection in principle however some sections of the site are not deliverable due to landscape quality and sensitivity. Land at Southam Road has no such serious challenges.  |
| 244        | Robin      | Parker        |  | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | Object to the inclusion of this site  |
| 244        | Robin      | Parker        |  | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | Bretch Hill needs regeneration not new houses next to it  |
| 244        | Robin      | Parker        |  | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | Is concerned with the effect of development on the local environment  |
| 244        | Robin      | Parker        |  | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | The proposals will cause traffic problems and safety issues   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council   | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | Support this allocation as the most appropriate green field site for future development.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Archaeology  | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | Policy should be widened to include undesignated below ground archaeological deposits. Archaeological survey should be noted in Key Site Specific Design. Wording supplied.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Ecology  | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                 | No Comment.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)  | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport            | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill  | Green infrastructure. Unlikely existing bus service will be re-routed. Existing services will be upgraded in respect of frequency. Emphasis on effective walking and cycling to existing bus stops. |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                        | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill  | EH supports the key principles relating to the historic environment.  |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill  | Remove from Plan - for now.   |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police              | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill  | Require on-site police presence. Additional bullet point under key infrastructure.  |
| 380        | Brian      | Little      | Local History Group                     | Policy                             | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill  | Good opportunity to produce a tidy edge to Banbury and engage greater interest in the wider estate subject to the Brighter Futures Campaign.  |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council                 | Paragraph                          | C.137                              | Strategic Development:<br>Banbury 4 -<br>Bankside Phase 2<br>(links to 'Policy<br>Banbury 12: Land<br>for the Relocation<br>of Banbury United<br>FC' | Planning application gave permission for no more than 1,070 homes and not 1,092. Unclear on additional 22 or 82 homes at Cotefield farm or 21 homes at rear of 33 Oxford Road.                      |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council                 | Paragraph                          | C.128                              | Strategic Development:<br>Banbury 4 -<br>Bankside Phase 2<br>(links to 'Policy<br>Banbury 12: Land<br>for the Relocation<br>of Banbury United<br>FC' | See comment 5 above.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 130        | Jennifer   | Glynn         |  | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Object to dropping of 'Bodicote' from the name of the proposal when bulk of development is in the parish of Bodicote. Banbury 4 & 12 are similarly miss-named as they lie in the Parish of Bodicote. Banbury 4 should be removed from the Local Plan.  |
| 130        | Jennifer   | Glynn         |  | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Object to proposal allocating 1,092 dwellings at Bankside Phase 1 on the grounds that Condition 6 of the Planning Application limits growth to 1,070 dwellings to comply with Policies in the South East Plan.   |
| 130        | Jennifer   | Glynn         |  | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Object to allocation at Bodicote/Bankside as policy fails to enhance or protect village. Allocation is disproportionate to the scale of the village size as growth would be equivalent to almost all the growth allocate to villages in category 1. Allocation in effect joins Bodicote to Banbury.  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Delay to Bankside Phase 1 will have a knock on effect with phase2.   |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones         | Marrons / Hallam Land Management         | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Delete Green Buffer at Bankside Phase 2.   |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones         | Marrons / Hallam Land Management         | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Bankside Phase 2- land adjacent Bankside Phase 1. Site provides a logical and sustainable extension to existing commitment. Infrastructure provided by first phase. Possible redistribution of uses between Banbury 12. Outdoor sports provision should reflect scale of provision already planned for Phase 1 and if they exceed standards set out in BSC.11 should count towards that provision. Reference to extra care homes and their location and scale should be determined through discussions. Delete reference to self-build housing. Remove reference to noise mitigation associated with M40 as this can be resolved at Planning Application stage. Reference to Public Art as CIL requirement should be deleted. Requirement for sustainable construction measures should be removed. |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven         | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP     | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Evidence base does not support allocation. Replace with Saltway.   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Development does not avoid coalescence with neighbouring settlements - Strategic Objective 12   |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | No objection in principle however Phase 1 of the site has ground contamination issues. Southam Road does not have any issues. Plan should acknowledge importance of Banbury 2 which is a key deliverable site.  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council   | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | It would significantly add to problems created by increased traffic flows. Evidence supporting the early planned extension is out of date with junctions already at capacity. CDC missed opportunity to gain developer funding for a South East link road when approving the first phase. There is a need for a Southern Link Road. |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council   | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | We are concerned with further coalescence with Bodicote.  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council   | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Banbury United Football Club need to re-sit in order to develop Canalside but consideration needs to be given to suitable bus service for supporters by bus from the town and the railway station. An alternative site could be found to the north east of the M40 junction.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology  | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Potential BAP habitat (Broadleaved woodland) around rugby ground. No Comment.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport   | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Possible access issue. Access through Bankside Phase 1 could cause capacity issues at A4260/Weeping Cross. Could be served by phase 1 bus service. New bus stops suggested - provision of bus terminus, walking & cycling connection with existing football club, transport assessment / travel plans.                              |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council  | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Land east of Oxford Road is located in Bodicote Parish. BAN 4 to be renamed BOD 4 and for this to count towards village Category 1 share of 250 units. The remaining land should be removed.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage   | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                    | Should include a new principle: 'An archaeological survey will be required due to close proximity to areas of potential archaeological interest'.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                        | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                        | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2   | The impact on SO11 should not be positive given the lack of a requirement for an archaeological assessment prior to any development.  |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2   | Keep.   |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police              | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2   | Require on-site police presence. Additional bullet point under key infrastructure.  |
| 380        | Brian      | Little      | Local History Group                     | Policy                             | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2   | Concern at the inadequacy of road infrastructure. With no southern entry to M40 pressure on the old Oxford Road and Bankside itself maybe intolerable.  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Paragraph                          | C.141                              | Strategic Development: Banbury 5 - North of Hanwell Fields | Policy provides no explanation of how the aspiration for a single masterplan will be deliverable. Site in multiple ownership. Plan should consider what the masterplan should include and require a design brief. |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Paragraph                          | C.141                              | Strategic Development: Banbury 5 - North of Hanwell Fields | Object - Site Allocation can deliver significantly more units than 400 and still deliver high quality design.   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields                                    | Support allocation Banbury 5 in principle.  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields                                    | Object - Site Allocation can deliver significantly more units than 400 and still deliver high quality design. Total site area is 25.5ha equating to approximately 540 units.                                      |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields                                    | Employment - does not define 'rural fringe'   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields                                    | Infrastructure - scale of urban extension is insufficient in size to support employment and services without viability analysis.  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields                                    | Key site Specific Design and Place Shaping Principles - Unclear if this is a aims and objectives list or validation checklist.  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields                                    | Objections to some principles; limitation to what is achievable in respect of layout.   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields                                    | New footpaths, accessibility & travel plans - should be subject to three tests of CIL   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments           | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields                                    | street frontages - more detail on flexibility required, soft urban edge - this should not automatically mean low density.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                 | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Strategic landscaping - should make reference to the importance of strategic landscaping in relation to topography - Policy should enable flexibility   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Rights of way - should enable flexibility for diversions of paths   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Green Buffer - should be proportionate and take into account topography   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Public open space - policy should enable commuted sums to the LPA for formal recreation. Sums could be spent on other facilities such as existing playing fields on Hanwell Fields or Drayton school rather than be provided on site as s106/Developer Contributions. |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Green Infrastructure - should be subject to three tests of CIL  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Archaeological survey - provide further detail in relation to specific heritage assets  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Lighting - criteria are over onerous for outline application  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Public art - vague  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Climate change - Should comply with Building Regulations only   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Surface water - further detail required in regards to future management / maintained preference   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | SuDS Strategic FRA is not an appropriate assessment to inform the location of SuDs within an allocation. Policy should be flexible.   |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Extra care homes - Policy lacks detail and justification in respect of need, viability and delivery. A definition should be provided together with evidence of delivery by RSLs or equivalent.  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | 3 existing dwellings - buildings have no special justification for their inclusion .  |
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Agricultural land quality - detailed management plan appears unnecessary until a detailed design is included. Retention of good quality soil could be conditioned and providing allotments within a s106 at a later stage.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Site at Warwick Road features equally if not better in sustainability terms as Hanwell Fields. No new evidence to justify de-allocation at Warwick Road. Site should be allocated for housing development.   |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | There has been no consultation with residents who were told there would be no further housing  |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The boundaries of the site have been changed   |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Schools are already full   |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | No extra facilities are planned  |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Flooding is already a problem at Warwick Road and Dukes Meadow   |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The development combined with other development in the area will be too much for services and facilities   |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The Horton hospital will not be able to cope meaning people will have to travel to Oxford  |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | There is enough housing for sale plus the permission at Bankside to enable demand to be met.   |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | A lack of jobs means a lack of buyers  |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Shops have closed and there is nothing for young people to do.   |
| 111        | John       | Davis       |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The planning of Banbury has become a complete fiasco.  |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG                                       | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The site has been previously rejected by CDC and Planning Inspector due to being unsustainable and this is still the case. There are no plans for education, no employment area within easy walking distance, no plans for health care, impacts on anti-social/policing issues, development north of Dukes Meadow Drive which is the northern Boundary of the town, demise of agricultural land, urbanisation of the gateway to Banbury with impact on the character of the landscape and outlook from Hanwell Fields and Hanwell village, changing of the 2 right of way footpaths. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name    | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|----------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foynt | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Principle of Banbury 5 supported. Housing numbers should be increased to 550. Delete reference to employment land. Object to single point of access. Object to community centre. Key criteria should be delivery / viability.  |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones          | Hanwell Village Residents                | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Object to policy as the inclusion of sites Banbury 2: East and West of Southam Road and Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields, and the exclusion of West of Warwick Road, have not been justified. Contradicts the conclusions of the Draft Core Strategy on the relative sustainability of these sites.  |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones          | Hanwell Village Residents                | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Altering the clear, defensible urban boundary to the north of Banbury is not justified. The Plan does not explain how an effective, defensible long-term urban boundary will be provided, how Hanwell village and its rural setting will be protected, nor how the suggested Green Buffers will be achieved. Moving the boundary requires justification and further detailed assessment. |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones          | Hanwell Village Residents                | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The Plan does not justify why development south of Salt Way would be more harmful than development to the north of Banbury. The strategic decision to offer greater protection to the Salt Way area is highly questionable and needs proper justification and further assessment.  |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones          | Hanwell Village Residents                | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | If the proposed housing sites to the north of Banbury are approved, there needs to be the strongest protection for Hanwell village and its setting and a well defined boundary with effective green buffers where appropriate.   |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones          | Hanwell Village Residents                | SA                                 | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Do not see how the overall conclusions on the sustainability of sites Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 can be reached on the evidence available.  |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon         | Hanwell Parish Council                   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Strongly object to the policy. The Plan does not justify why Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 (North of Hanwell Fields) are now included and West of Warwick Road is excluded.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The Plan does not justify why the clear, defensible boundary to the north of Banbury which now defines the limit of built development should now be significantly altered. Nor how the new edge will constitute an effective, defensible long term boundary, how this will protect Hanwell village and how the 'Green Buffers' will be achieved. |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             |  |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Banbury 2 is less sustainable than other sites and create a poor environment for new housing. It is not clear that the detrimental visual impacts have been properly balanced. The site is more suitable for long term employment.   |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The Plan does not justify a radical shift from the Draft Core Strategy 2010 and why development south of Banbury at Salt Way is deemed more harmful than the housing development proposed north of Banbury.  |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                        | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Strongly object to the policy. The Plan does not justify why Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 (North of Hanwell Fields) are now included and West of Warwick Road is excluded.  |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                        | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The Plan does not justify why the clear, defensible boundary to the north of Banbury which now defines the limit of built development should now be significantly altered. Nor how the new edge will constitute an effective, defensible long term boundary, how this will protect Hanwell village and how the 'Green Buffers' will be achieved. |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                        | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Banbury 2 is less sustainable than other sites and create a poor environment for new housing. It is not clear that the detrimental visual impacts have been properly balanced. The site is more suitable for long term employment.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |               | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The Plan does not justify a radical shift from the Draft Core Strategy 2010 and why development south of Banbury at Salt Way is deemed more harmful than the housing development proposed north of Banbury.   |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |               | SA                                 | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Do not see how the overall conclusions of the SA of Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 can be reached on the evidence presented. There are serious issues about Banbury's long term capacity to expand given its topography and physical constraints. The sustainability of these sites is questionable and the potential mitigating measures needs further evidence and further careful assessment. |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |               | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Strongly object to the policy. The Plan does not justify why Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 (North of Hanwell Fields) are now included and West of Warwick Road is excluded.   |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |               | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The Plan does not justify why the clear, defensible boundary to the north of Banbury which now defines the limit of built development should now be significantly altered. Nor how the new edge will constitute an effective, defensible long term boundary, how this will protect Hanwell village and how the 'Green Buffers' will be achieved.  |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |               | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Plan does not justify the inclusion of East & West Southam Road. Site constrained by noise, heritage and other environmental constraints. Adjoins industrial area to the south. Might be suitable for long term employment use.   |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |               | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Banbury 2 is less sustainable than other sites and create a poor environment for new housing. It is not clear that the detrimental visual impacts have been properly balanced. The site is more suitable for long term employment.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | The Plan does not justify a radical shift from the Draft Core Strategy 2010 and why development south of Banbury at Salt Way is deemed more harmful than the housing development proposed north of Banbury.   |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Extends development beyond new distributor road, which provides a clear boundary to development and would extend the over the local landscape ridge with impact on the Hanwell Village Conservation Area.   |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | No objection in principle however land to the North of Hanwell Fields sites on the ridge line and is therefore prominent in visual amenity terms. Banbury 2 is more discreet in landscape terms. Plan should acknowledge importance of Banbury 2 which is a key deliverable site. |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Objection to Ban 5 on the grounds of being previously dismissed, public objection, unsustainable location, high commuting, no confirmed services, land is of high landscape value, Hanwell Filed was designed as the Urban edge, rights of way, loss of countryside               |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Concern at the lack of school provision at Ban 5 and wider.   |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Concern at the lack of health provision, e.g. Doctors Surgery   |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Concern at the lack of Retail provision e.g. shops  |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Concern at the lack of community facilities   |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Limit of development previously agreed at Dukes Meadows Drive   |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Concern regarding traffic congestion and formation of rat runs  |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Loss in House values in Hanwell Field   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name  | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|-------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 254        | Mark        | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                    | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Accepts the need to meet housing delivery and bring forward additional sites to achieve this. However, development of additional areas should not take place instead Canalside and should not be implemented until the planned Bankside has been completed. The site is adjacent to a recently developed site and feel that it would be better to have a period of stability.  |
| 264        | Daniel      | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations  | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Primary schools will depend on housing mix, tenure and build rate. Spare capacity in other schools. Text should reflect that of Banbury 3.   |
| 264        | Daniel      | Round       | OCC - Ecology                           | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Brown long-eared maternity roost and two semi-improved grassland fields present. Woodland to the north of BAN5 contains Natters Bat. Woodland should be retained.  |
| 264        | Daniel      | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport            | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Public transport services to other strategic sites. New bullet point; walking & cycling, transport assessment & plans.   |
| 279        | Martin      | Small       | English Heritage                        | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | EH supports the key principles relating to the historic environment.   |
| 292        | Christopher | Taylor      |   | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Objects to the proposed development due to landscape and environmental impact, including the adverse impact of light pollution on the Hanwell Community Observatory. It is not clear why the site is being proposed given that the site was previously refused permission and was only proposed as a reserve site in the draft Core Strategy. The revocation of the South East Plan is imminent and when this happens the basis for the Plan's housing figures will disappear. Reference is made to previous representations made on the site by the objector. |
| 325        | Antony      | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Remove from Plan - Green Belt  |
| 325        | Antony      | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Remove from Plan. Traffic issues. Unsustainable location. Flooding risk. Visual sensitivities.   |
| 380        | Brian       | Little      | Local History Group                     | Policy                             | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Important to ensure Hardwick lost village and Hanwell do not lose their identity.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 3          | Alec       | Arrol         | Kennet Properties / Thames Water | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | KPL continues to support this allocation. It plays an important role in meeting employment land requirements during the LP life time, as evidenced by the completion of its first phase.   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society            | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | Welcome key site specific design and place shaping principles. In particular bullet point 6.   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society            | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | Site is located close to Schedule Monument and ancient hedgerow that marks Oxfordshire / Northamptonshire county boundary.   |
| 203        | Rebecca    | Micklem       | BBOWT                            | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | Despite the identification of potential habitat loss in the Sustainability Appraisal, it would appear that no ecological assessment of the area has been undertaken. This is needed to ensure that the policy is appropriate in terms of biodiversity impacts, to identify requirements for biodiversity protection, mitigation and enhancement, and to ensure compliance with NPPF paras. 109 and 165 |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran        | Environment Agency               | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40.        | Pleased to see that all built development will be rolled back outside modelled Flood Zone 3 in line with Level 2 SFRA.   |
| 221        | Peter      | Frampton      | Framptons / Barwood Developments | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | Site should be developed to its maximum potential for B2 & B8 uses while maintaining flood mitigation measures. Policy should clarify land area where it states 6.3 ha net remaining. To ensure flexibility. Map attached.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council             | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | Supports the development of this site but would like to see a limit on B8 uses.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Archaeology                | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | No further archaeological survey required.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Ecology                    | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | Banbury Sewage Farm has records of many rare species. New survey required.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport  | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | Question walking distance assumption. Poor public transport access. A road line has been safeguarded. Emphasis on improving pedestrian and cycling links to the railway station. New bullet point - transport assessment / travel plans. |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group                             | Policy                             | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40         | Need high value industry and not warehouse.  |
| 26         | Ed         | Barrett     | Turley Associates/ Scottish Widows / Scottish Widows Unit Funds Ltd | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre   | Support principal of extending town centre boundary to include Spiceball Development Area.   |
| 26         | Ed         | Barrett     | Turley Associates/ Scottish Widows / Scottish Widows Unit Funds Ltd | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre   | Plan is silent on future scale of retail and leisure development within Banbury Town Centre. Should include retail targets.  |
| 158        | Chris      | Hone        | CPRE Banbury District   | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre   | It needs to be ensured that development proposals in certain parts of the town do not compromise the sustainability of the town centre as a whole.   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency  | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre   | Where there is a change of use from Less Vulnerable to More Vulnerable development in Flood Zones 2 and 3, need to consider flood risk to future users . Access and egress to be considered in line with Level to SFRA.                  |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council  | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre   | Supports this policy and in particular residential uses above ground floor level.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology   | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre   | Opportunities should be pursued for Green Infrastructure, SuDS & biodiversity in buildings.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport  | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre   | Re-phase Canalside bullet. Banbury bus Station - text unclear. Redevelopment of the bus station should improve bus routeing and passenger waiting environment.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage  | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre   | Would like to see a reference to the Conservation Area and listed buildings within this policy.  |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group                             | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre   | Push ahead and improve car parking.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                    | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 380        | Brian      | Little        | Local History Group   | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town Centre                      | Should be leisure related and not retail led. Demand for a store would best be met within Castle Quay when the opportunity arises.   |
| 380        | Brian      | Little        | Local History Group   | Policy                             | Banbury 7                          | Strengthening Banbury Town centre                      | The historic town centre must remain the primary focus of future tourism.  |
| 118        | Peter      | Frampton      | Framptons   | Paragraph                          | C.157                              | Strategic Development: Banbury 8 - Land at Bolton Road | Reasoned justification for Banbury 8 does not acknowledge; multiple ownerships, land disposal, not deliverable, requirements for indoor sports provision & why it should be an exemplary demonstration with Policy BSD1-5.   |
| 26         | Ed         | Barrett       | Turley Associates/ Scottish Widows / Scottish Widows Unit Funds Ltd | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                                    | Should include retail floorspace target for Bolton Road.   |
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton      | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors                  | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                                    | This policy is supported. However there should be recognition within the policy that viability should be taken into account when balancing competing policy requirements. Or alternatively viability should be considered as a stand alone policy elsewhere within the plan.   |
| 118        | Peter      | Frampton      | Framptons   | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                                    | Policy conflicts with NPPF Para 154 - Council should be transparent to the likelihood of using CPO powers.   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society   | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                                    | Supported subject to Banbury Masterplan.   |
| 196        | Kirill     | Malkin        | Quod / Gala Leisure   | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                                    | Gala Leisure own the leasehold for Land at Bolton Way until 2023 where they run a successful and commercially viable business for the last 13 years. No approach has been made to Gala Leisure in respect of alternatives sites or their requirements. The proposed indicative alternative site set out in the Bolton Road SPD is unsuitable for the their business needs, being a third the size and in a first floor location. Gala Leisure have no immediate intention to move. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 196        | Kirill     | Malkin      | Quod / Gala Leisure                                  | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Should no suitable relocation site be identified Gala Leisure would be forced to leave the Banbury Market with the associated economic impact - loss of 18 jobs. Proposal is contrary to aims of the NPPF and Sustainable Development. Policy is undeliverable without engagement with local businesses.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                                 | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Support the principle of regenerating Land at Bolton Road. We would not like to see historic buildings demolished and would like to see links to the old town and Parsons Street. Needs to include car parking provision and a town centre supermarket which the town currently lacks. It presents the opportunity to develop historic outbuildings to the rear of Parsons Street. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology                                    | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Archaeological survey should be noted in Key Site Specific Design. Wording supplied.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology  | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Opportunities should be pursued for Green Infrastructure, SuDS & biodiversity in buildings. Green spaces will need to be managed in perpetuity with funding and delivery mechanisms considered. Bat survey required.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                         | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Amend bullet point 9. New bullet point - design of car park, travel plans / travel assessment.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                                     | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | EH supports the key principles relating to the historic environment.   |
| 285        | Victor     | Smith       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Building any more shops, offices or industrial premises is not sustainable. Agree to the redevelopment of Bolton Road, Provision of additional shops out of town is wrong.   |
| 317        | Robert     | Tustain     |  | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Support Bolton Road redevelopment. Suggest development includes a Supermarket, Theatre & Cinema. Object to a Hotel proposal.   |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group              | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Include residential and underground car parking.   |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams    | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Welcome inclusion of policy. Policy should recognise that viability should be taken into account when balancing competing requirements. Should viability form a stand along policy within the plan?  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 380        | Brian      | Little      | Local History Group   | Policy                             | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                 | Essential that there are links to the old town.   |
| 26         | Ed         | Barrett     | Turley Associates/ Scottish Widows / Scottish Widows Unit Funds Ltd | Policy                             | Banbury 9                          | Spiceball Development Area          | Inclusion of retail and leisure uses within Spiceball development area are considered to compliment town centre location.   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency  | Policy                             | Banbury 9                          | Spiceball Development Area          | In direct conflict with footnote 20 (page 24) of NPPF. Wording needs to change to 'A Flood Risk Assessment will be required for any future planning application' in line with NPPF requirements.                        |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council  | Policy                             | Banbury 9                          | Spiceball Development Area          | Support Cultural Quarter . The town needs a site for a new library and facilities such as a theatre/cinema and art gallery. It needs to include car parking, probably on ground floor to prevent possible flood damage. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology   | Policy                             | Banbury 9                          | Spiceball Development Area          | Opportunities should be pursued for Green Infrastructure, SuDS & biodiversity in buildings.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport  | Policy                             | Banbury 9                          | Spiceball Development Area          | New bullet point - pedestrian & cycle route, sustainable modes of transport, transport assessment / travel plans.   |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group                             | Policy                             | Banbury 9                          | Spiceball Development Area          | Go ahead.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council  | Policy                             | Banbury 10                         | Bretch Hill Regeneration Area       | Support proposal that will assist in reducing high levels of deprivation in western Banbury   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology   | Policy                             | Banbury 10                         | Bretch Hill Regeneration Area       | Opportunities should be pursued for Green Infrastructure, SuDS & biodiversity in buildings.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport  | Policy                             | Banbury 10                         | Bretch Hill Regeneration Area       | Green infrastructure. Unlike to deliver direct bus service. Bullet point 4 - amendment suggested. Review existing traffic calming measures.   |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group                             | Policy                             | Banbury 10                         | Bretch Hill Regeneration Area       | Go ahead - meet energy conservation.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)  | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | C.170                              | Strategic Development:<br>Banbury 11 - Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation | Support para C.119, C.170 & C.176 and the requirement for further Cricket Pitch provision.   |
| 44         | Fiona      | Brereton    | Drivers Jonas Deloitte/Aberdeen Property Investors   | Paragraph                          | 1.52                               | Banbury masterplan   | It is assumed the Banbury Masterplan will include retail capacity figures but these figures should be included in the Local Plan as well |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Paragraph                          | C.176                              | Strategic Development:<br>Banbury 11 - Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation | Support para C.119, C.170 & C.176 and the requirement for further Cricket Pitch provision.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council   | Policy                             | Banbury 11                         | Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport & Recreation  | Supports the identified deficiencies and the creation of a liner park north -south, and the relocation of Banbury United.                |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | C.180                              | Strategic Development:<br>Banbury 12 - Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC          | Has traffic survey's been undertaken? Traffic problems at Bloxham Road & Banbury at Oxford Road.   |
| 13         | Vicky      | Aston       |  | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Recreation of Banbury United FC   | Support relocation of Banbury FC & welcome further engagement.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                     | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)          | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 130        | Jennifer   | Glynn       |                                   | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC | Object to the allocation of Banbury Football Club at Banbury 12 on the grounds that it does not respect the identity of Bodicote and will increase traffic. Suggest allocation is removed from the Plan and alternative location found.                                      |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson      | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC | Objection to the relocation of Banbury FC on grounds of unsustainable location and traffic congestion through the town . Alternative site suggested between Station Road and the Motorway.   |
| 169        | Heather    | Johnston    |                                   | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC | Objection to the relocation of Banbury FC on grounds of unsustainable location and traffic congestion through the town . Alternative site suggested between Station Road and the Motorway.   |
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones       | Marrons / Hallam Land Management  | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the relocation of Banbury United FC | Possible redistribution of uses between Banbury 4. Allocation should be reflected in gross terms.  |
| 199        | Gerard     | McCrary     | Banbury Utd FC                    | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC | Promotes alternative site for Banbury United FC.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council              | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury United    | Banbury United Football Club need to re-sit in order to develop Canalside but consideration needs to be given to suitable bus service for supporters by bus from the town and the railway station. An alternative site could be found to the north east of the M40 junction. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                     | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury FC        | Potential BAP habitat (Broadleaved woodland) around rugby ground. No Comment.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport      | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury FC        | New location is not sustainable. Consider pedestrian & cycling links.  |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council           | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury FC        | Re-label BOD 12 and not BAN 12. Concern at relocation of FC to the South of the town as will cause traffic congestion along Oxford Road. Suggest locating in the north.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                  | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury FC                                | Go ahead.   |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency                      | Paragraph                          | C.181                              | Strategic Development: Banbury 13 - Burial Site Provision in Banbury | Support the commitment to survey land to establish the suitability of ground conditions.  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency                      | Policy                             | Banbury 13                         | Burial Site Provision in Banbury                                     | It must not be established in an area than this likely to have a negative impact on ground water.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                    | Policy                             | Banbury 13                         | Burial site provision in Banbury                                     | TC would like to see an additional allocation of the field to the north of the cemetery for a cemetery extension. Noted that developer contributions will be sought towards costs but inflated land prices would make a negotiated sale improbable. Noted the intention of progressing this matter through the Local Neighbourhoods DPD but TC questions whether this will have the same weight. Without and Strategic allocation CDC will need to use CPO powers as it did to acquire the original cemetery. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                           | Policy                             | Banbury 13                         | Burial Site Provision in Banbury                                     | Native and local provenance planting and sowing should be encouraged within the landscape.  |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts       | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group | Policy                             | Banbury 13                         | Burial Site Provision in Banbury                                     | Needed.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council                    | Policy                             | Banbury 14                         | Banbury Country Park   | TC supports the aspiration to provide a community woodland, Whilst this is highly desirable TC already manages a Country Park which is closer o the town for the benefit of Banbury residents, and this is pertinent to where future maintenance responsibility for the site might reside.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology                       | Policy                             | Banbury 14                         | Banbury Country Park   | Archaeological survey should be noted in Key Site Specific Design. Wording supplied.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                           | Policy                             | Banbury 14                         | Banbury Country Park   | Support.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport                                    | Policy                             | Banbury 14                         | Banbury Country Park                | Site is not in a sustainable location. Text on pedestrian and cycling access to public transport services.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small         | English Heritage  | Policy                             | Banbury 14                         | Banbury Country Park                | Mention could be made of the Grade II listed lock and Lock Cottage at the north end of the proposed Country Park.  |
| 325        | Antony     | Watts         | Hanwell Fields Development Action Group                         | Policy                             | Banbury 14                         | Banbury Country Park                | Worthless. Support public footpaths only.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Section                            | C.4                                | Kidlington                          | Support approach at Kidlington given settlement size and market position.  |
| 162        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Section                            | C.4                                | Kidlington                          | Plan should make decision in respect of re-development potential of Police HQ site.  |
| 162        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Section                            | C.4                                | Kidlington                          | Clarity required in respect of Stratfield Brake and evidence base - open space review. Amendments suggested.   |
| 223        | Peter      | Frampton      | Framptons / Barwood Developments                                | Section                            | C.4                                | Kidlington                          | Policy should set out a reasoned justification for the exceptional circumstances for the alteration of the green belt. Extent of Green Belt Review boundary is not supported by NPPF para 85 as it will need to be reviewed at the end of the development plan period & does not define a boundary using physical features. Approach excludes housing. Selective review should occur urgently and before submission of the Local Plan. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations                          | Section                            | C.4                                | Kidlington                          | Text that refers to Kidlington should appear in one location. Area of search for Green Belt review should be widened to include land at Begbroke Science Park.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport                                    | Section                            | C.4                                | Kidlington                          | New issue; transport links between Oxford & Bicester, improving frequency and quality of bus service. Rename airport. Mention Water Eaton Parkway and the wider Evergreen project.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council                          | Section                            | C.4                                | Kidlington                          | Support business growth at Oxford Airport but believe that there should be restrictions on operations  |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith         | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council                          | Section                            | C.4                                | Kidlington                          | Is concerned about the traffic impact of more development at Langford Lane   |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Paragraph                          | C.188                              | C.4 Kidlington                      | Update population figures.   |
| 256        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                                       | Paragraph                          | C.188                              | C.4 Kidlington                      | Population figure for Kidlington & Gosport is an underestimate.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                                 | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Paragraph                          | C.190                              | C.4 Kidlington  | Support.   |
| 255        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                                       | Paragraph                          | C.190                              | C.4 Kidlington  | Support proposed Kidlington Masterplan. Like reassurance that it will include an up to date reassessment of local housing need and review of all housing options and the housing target of 259 will be exceeded. Wording supplied. |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | C.192                              | What Will Happen Where  | C.192 should refer specifically to Begbroke Science Park & not just Begbroke. Object to the chosen approach at Kidlington in not releasing land from the Green Belt within the Local Plan but within subsequent DPD                |
| 160        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Paragraph                          | C.192                              | What will Happen and Where  | Text suggestion.   |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                                       | Paragraph                          | C.192                              | What will happen when and where                                     | Include housing need.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | C.193                              | What Will Happen Where  | Object to C.193 sentence does not make sense as Employment Allocations within inset area are already outside Green Belt and that second part of sentence is out of date. Text supplied.  |
| 190        | Nik        | Lyzba         | JPPC / Oxford University Press                                  | Paragraph                          | C.194                              | Strategic Development: Kidlington 1 - Langford Lane Technology Park | Concern policy only applies to 'some additional employment land' in Kidlington rather than requirement identified in ELR for between 9.3 - 11.3 ha.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Paragraph                          | C.195                              | Strategic Development: Kidlington 1 - Langford Lane Technology Park | Object to C.195, Oxford Technology Park is needed now.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 5          | Tom        | Ashley        | Turnberry Planing Ltd / Oxford University                       | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Report sets out history and background of Begbroke Science Park, provides a brief overview of the Universities development strategy, discusses in more detail the recent and future growth in scientific research at the University, explains why Begbroke Science Park is considered the University to be the most appropriate location for scientific research, explores the scale of the development that could be required at the Science Park during 2031 to support the growth of scientific research & draws together the analysis for 'exceptional circumstances' in support of a small scale review of the Green Belt boundaries around the Science Park. |
| 5          | Tom        | Ashley        | Turnberry Planing Ltd / Oxford University                       | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Small Scale Green Belt review for Langford Lane should be expanded to include Begbroke Science Park. Wording supplied. Reflecting future demand for expansion & 'exceptional circumstances'.   |
| 85         | Will       | Cobley        | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Blenheim Palace Estate                  | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Support small scale review of Green Belt, NPPF Para 83. Policy and supporting text should be amended to a proper review to ensure boundaries are defensible in the long term.  |
| 100        | Suzi       | Coyne         | Suzi Coyne Planning / Worton Farms Ltd                          | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Land at Worton farm should be removed from the Local Green Space designation (Green Belt?).  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Object to Policy Kidlington 1, policy does not bring forward much needed employment land quickly enough. Text supplied. Bullet points within policy supported.   |
| 160        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Support selective green belt review at Kidlington for employment land but review should also include a review of residential options. Concern at unsustainable commuting. Paragraph B.33 should introduce a restriction on the scope of growth of Oxford Airport. Consideration of design issues; height of buildings, connectivity within Kidlington Masterplan. Amendments suggested.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                                  | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Support policy and small scale local review of the Green Belt at Langford Lane / London Oxford Airport. Securing high quality employment land in this location may alleviate pressure from the more valuable inner Green Belt.  |
| 190        | Nik        | Lyzba       | JPPC / Oxford University Press   | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Support limited review of Green Belt at Langford Lane. And should be reflected in Policy ESD14 and tie in with Policy Kidlington 1. Area of search should be widened to include the North West in order to not restrict unreasonably the area subject to review.  |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward      | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | It does not mention the site of the proposed station.   |
| 203        | Rebecca    | Micklem     | BBOWT                            | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | The proposal is adjacent to Rushy Meadows SSSI, and overlaps with Langford Meadows LWS and Lower Cherwell Valley CTA. However, it would appear that no ecological assessment of the area has been undertaken. This is needed to ensure that the policy is appropriate in terms of biodiversity impacts, to identify requirements for biodiversity protection, mitigation and enhancement, and to ensure compliance with NPPF paras. 109 and 165 |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency               | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | No issues in principle with the policy and welcome the provision of SuDS. However, an opportunity to reduce flood risk has been missed. This could include de-culverting or diverting Thrupp Ditch. Remediation of contaminated land could have been included as a key design principle.  |
| 223        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Barwood Developments | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | De-allocate Land identified at Kidlington from the Green Belt & allocate as Employment. Land is available, suitable and achievable for employment development. Map attached.  |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath     | Kidlington Parish Council        | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Minor wording amendments.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                             | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Many species present - Barn Owl, Hobby & Kingfisher, Otter, Water Vole. Rushey Meadows SSSI adjoins south-western boundary of proposed Green Belt review. Lower Cherwell Valley Conservation Target Area and Lowland Meadow BAP Priority Habitat. Direct or indirect damage should be considered.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport              | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Connectivity with village centre, Oxford, Bicester and Water Eaton Parkway. New & existing development. Improvements needed to public transport, walking & cycling. Bus service should be developed to all day - growing demand of enterprise in area.   |
| 283        | Roger      | Smith       | Savills / The Bulford trust               | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Support small scale review of the Green Belt on the northern edge of Kidlington as this provides opportunity for residential development & to address open space deficiency. Area of search should be expanded to the east of the Langford Lane Technology Park and East of Banbury Road (north of the Moors).   |
| 291        | Neville    | Surtees     | Barton Willmore / J A Pye Ltd             | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Support aim to undertake a Limited Green Belt Review. The scope of review area needs to be increased in size to present realistic options for development. Omission Site: Land to the South of Langford Locks is suitable for employment land given its sustainable location, constrained day railway line & Canal, containment, urban character, non-historic setting & need for employment land. Land would form a continuation of employment land to the north and logical extension. Will reduce commuting. Limited Green Belt Review area is removed from Central Kidlington. |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District                    | Policy                             | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park       | Support principle of structured framework.   |
| 5          | Tom        | Ashley      | Turnberry Planing Ltd / Oxford University | Paragraph                          | C.192                              | What will happen when and where     | Support reference to Begbroke Science Park.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 159        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Paragraph                          | C.197                              | Strategic Development: Kidlington 2 - Strengthening Kidlington Village Centre             | Object to overestimation of additional comparison goods retail floor space.  |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                 | Paragraph                          | C.197                              | Strategic Development: Kidlington 2 - Strengthening Kidlington Village Centre             | Amend para C.197 to reflect the increased allowance made in projections to tackle under-representation of comparison floor space and any identified future over trading at Kidlington.   |
| 159        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Paragraph                          | C.199                              | Strategic Development: Kidlington 2 - Strengthening Kidlington Village Centre             | Support extension to Kidlington Village Centre.  |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara     | The Astons and Heyford Ward               | Policy                             | Kidlington 2                       | Strengthening Kidlington Village Centre   | Mention the key objective to secure the space behind buildings in the High Street for a vehicle delivery road so that the High Street is eventually pedestrianised. Cross reference to Kidlington Infrastructure requirements. |
| 258        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council                 | Policy                             | Kidlington 2                       | Strengthening Kidlington Village Centre   | Support Kidlington Masterplan.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Ecology                             | Policy                             | Kidlington 2                       | Strengthening Kidlington Village Centre   | Opportunities should be perused for Green Infrastructure, SuDS & biodiversity in buildings.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport              | Policy                             | Kidlington 2                       | Strengthening Kidlington Village Centre   | Policy should mention links to public transport. Link to Langford Lane & Airport is poor to Water Eaton & Oxford.  |
| 5          | Tom        | Ashley        | Turnberry Planing Ltd / Oxford University | Paragraph                          | C.200                              | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in the Villages and Rural Areas | Support reference to Begbroke Science Park.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name         | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)  | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|--------------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 22         | Tony               | Baldry MP   |  | Other                              | C.5                                | Our Villages and Rural Areas   | A number of houses are left to be built in the villages overall. As part of the Local Plan process villages should be encouraged to carry out their own neighbourhood planning exercise. It is going to be more sensible for housing numbers to be met by villages volunteering to take new houses rather than housing numbers being imposed upon them. |
| 22         | Tony               | Baldry MP   |  | Other                              | C.5                                | Our Villages and Rural Areas   | Thought could be given to whether it is possible, with the support of Parish Councils, for planning permission to be granted in villages for new housing on the understanding that such affordable housing is for people with local connections.  |
| 64         | Terry              | Byrd        | Merton Parish Council                  | Section                            | C.5                                | Our Villages and Rural Areas   | Proposals are too prescriptive and will seriously inhibit Neighbourhoods/Parish Plans and disable localism.   |
| 264        | Daniel             | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Section                            | C.5                                | Our Villages and Rural Areas   | Section duplicates Kidlington & Airport.  |
| 280        | Carl               | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Section                            | C.5                                | Our Villages and Rural Areas   | It is not clear if Gosford is treated as a separate entity to Kidlington  |
| 280        | Carl               | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Section                            | C.5                                | Our Villages and Rural Areas   | Infilling is fine but the street scene and layout needs to be taken into account  |
| 280        | Carl               | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Section                            | C.5                                | Our Villages and Rural Areas   | The Parish have attended Parish workshops and these have assisted in forming policy. They do not consider that the preparation of the Parish Neighbourhood plan is needed and will accept that the Local Plan will fulfil its requirements.   |
| 280        | Carl               | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Section                            | C.5                                | Our Villages and Rural Areas   | It is considered that there is not enough in the Plan to protect village services and facilities.   |
| 299        | Bruce              | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District                 | Section                            | C.5                                | Our Villages and Rural Areas   | Agree in principle with the overall strategy.   |
| 197        | Margaret Elizabeth | Mason       |  | Paragraph                          | C.201                              | Meeting the Challenges of Developing a Sustainable Economy in the Villages and Rural Areas | Support the proposal to improve mobile phone and internet services in the village and therefore improve home working in rural communities.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name         | Second Name | Organisations                       | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)  | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 63         | Peter              | Burrows     | Adderbury Conservation Action Group | Paragraph                          | C.202                              | Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in the Villages and Rural Areas  | Large estates on the edge of as yet unspoilt conservation areas/historic villages e.g. Adderbury, would destroy the appeal of the area to the tourist industry. |
| 113        | Julia              | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                         | Para graph                         | C.202                              | Meeting the Challenge of Building Sustainable Villages and Rural Areas                     | Supports the aim of living villages   |
| 197        | Margaret Elizabeth | Mason       |                                     | Paragraph                          | C.202                              | Meeting the Challenges of Developing a Sustainable Economy in the Villages and Rural Areas | Support the provision of Sport and Recreation facilities in rural areas   |
| 113        | Julia              | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                         | Paragraph                          | C.205                              | Meeting the Challenge of Building Sustainable Villages and Rural Areas                     | There should be a presumption in favour of retaining village services   |
| 168        | Patricia           | Jesson      | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council   | Paragraph                          | C.205                              | Meeting the Challenge of Building Sustainable Villages and Rural Areas                     | Will sports facilities, present and proposed meet the lack of sports facilities in Banbury?   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name         | Second Name   | Organisations                       | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|--------------------|---------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 312        | Sarah Caroline     | Turner        |                                     | Paragraph                          | C.206                              | Meeting the Challenges of Building Sustainable Villages and Rural Areas                   | Objection to strategy as it seeks to direct growth only at the existing sustainable settlements at expense of smaller villages. Wording supplied. |
| 160        | Andrew             | Hornsby-Smith |                                     | Paragraph                          | C.208                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Our Villages and Rural Areas | Oxford Meadows SAC located 4km from Langford Lane Technology Park.  |
| 197        | Margaret Elizabeth | Mason         |                                     | Paragraph                          | C.208                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in the Villages and Rural Areas | Developments should include adequate off-road parking   |
| 63         | Peter              | Burrows       | Adderbury Conservation Action Group | Paragraph                          | C.209                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in our Villages and Rural Areas | The continual pressure for the development of the larger estates will only exacerbate the need for travel.  |
| 160        | Andrew             | Hornsby-Smith |                                     | Paragraph                          | C.209                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in our Villages and Rural Areas | Support mixed development and sustainable travel.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                     | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology                 | Paragraph                          | C.209                              | Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in our Villages and Rural Areas | Ref to enhancing the quality of our natural, built and archaeological heritage.   |
| 130        | Jennifer   | Glynn       |                                   | Paragraph                          | C.210                              | Our Vision and Strategy for Our Villages and Rural Areas                                  | Object to coalescence of Bodicote.  |
| 250        | Ruth       | POWLES      | Kirtlington Parish Council        | Paragraph                          | C.210                              | Our Vision and Strategy for Our Villages and Rural Areas                                  | Plans fails to meet infrastructure requirements in Bicester including East West Rail and Project Evergreen 3. Suggest out of town rail station. Improvements to A34. Concern at rat runs. |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council           | Paragraph                          | C.210                              | Our Vision and Strategy for Our Villages and Rural Areas                                  | Disagree that villages are protected - Bodicote is over run.  |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson      | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council | Paragraph                          | C.211                              | Our Vision and Strategy for Our Villages and Rural Areas                                  | Wroxton is a conservation village, any development will take place in the conservation area, what restrictions will that put on developments?   |
| 250        | Ruth       | POWLES      | Kirtlington Parish Council        | Paragraph                          | C.211                              | Our Vision and Strategy for Our Villages and Rural Areas                                  | Plans fails to meet infrastructure requirements in Bicester including East West Rail and Project Evergreen 3. Suggest out of town rail station. Improvements to A34. Concern at rat runs. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations                       | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)       | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|----------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 113        | Julia          | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                         | Paragraph                          | C.214                              | What will happen and where                | Development should not be allowed on the basis of arguments that would enable services to be maintained. The community should be consulted.   |
| 313        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |                                     | Paragraph                          | C.214                              | What will happen and where                | Objection to strategy as it seeks to direct growth only at the existing sustainable settlements at expense of smaller villages. Wording supplied.   |
| 246        | Jonathan       | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land    | Paragraph                          | C.216                              | What will Happen and Where                | No explanation provided for the reduction in the overall level of growth in the Rural Areas. Rural areas require sufficient housing to support new homes and provide choice.  |
| 248        | Jonathan       | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land    | Paragraph                          | C.216                              | What will Happen and Where                | No explanation provided for the reduction in the overall level of growth in the Rural Areas. Rural areas require sufficient housing to support new homes and provide choice.  |
| 113        | Julia          | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                         | Paragraph                          | C.218                              | What will Happen and Where                | Support this paragraph on design  |
| 63         | Peter          | Burrows     | Adderbury Conservation Action Group | Paragraph                          | C.220                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | The evidence base, methodology and assessment of each village has not been set out to enable comparisons to be made.  |
| 64         | Terry          | Byrd        | Merton Parish Council               | Paragraph                          | C.220                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | CRAITLUS only covered 33 settlements of approximately 90. Why not all of them or any other number of them?. The Bicester SE relief road will have a significant effect for Merton but CRAITLUS would not be revised. The paragraph makes no mention of maintaining or improving Sustainability. |
| 132        | Theresa        | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council            | Paragraph                          | C.220                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | Para C220 does not set out the methodology and assessment to derive the village growth and to enable comparison.  |
| 134        | Theresa        | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council              | Paragraph                          | C.220                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | Para C220 does not set out the methodology and assessment to derive the village categorisation and to enable comparison. SHLAA has not been made available.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                       | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)       | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |                                     | Paragraph                          | C.220-232                          | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | Strongly Support this policy. Agree that the Status of Hanwell should be Category C.   |
| 263        | Mike       | Robinson    | Carter Jonas LLP / Hill Residential | Paragraph                          | C.220-C.239                        | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | Chesterton scored higher (26 out of a score of 30) than seven of the 'Category A' villages and should be included as a Category A village. The amount of housing in Group 3 should be increased to meet rural needs in suitable villages. A greater proportion of development should be allowed where there is support from the Parish Council . |
| 63         | Peter      | Burrows     | Adderbury Conservation Action Group | Paragraph                          | C.221                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | There is no attempt to evaluate and compare services in different areas e.g. a service which is available 12 hours a day 5 days a week compared to 2 hours twice a week. They should be rated differently.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council            | Paragraph                          | C.221                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | The use of CRAITLUS is questioned because it does not demonstrate the availability in time or distance of village service provision / facility only that provision may exist. The SHLAA is still not available to comment on and inform for the production of a Neighbourhood Plan.  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council              | Paragraph                          | C.221                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | CRAITLUS and SHLAA have been used to inform village categorisation. The SHLAA is still not available to assess accuracy and compliance and CRAITLUS has been questioned as some of the methodology used could deliver flawed data.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council            | Paragraph                          | C.222                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | States that the principle of categorisation is well established and if this is the case where is the methodology?  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council              | Paragraph                          | C.222                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | States that the principle of categorisation is well established. Just because this was used for previous plans does not make it appropriate now.   |
| 19         | Ken        | Atack       | Cropredy Ward                       | Paragraph                          | C.223                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | Pleased to see the concept of clusters has remained within the plan. This arrangement has been acknowledged by Parish Councils as a sensible way forward.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council            | Paragraph                          | C.225                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | Do not support Adderbury as a Category A village.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)       | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                      | Paragraph                          | C.225                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | There is insufficient evidence base to include Bloxham in the Category (No through bus service to Oxford and lack of public transport makes accessing the hospital provision costly).                         |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson      | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council           | Paragraph                          | C.225                              | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | Wroxton is a Cat B village. Does this preclude minor development?   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward                 | Paragraph                          | C.225/230                          | Policy Villages 1: Village categorisation | Lower Heyford should be removed from the list of 'clustered' villages as it is not linked to Steeple Aston.   |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council                     | Paragraph                          | C.225                              | Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation | Bodicote is included in a Category A village - suitable for minor development or infilling, however allocated 400 dwg. Village categorisation is confusing.   |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd     | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | Support the inclusion of Deddington as a Category 1 settlement.   |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd     | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | Questions if there is a need for the policy as Policy villages 2 indicates which are the most sustainable villages.   |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd     | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | The 'type of development' specified is ambiguous and it is not clear if this relates to development within the village or on the edge. The term minor development is open to interpretation.                  |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd     | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | There is no justification for the reduction in the amount of dwellings in the rural areas and focusing too much development in Bicester will force local people away the rural areas to find homes.           |
| 24         | Suzanne    | Bangert     | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Mr & Mrs P Ashworth | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | Policy should allow more minor development in category C villages.  |
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | Policy should be amended to include a reference to the need for new allocations to be provided as extensions to villages. No consistency with Policy Villages 2.  |
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)            | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | Support approach based on sustainability however it should be recognised that improvements to Category A villages will support surrounding smaller settlements.   |
| 97         | Roger      | Cooke       |   | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | The policy is unsound because their classification is fundamentally wrong and hence the numbers allocated are wrong. It has not taken into account sustainability and ability to cope with extra development. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 106        | Russell    | Crow        | Barton Willmore / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Hook Norton is more sustainable than other settlements in Group 2 and is as sustainable as Deddington which is considered a Group 1 settlement in Policy Villages 2. Hook Norton has better site options for future growth in term so limiting impact on character of villages and locating growth near to existing facilities. The CRAITUS assessment of total network travel time and distance contains significant assumptions and is inconsistent with ONS data. Promote Hook Norton to Group 1 or take a higher proportion of growth in Group 2. |
| 130        | Jennifer   | Glynn       |  | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Development proposed at Bankside Phase 1 conflicts with policy for small scale infill development.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council               | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Reasons set in C.220 to C222  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council               | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Reasons set in C.220 to C222  |
| 133        | Theresa    | Goss        | Milcombe Parish Council                | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Milcombe is down as category B and the satellite villages have no bearing on this village. Infilling and conversions are noted in the policy but never put into practice. Bloxham is noted as category A - minor development - but the PC would don't call minor the development that has already taken place in Bloxham.   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                 | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Reasons set in C.220 to C222  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                 | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Disagree with reference to Bloxham, as previously stated - flawed methodology used  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 141        | Peter      | Hardman       |   | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Object to the categorisation of the Sibfords as Category A when previous report by Craitilus suggests they are category villages B or C. Suggest that Category A status is widened to encompass the villages of Epwell, Swalcliffe, Tadmarton, Shutford and Shenington.  |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman       | Middleton Stoney Parish Council           | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Unclear as the reasoning behind the categorisation of Middleton Stoney within Category B since the village has no shop, primary school, no new employment prospects and is only served by a subsidised bus service which could be discontinued at any time. Should revise category to reflect sustainability.  |
| 156        | Miranda    | Rogers        | Stansgate Planning / P S Coles Will Trust | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Assessment require for the settlement hierarchy of settlements. Why forms of development are proposed e.g. infill, conversions etc.. Policy should include housing identified for local need, particularly where it contributes to improvements within the settlement. Shenington should be included in a Category A village. Shenington is a sustainable location with many services. Only large village in the North West of the District. Other smaller settlements have been promoted above it. High house prices. |
| 157        | Sian       | Holland       | Stansgate Planning / Brasenose College    | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Support inclusion of Cropredy as a Category A village. Good range of services and facilities. Important northern centre for Claydon, Wardington, Mollington, Prescote, Williamscoote and Great Bourton. Support provision of new housing for growing population, aging population and smaller households.  |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Remove Kidlington.   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council         | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Wroxton is a Cat B village. Does this preclude minor development?  |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones         | Hanwell Village Residents                 | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Strongly support. Agree Hanwell Village should be category C and suitable for no new development except conversions. It is a small village of 120 houses, few facilities and poor transport links. Not a sustainable location for growth.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council           | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Support Hanwell village as a category C settlement, one of the least sustainable as it has few services and poor transport.   |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                                  | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Strongly support. Agree Hanwell Village should be category C and suitable for no new development except conversions. It is a small village of 120 houses, few facilities and poor transport links. Not a sustainable location for growth.   |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |                                  | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Strongly Support this policy. Agree that the Status of Hanwell should be Category C.  |
| 188        | Rob        | Linnell     | Savills / Trinity College Oxford | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Support the identification of Wroxton as a Category B village. Wroxton has a good range of services and facilities and it is a sustainable village in close proximity to the main service centre of Banbury.  |
| 201        | Helen      | Metcalfe    | Fritwell Parish Council          | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Fritwell should not be included as a Category A village. It is the smallest in its group and does not have the services and facilities the other villages have. The infrastructure is at capacity and the CRAITILUS report does not include Fritwell within the top 10 villages assessed as being within 30 minutes of key services. It is included in an area of poor accessibility and has a score of a Category B village. |
| 216        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Messrs Markham       | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Policy should extent to previously developed land. Too restrictive for example infilling within Category B and conversions in Category C. For example would prevent redevelopment in Charlton or Ottmoor.   |
| 227        | Louise     | Morton      | Quadrant Town Planning Ltd       | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Restricting development to conversions in category 3 villages is not justified as the evidence base shows a need for more affordable housing  |
| 227        | Louise     | Morton      | Quadrant Town Planning Ltd       | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | The policy does not allow smaller Brownfield sites to come forward in villages to meet Brownfield land targets  |
| 227        | Louise     | Morton      | Quadrant Town Planning Ltd       | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | The Policy is contrary to the NPPF which promotes a presumption in favour of development  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                       | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 227        | Louise     | Morton      | Quadrant Town Planning Ltd          | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | The policy is a shift away from the adopted local plan.  |
| 227        | Louise     | Morton      | Quadrant Town Planning Ltd          | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Support is given for the Craitlus Study which uses sustainability criteria   |
| 227        | Louise     | Morton      | Quadrant Town Planning Ltd          | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | No consideration is given to the positive environmental effects of development in villages   |
| 228        | Mary       | Mulley      |                                     | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | The Sibfords should not be a category 1 village as other villages in the group are much larger   |
| 246        | Jonathan   | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land    | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Support Adderbury as a Category A service centre village.  |
| 248        | Jonathan   | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land    | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Support Ambrosden as a Category A service centre village.  |
| 259        | George     | Reynolds    |                                     | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Smaller category 3 villages should receive more development to help maintain services and facilities. A lack of new dwellings will lead to larger extensions or demolition of existing dwellings. Infilling should be permitted in these villages. |
| 263        | Mike       | Robinson    | Carter Jonas LLP / Hill Residential | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Chesterton scored higher (26 out of a score of 30) than seven of the 'Category A' villages and should be included as a Category A village.   |
| 275        | Tom        | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Minns Estates Ltd     | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Category B villages should be recognised as suitable for minor development   |
| 275        | Tom        | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Minns Estates Ltd     | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Enslow should be linked with Bletchingdon due to the proximity of the villages and should be a category B village  |
| 275        | Tom        | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Minns Estates Ltd     | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | There is a need for affordable housing in the rural areas which will not be met by this policy   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|----------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 275        | Tom            | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Minns Estates Ltd  | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Infilling is likely to result in no more than 3 dwellings and therefore affordable housing will not be secured under Policy BSC3.   |
| 275        | Tom            | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Minns Estates Ltd  | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | In order to be justified and effective Policy villages 1 should be amended to permit minor development in category B villages in order to assist the delivery of affordable housing in rural areas. Bletchingdon / Enslow should be considered jointly together as a Category B settlement. |
| 283        | Roger          | Smith       | Savills / The Bulford trust  | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Kidlington should not be classified as a Category A village as it is the Districts third largest settlement with a population of 13,000 and a sustainable location for development.   |
| 289        | Chris          | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd   | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Category not justified by evidence base. Object to reference of only minor development. Highest levels of growth should be directed at the most sustainable locations.  |
| 294        | Oliver         | Taylor      | Framptons / Mintondale Development Ltd                                   | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | The categorisation of villages within Group A is not justified.   |
| 314        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |  | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Better define 'Minor development'   |
| 375        | E              | Walker      | One Property Group Phase 2 Planning and Development Ltd                  | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Policy should include minor development for the satellite villages under category B. Helping to provide a balanced housing strategy which will take into account local housing needs in rural areas and helping people to stay local.   |
| 376        | R.A            | Sutton      | Berry Morris   | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Policy is too restrictive. Category B settlements should reflect the Adopted Local Plan Category 2 settlements listed in Policy H14. Policy should include an exception for awkward development in uncomfortable locations such as farm yards, haulage yard or commercial businesses.       |
| 387        | Kiran          | Williams    | BNP Paribas Real Estate UK Ltd / Trustees of Norman Collision Foundation | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation              | Support Ambrosdon as a category A village and supporting paragraphs C.225, C.226 & C.229.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations                           | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)       | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|----------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 379        | Wrigley        | Julie       | Savills/ A.Plumb/Milton Village Meeting | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | Milton residents do not use facilities in Bloxham or Adderbury, they go to Banbury   |
| 379        | Wrigley        | Julie       | Savills/ A.Plumb/Milton Village Meeting | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | Infilling is generally not supported as it leads to a loss of valuable spaces but small scale affordable may be a possibility. |
| 379        | Wrigley        | Julie       | Savills/ A.Plumb/Milton Village Meeting | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | Milton would like to remain a cat 3 village  |
| 379        | Wrigley        | Julie       | Savills/ A.Plumb/Milton Village Meeting | Policy                             | Villages 1                         | Village Categorisation                    | There should be a mechanism for the village to put forward small scale one of sites for affordable housing                     |
| 113        | Julia          | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                             | Paragraph                          | C.226                              | Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation | The character of the village should be considered in the design of new development   |
| 113        | Julia          | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                             | Paragraph                          | C.227                              | Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation | The character of the village should be considered in the design of new development   |
| 246        | Jonathan       | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land        | Paragraph                          | C.227                              | Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation | Minor development should have regard to the size and role of the village.  |
| 248        | Jonathan       | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land        | Paragraph                          | C.227                              | Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation | Minor development should have regard to the size and role of the village.  |
| 315        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |   | Paragraph                          | C.227                              | Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation | Reinstate village envelope policy.   |
| 194        | James          | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward             | Paragraph                          | C.228                              | Village Categorisation                    | Infilling needs a wider definition to allow for sensible and acceptable minor additions to Category B villages.                |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                           | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 376        | R.A.       | Sutton        | Berry Morris             | Paragraph                          | C.228                              | Policy Village 1: Village Categorisation                      | Definition of infill should be more flexible to include sites within the established built framework.   |
| 64         | Terry      | Byrd          | Merton Parish Council    | Paragraph                          | C.229 - C330                       | Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation                     | Is Blackthorn significantly closer to Ambrosden than Merton is?   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council | Paragraph                          | C.229                              | Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation                     | Adderbury cannot act as a service centre because of lack of facilities, in both suitable locations and provided at times to meet the time scales of its residents.  |
| 224        | Paul       | Morley        | Cropredy Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | C.230                              | Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation                     | The approach taken for housing development is both realistic and proportional. It is an improvement on the 2006 draft paper. The idea of clusters was raised by Cropedy PC in 2009/10 and seems to have been adopted. |
| 224        | Paul       | Morley        | Cropredy Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | C.233                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | The approach taken for housing development is both realistic and proportional. It is an improvement on the 2006 draft paper. The idea of clusters was raised by Cropedy PC in 2009/10 and seems to have been adopted. |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards       | Corylus Ltd              | Paragraph                          | C.234                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Welcomes the amendment in numbers since the draft Core Strategy   |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                          | Paragraph                          | C.234                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Minor change.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                           | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward                 | Paragraph                          | C.234                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Housing numbers in Group 2 should be allocated pro rate to the size of each village. Equal share would have a disproportionate impact on smaller villages.  |
| 224        | Paul       | Morley      | Cropedy Parish Council                      | Paragraph                          | C.234                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | The approach taken for housing development is both realistic and proportional. It is an improvement on the 2006 draft paper. The idea of clusters was raised by Cropedy PC in 2009/10 and seems to have been adopted.   |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council                     | Paragraph                          | C.234                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Bodicote is located in Group 1 - does 500 target include existing permissions at Cotefield Farm and 33 Oxford Road.   |
| 20         | Peter      | Atkin       | Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd     | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Growth Across the Rural Areas                 | More development should be allocated to the larger villages   |
| 24         | Suzanne    | Bangert     | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Mr & Mrs P Ashworth | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Growth Across the Rural Areas                 | Policy should include a numerical range and be less prescriptive.   |
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas                    | Disagree with approach - SHLAA out of date. No SA undertaken of distribution approach. Concern at the reliance of Neighbourhood Plans to allocate land. Bloxham is fourth largest settlement - should take greater proportion of growth. Omission site - Tadmarton Road, Bloxham. Capacity for 55 dwg including open space, new car park for school. Unclear how village target for 1000 dwg has been reached in absence of SHMA. Unclear if Bodicote target has been met by Bankside allocation? |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                          | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 75         | Phil       | Clark       | Bloor Homes Ltd (South Midlands)       | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas                   | Overall scale of growth can't be known until more detailed assessments have been undertaken. Local Plan should not cap development in rural areas. Supporting text should set criteria for suitable, sustainable and available sites to come forward.  |
| 97         | Roger      | Cooke       |  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas                   | Development in Category 1 villages should be limited unless there is proven ability to cope with more houses whilst the majority of the houses should be built in smaller villages in conjunction with providing them facilities. If a village is considered too small, it should be clustered with nearby villages to take a number of houses and improved facilities between them.   |
| 106        | Russell    | Crow        | Barton Willmore / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas                   | By using evidence supplied to Policy BSC.1 which shows a requirement for 24,199 dwg across the plan period relating to economic aspirations and same distribution of growth, Group 2 villages should receive 273 dwg rather than 189 a 44% increase. Given concerns over availability of sites, a greater reliance on Hook Norton is supported. Support approach to divide growth 'broadly equally' amongst villages. Concern at the robustness of CRAITLUS. |
| 112        | Keith      | Dixon       | Launton Parish Council                 | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing growth in the rural areas                       | Growth of 83 dwellings per village is not minor development for Launton as it will be a 5.6% increase in development   |
| 112        | Keith      | Dixon       | Launton Parish Council                 | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing growth in the rural areas                       | There is a loss of a presumption against extending the village envelope. In Launton there is no land available for development so it would have to be on the edge.   |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                            | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Policy Villages : Distributing Growth across the rural areas | Welcomes the amendment in numbers since the draft Core Strategy  |
| 127        | Robert     | Gardner     |  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Villages and Rural Areas                                     | Support policy and approach to distribute growth broadly equally between settlements.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)            | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 130        | Jennifer   | Glynn       |                                 | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas     | Bankside Phase 2 will take up almost all the Rural Villages quota of 500 dwg.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council        | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Housing Across the Rural Areas | The under note to the table should be the date just after the last statutory plan i.e. 2001 for equitable purposes.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council        | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Housing Across the Rural Areas | The under note to the table should be the date just after the last statutory plan i.e. 2001 for equitable purposes.   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council          | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Housing Across the Rural Areas | The date used for counting completions places villages such as Bloxham that have had substantial development at a disadvantage when the allocation of the 500 is to occur.  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council          | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Housing Across the Rural Areas | Disagree see previous notes   |
| 140        | Peter      | Hardman     |                                 | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Housing Across the Rural Areas | Object to the allocation of housing between villages in Group 2. This should not be divided 'broadly equal' but should be 'proportionate' to the existing settlements   |
| 152        | Andrew     | Hickman     | Middleton Stoney Parish Council | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas     | The precise allocation for villages in Group 3 will be set out in a Local Neighbourhoods Development Plan. Given that development will be restricted to infilling and conversions, there will be a large element of speculation as to the properties and sites that are included and thus cannot be precision in the figure. Is it merely aspiration? |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)        | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 156        | Miranda    | Rogers        | Stansgate Planning / P S Coles Will Trust | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Policy lacks justification for housing numbers, split and settlement hierarchy. Assessment of outstanding housing requirement and sustainability of villages. To include Shenington. Consideration of individual housing targets for each settlement. Breakdown to be left to Neighbourhood DPD. Reference to Windfall to be deleted as separate allowance. Housing targets should inform housing allocations. Danger that housing allocations will be met in one village to the detriment of others.   |
| 157        | Sian       | Holland       | Stansgate Planning / Brasenose College    | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Policy lacks justification for housing numbers, split and settlement hierarchy. Assessment of outstanding housing requirement and sustainability of villages. To include Shenington. Consideration of individual housing targets for each settlement. Breakdown to be left to Neighbourhood DPD. Reference to Windfall to be deleted as separate allowance. Housing targets should inform housing allocations. Danger that housing allocations will be met in one village to the detriment of others. Figure for Cropredy should be increased beyond indicative 38. |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Remove Kidlington.  |
| 167        | K W        | Janes         |   | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural areas | Objects to new homes at Bloxham as this is not sustainable development  |
| 167        | K W        | Janes         |   | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural areas | There is little information in the Plan about the villages  |
| 167        | K W        | Janes         |   | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural areas | The bus service is not adequate to travel to work and elsewhere   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name    | Organisations                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|----------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 167        | K W        | Janes          |                              | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural areas         | Bloxham has received a lot of development since 2006 and the services are full and fail frequently   |
| 167        | K W        | Janes          |                              | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural areas         | More development will lead to more congestion  |
| 167        | K W        | Janes          |                              | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural areas         | Incorrect information about schools is being used to make decisions  |
| 177        | Vic        | Keeble         | Chesterton Parish Council    | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth across the Rural Area          | Object to the use of shared housing numbers between grouped villages. Numbers appear arbitrary. Numbers should be replaced with more flexible targets and Kidlington should be excluded from the list of smaller villages.   |
| 181        | Mike       | Kerford-Byrnes | The Astons and Heyfords Ward | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Housing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Include a further caveat in the rural allocations to stating that they will be limited by the availability of necessary supporting infrastructure. Finmere and Fritwell will be particularly disadvantaged by the 'broadly equal' division of allocations under Group 2. |
| 182        | Mike       | Kerford-Byrnes | Finmere Parish Council       | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Housing Growth Across the Rural Areas | The availability of adequate infrastructure should be a factor in the allocation of houses in rural areas. The Plan should reflect this as a policy.   |
| 182        | Mike       | Kerford-Byrnes | Finmere Parish Council       | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Housing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Housing provision within a village group should not be allocated 'broadly equally'. The Policy should reflect that the allocations are approximately proportional to the relative population of the villages within the group.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name         | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)           | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|--------------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 188        | Rob                | Linnell     | Savills / Trinity College Oxford | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution Growth Across the Rural Areas    | Support the allocation of 259 dwellings to the Group 3 villages which includes Wroxton. Trinity Collage is liaising with Wroxton Parish Council and CDC to draw up proposals. The precise number of dwellings to be allocated to Wroxton will be confirmed via the Local Neighbourhood Plans DPD as per LP paragraph C.236. Trinity College reserves the right to submit further representations on the Local Plan should the number of dwellings to Group 3 be altered. |
| 192        | Colin              | Macklin     |                                  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas    | Concern raised in respect of traffic impact of proposed new development on the village of Aynho. Environmental impact has not been considered.   |
| 197        | Margaret Elizabeth | Mason       |                                  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas    | Affordable housing should be included within village Plan housing target. Object to over allocation of housing at Steeple Ashton.  |
| 201        | Helen              | Metcalfe    | Fritwell Parish Council          | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across Rural Areas        | The total number of homes should not be distributed 'broadly equally'. Group 2 varies in terms of size, population, services , infrastructure, accessibility and opportunities for employment. Fritwell should not accommodate the same number of homes as larger villages. Home numbers should reflect on a pro-rata basis the village size, population, quality and sustainability of services, infrastructure and accessibility.                                      |
| 215        | Peter              | Frampton    | Framptons / Mr Roger Freeman     | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Growth Across the Rural Areas | Policy should clarify that scale of growth is a minimum figure. Distribution can't be uniform. Additional sites maybe acceptable subject to environmental constraints.   |
| 224        | Paul               | Morley      | Cropredy Parish Council          | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Growth Across the Rural Areas | The approach taken for housing development is both realistic and proportional. It is an improvement on the 2006 draft paper. The idea of clusters was raised by Cropedy PC in 2009/10 and seems to have been adopted.  |
| 228        | Mary               | Mulley      |                                  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas    | There will be a loss of character of Sibford and its surroundings  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)        | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 228        | Mary       | Mulley      |                                  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | New development will be out of character with the village  |
| 228        | Mary       | Mulley      |                                  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | People will have to travel long distances on minor roads to work   |
| 228        | Mary       | Mulley      |                                  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Sibford is the other side of the Banbury to the motorway   |
| 228        | Mary       | Mulley      |                                  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | There will be an increase in traffic contributing to global warming  |
| 246        | Jonathan   | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Support overall number of homes in Villages 2 but consider housing distribution should be allocated to individual villages through a more detailed assessment. Policy should reflect sites. In advance of Local Neighbourhoods DPD - Policy should set out criteria for sustainable development.   |
| 248        | Jonathan   | Porter      | Barton Willmore / Archstone Land | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Support policy Villages 2 and its aim to commit substantial housing to the villages. Consider the precise number of homes to be allocated to an individual village cannot be known until a detailed assessment has been undertaken. Policy should make it clear that the overall figure and distribution of homes are approximate and subject to availability of suitable sites. Concern that Policy could stifle growth. In advance of Local Neighbourhoods DPD - Policy should set out criteria for sustainable development. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)           | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 255        | Trish      | Redpath     | Kidlington Parish Council                        | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Growth Across the Rural Areas | Object to Kidlington category as a village, Kidlington has larger more complex housing needs , 259 dwellings is not based on sufficient evidence about present and future housing needs and an underestimate of its population.  |
| 260        | George     | Reynolds    |  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Growth Across the Rural Areas | Villages are not equal in size nor sustainability. Object to diving 'Broadly equally'. Lack of SHLAA & Neighbourhoods DPD.   |
| 263        | Mike       | Robinson    | Carter Jonas LLP / Hill Residential              | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Growth Across the Rural Areas | The amount of housing in Group 3 should be increased to meet rural needs in suitable villages.<br>A greater proportion of development should be allowed where there is support from the Parish Council .   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations           | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas    | How many houses have already been built within the villages?<br>Should group 1 be split to sub divide Launton & Ambrosden.   |
| 277        | Tom        | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Berkeley Homes (Oxford & Chiltern) | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas    | Villages identified in Group 3 are not capable of delivery growth allocation of 259 dwg. With exception of Kidlington, Weston on Green & Yarnton remaining villages are Category B and only suitable for infilling and conversions. The first three are restrict by Green Belt. Council is lacking a SHLAA. Unclear if Bankside development counts towards Bodicote figure. Group 3 village growth should be distributed to Group 1 as it is more sustainable. Group 3 should instead form windfall allowance. |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council                         | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distribution of Growth across the Rural Areas | Object to Distribution off Growth figures in rural areas. Between 2050-2550 dwg are to be built in Ambrosden as opposed to 500 split between 6 parishes. Description should be village not parish.   |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                         | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas    | Object to inclusion of Bloxham in category - clearly of larger scale. Policy is not flexible and relies on windfall sites. Not based on evidence - settlements should be individually assessed.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name     | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                           | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|----------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 294        | Oliver         | Taylor      | Framptons / Mintondale Development Ltd                        | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth across the Rural Areas                    | Group A allocation of 500 dwg not based on evidence or delay at Banbury / Bicester. There should be no upper limit of growth at Villages.  |
| 299        | Bruce          | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District  | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas                    | Unclear the limits to growth that apply to the three inset villages, although Kidlington is dealt with at Begbroke & Yarnton it is less clear.   |
| 316        | Sarah Caroline | Turner      |   | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas                    | Object to scale of housing growth proposed in category A. Suggest figure is reduced and demand directed towards the NW Bicester Eco-town. or distributed amongst other villages.   |
| 341        | Alison         | Wright      | Savills for the Estate of the Late J W Tustain                | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas                    | Support allocation of Milcombe as a Category 3 village. Object to an equal distribution of growth of 22 dwg between the 12 group 3 villages. Suggest land adjacent to Oak Farm, Milcombe has capacity for 40 dwg. Forthcoming Neighbourhood Development Plan should allocate site. Plan attached.  |
| 379        | Wrigley        | Julie       | Savills/ A.Plumb/Milton Village Meeting                       | Policy                             | Villages 2                         | Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas                    | The growth at Adderbury and Bloxham is not matched by facilities and infrastructure, the policy should require this.   |
| 63         | Peter          | Burrows     | Adderbury Conservation Action Group                           | Paragraph                          | C.235                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth across the Rural Areas | It should be clearly demonstrated why Adderbury should be a category A village. If this is to be the case, Adderbury should not accommodate more development than any other category A village. The policy is contrary to the NPPF which indicates it is up to local people to develop a Neighbourhood Plan in conformity with the Local Plan. |
| 102        | Sam            | Croft       | RPS Planning & Development / Banner Homes Ltd / Rowland Bratt | Paragraph                          | C.235                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth across the Rural Areas | Clarification sought on the quantum of development at bankside attributed to Banbury and Bodicote. In particular when considering rural housing numbers.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council | Paragraph                          | C.235                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth across the Rural Areas                         | Contrary to the principles in the Localism Act and the NPPF in which it is for local people to develop a Neighbourhood Plan in general conformity with the strategic policies of the local plan.  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council   | Paragraph                          | C.235                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth across the Rural Areas                         | There is confusion with the terminology 'Local Neighbourhoods Development Plan Document which will be interpreted as the Neighbourhood Development Plan produced by villages. Neighbourhood Development Plans allow villages to state the number of dwellings and where they are to be accommodated in the village. |
| 269        | Valerie    | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | C.235                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas                         | What is the timetable for the Local Neighbourhood DPDs?   |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd              | Paragraph                          | C.236                              | Distributing Growth in the Rural areas  | The figures should be equally divided between the villages  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council   | Paragraph                          | C.236                              | Distribution of Housing Across the Rural Areas  | There is confusion with the terminology 'Local Neighbourhoods Development Plan Document which will be interpreted as the Neighbourhood Development Plan produced by villages. Neighbourhood Development Plans allow villages to state the number of dwellings and where they are to be accommodated in the village. |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd | Paragraph                          | C.236                              | Policy ESD.10: Protecting and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment | No evidence supplied for the equal distribution of growth between settlements.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                           | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                           | Paragraph                          | C.238                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | This Local Plan is not proposing that any ' <i>significant</i> ' amendments to Green Belt boundaries are made around these villages to accommodate new housing. ' <i>Where very small infill proposals that do not harm the primary purpose of the Green Belt are made the proposals will be assessed on a site by site basis against the relationship with the existing village and Green Belt boundaries.</i> ' |
| 255        | Trish      | Redpath       | Kidlington Parish Council | Paragraph                          | C.238                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Text should make reference to reassessment of housing need and review of all housing developments.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council  | Paragraph                          | C.239                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | Ignores that the last adopted plan was in 1996 and as consequence ignores the contribution of some villages where development took place prior to 2011. The date should be the last statutory plan i.e. 2001  |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council    | Paragraph                          | C.239                              | Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas | The start date should be taken from 13th of December 2004, last statutory Plan at CDC.  |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards       | Corylus Ltd               | Para graph                         | C.241                              | Policy Villages 3: Rural Exception Sites                      | Support the provision of Rural Exception sites  |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards       | Corylus Ltd               | Policy                             | Villages 3                         | Rural Exception Sites   | Support the provision of Rural Exception sites  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council  | Policy                             | Villages 3                         | Rural Exception Sites   | Supported   |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|--|
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council           | Policy                             | Villages 3                         | Rural Exception Sites   | Agree  |
| 188        | Rob        | Linnell     | Savills / Trinity College Oxford | Policy                             | Villages 3                         | Rural Exception Sites   | The policy is largely consistent with the advice in NPPF to allow cross subsidisation with open market housing. However, there is no basis for the 25 % threshold of open market homes. It is recommended that the policy refers to an 'element of affordable housing' rather than having a fixed amount in line with the requirement for flexibility in paragraph 50 of the NPPF.<br>It is recommended that the policy is amended to allow for schemes supported by the local community to deliver facilities and services as well as affordable housing. |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council         | Policy                             | Villages 3                         | Rural Exception Sites   | Support policy. Ability for small scale market housing to support viability of rural exception sites should be retained. Does not address self build and serviced plots. Policy should encourage self builds. Definition of affordable housing should be extended to include subsidised low cost sale, entry level housing for sale, private rented accommodation & intermediate.  |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd         | Policy                             | Villages 3                         | Rural Exception Sites   | Delete 'Within or'. New rural exception sites policy should apply beyond settlement boundaries.  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council         | Paragraph                          | C.248                              | Policy Villages 4: Meeting the needs for Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation. | The statement of an evidence base does not accord with the population general view.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                     | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)   | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council            | Paragraph                          | C.248                              | Policy Villages 4: Meeting the needs for Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation. | There is no evidence submitted or referenced to substantiate this statement.                                  |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council | Table                              | Table 12                           | Rural Sub Areas: Open Space   | Will any increased sports facilities in Banbury be supplemented by proposed facilities in the rural villages. |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council          | Policy                             | Villages 4                         | Meeting the needs for Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation.                    | The policy doesn't take into account sports played by the female population.                                  |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss          | Adderbury Parish Council          | Policy                             | Villages 4                         | Meeting the needs for Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation.                    | Agree - subject to qualification previously mentioned   |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council            | Policy                             | Villages 4                         | Meeting the needs for Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation.                    | The rural north shows no reference to hockey pitches, netball courts, or to tennis courts.                    |
| 162        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                                   | Policy                             | Villages 4                         | Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation                       | Minor Amendment   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council | Policy                             | Villages 4                         | Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport & Recreation                         | Will any increased sports facilities in Banbury be supplemented by proposed facilities in the rural villages. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                      | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Policy                             | Villages 4                         | Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation    | Green Infrastructure should include linear routes and green corridors for village and rural areas.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | Villages 4                         | Meeting the need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation    | Small plots are costly to maintain   |
| 287        | Jennifer   | Spear       | Ambrosden Parish Council               | Policy                             | Villages 4                         |  | Policy omits Ambrosden under provision of open space. While there are a number of facilities within the Parish these are all controlled by the MOD and are not available for public use. Two small LEAFs, no open space and no facilities within the school. Policy should be amended to provide additional provision. |
| 134        | Theresa    | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                 | Paragraph                          | C.250                              | Meeting the needs for Open Spaces, Sport and Recreation. | This again references the DPD as the point of reference rather than a NDP.   |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group       | Paragraph                          | C.257                              | Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford              | Further development should be explored to make the site more sustainable recognising the planned development at Upper Heyford  |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group       | Paragraph                          | C.257                              | Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford              | The Plan should comply with NPPF and increase housing supply recognising that the sites at Bicester will not be deliverable quickly  |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group       | Para                               | C.257                              | Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford              | The Plan should allow for more development at Upper Heyford.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward      | Paragraph                          | C.257                              | Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford | Delete final sentence. Upper Heyford is an unsustainable site and the current development was only permitted in order to preserve the heritage assets. Make clear that this development is set within strict limits and will not be expanded. |
| 245        | Steven     | Pickles     | West Waddy ADP                   | Paragraph                          | C.257                              | Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford | Support commitment to review the potential to accommodate development at Upper Heyford, subject to improvements to transport links and social infrastructure.   |
| 15         | Vicky      | Aston       | Sport England                    | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | Object as policy as it does not make reference to existing sports facilities at RAF Heyford.  |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | The Plan should allow for more development at Upper Heyford and there should be an early review   |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | More development should be located at Upper Heyford   |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | The Policy is not positively prepared and is unsound. All employment uses should be allowed on the site not just high quality allowing for the re-use of existing buildings.  |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | The policy is repetitious regarding public transport use and development respecting the conservation area   |
| 57         | Paul       | Burrell     | Pegasus Group / Dorchester Group | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | The requirements on the site should be reduced and the policy should say 'a primary school or other school as may be appropriate'   |
| 67         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore / Bovis Homes    | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | Supporting inclusion of site for approx 760 dwg with supporting infrastructure, primary school and community, recreation and employment opportunities. Welcome possible extension of site beyond 2031.  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency               | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | We are pleased that the need for remediation of contamination for any further significant development has been addressed.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport     | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | Amend bullet points. Wording supplied.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                 | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford                    | EH supports the reference to the historical interest of this former airfield.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District                         | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford            | Support.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                       | Policy                             | Villages 5                         | Former RAF Upper Heyford            | Supported  |
| 41         | Rhianon    | Boulton     | Turley Associates / Western Power Distribution | Paragraph                          | D.1                                | The Infrastructure Delivery Plan    | Western power own a number of strategic electricity distribution circuits in the District which they would normally expect developers to pay to relocate if needed   |
| 41         | Rhianon    | Boulton     | Turley Associates / Western Power Distribution | Paragraph                          | D.1                                | The Infrastructure Delivery Plan    | Western power would normally seek to retain the position of certain electricity circuits   |
| 41         | Rhianon    | Boulton     | Turley Associates / Western Power Distribution | Paragraph                          | D.1                                | The Infrastructure Delivery Plan    | There are no restrictions in terms of the position of new development and its overhead lines but advise that these are taken into account  |
| 41         | Rhianon    | Boulton     | Turley Associates / Western Power Distribution | Paragraph                          | D.1                                | The Infrastructure Delivery Plan    | WPD should be consulted about development proposals  |
| 205        | Jack       | Moeran      | Environment Agency                             | Paragraph                          | D.1                                | The Infrastructure Delivery Plan    | Pleased with the IDP. However, wish to reiterate that water infrastructure must be in place before development coming forward.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Education & early Intervention Services  | Section                            | D                                  | Infrastructure Delivery Plan        | Unclear what private sector partners are? Builders or education services? Does not mention special education. Nursery provision should be 'normally' supplied in new primary schools. No mention of youth facilities or Children centres. Why is education provision proposed at Kidlington when no housing is proposed? |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                   | Section                            | D                                  | Infrastructure Delivery Plan        | No comment.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                   | Appendix                           | D.0                                | Kidlington & Rural Areas            | Public rights of way. New bullet walking & cycling. LTP3 Policies CW1-CW5.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                   | Appendix                           | D.1                                | Infrastructure Plan Bicester        | Under Park & ride; add developers and Bicester Village as partners. Under East West Rail add Chiltern Railways & OCC as partners. Under Evergreen 3 add OCC as partner.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                   | Appendix                           | D.1                                | Banbury                             | Include public transport - what level of detail appropriate?   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport             | Appendix                           | D.1                                | Kidlington                          | Amend Access to Oxford with Northern approaches to Oxford. London Oxford Airport is not the responsibility of OCC - regulated by DFT & CAA. Include public transport.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Highways and Transport             | Appendix                           | D.1                                | Rural Areas                         | Include public transport.   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Paragraph                          | D.2                                | Infrastructure Delivery Plan        | Object to the plan as it is reliant upon a temporary Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and that the infrastructure requirements would be superseded by the final IDP. The IDP should take account of John Harman's report and the NPPF.  |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease         | RPS / Thames Valley Police               | Section                            | D.4                                | The Infrastructure Delivery Plan    | Developer contributions are required to maintain appropriate level of policing for new and existing population. Should refer to police infrastructure.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations   | Paragraph                          | D.9                                | The Infrastructure Delivery Plan    | Support definition of 'Priority' & 'Less Critical'  |
| 14         | Vicky      | Aston         | Sport England                            | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Suggest sport and infrastructure is added to list of infrastructure in Policy INF 1 Infrastructure.   |
| 34         | Carmelle   | Bell          | Thames Water                             | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | The policy should be amended to include 'utilities' in the list of infrastructure requirements. This is supported by paragraphs 156 and 162 of the NPPF.<br>Whilst the levels of growth in the LP are not considered to be unmanageable, infrastructure upgrades will be required (Bicester in particular) and developers should work with Thames Water to draw up water and drainage strategies. The exact scale and location will be determined once there is a clear phasing plan. |
| 83         | David      | Coates        | Kingerlee Homes                          | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Consider Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) contains insufficient costing information. It is unclear the relationship between the IDP, the developer contributions SPD and the Community Infrastructure Levy. (Suggested amendments supplied)   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name    | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|----------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards        | Corylus Ltd                              | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Support the requirement for development proposals to demonstrate that infrastructure requirements can be met   |
| 129        | Chris      | Gaskell        | SSE Power Distribution                   | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | At this stage SSEPD provide only general guidance. Connections for new development can be provided subject to cost and timescale. Where existing infrastructure is inadequate, the costs of any upstream reinforcement would normally be apportioned between developer and DNO (Distribution Network Operator). Maximum time-scales in these instances would not exceed around 2 years and should not impede delivery of any proposed housing development. SSEPD have already begun the process of undertaking reinforcement works in the Bicester area to provide significant additional electrical capacity which would be available in 3-4 years. Existing overhead lines can remain in place. Where this is not practicable agreement will be needed with SSEPD prior to submission of a planning application. |
| 130        | Jennifer   | Glynn          |  | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Concern of electricity blackouts caused by power station closures.   |
| 132        | Theresa    | Goss           | Adderbury Parish Council                 | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Supported  |
| 135        | Timothy    | Hallchurch MBE |  | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Concern relating to the retention of local pubs, shops and some local businesses. A number of local examples quoted.   |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn  | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3 | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Policy INF1 does not address the key issues of viability and cost in the preparation of the Local Plan. The Plan should be revised to take account of viability testing for Local Plans by John Harmon and the NPPF requirements.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 158        | Chris      | Hone        | CPRE Banbury District                  | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Large housing sites within urban areas must be provided with effective infrastructure to ensure their overall sustainability, and there must be an effective partnership between the Council and other relevant authorities to secure this, set up at an early stage of the planning process. |
| 175        | Gareth     | Jones       |  | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | The plan is seeking to address deficiencies for indoor sport and recreation. Future facilities need to meet the challenges of population growth, expectation and demand pressures. The representation details the specific need of facilities for a number of sports.                         |
| 177        | Vic        | Keeble      | Chesterton Parish Council              | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Plan lacks a credible Infrastructure Delivery Plan. No mention of the North Relief Road. Howes Lane and Lords Lane are totally inadequate.  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven       | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | No viability assessment of sites. No delivery mechanism for the Country Park. Gaps in evidence. Additional consultation required in respect of Infrastructure.  |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency                        | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Plan is not clear about funding or delivery of key transport schemes noted within the document. Concern that IDP is only in Draft. Should be finalised at this stage.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Support approach.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport           | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Amend bullet point 2 to add: 'adoption and maintenance responsibilities'.   |
| 280        | Carl       | Smith       | Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | There should be a CIL and Charging schedule which deals with flood defences, parking management, highway improvements, improvements to sport management, maintaining Stratfield Brake footbridge across the Oxford Canal and along with other necessary items                                 |
| 298        | Laurence   | Todd        |  | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | There should be supporting Infrastructure to new housing development  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                             | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 298        | Laurence   | Todd        |   | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | The developers and companies such as Chiltern railways should pay contributions towards Infrastructure   |
| 332        | Neil       | Williams    |   | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | The local roads cannot take any more traffic.  |
| 332        | Neil       | Williams    |   | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | The school, doctors surgery and dental surgery are all at capacity. There needs to be a review of local services before housing is built. More services will be needed   |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police                | Policy                             | INF1                               | Infrastructure                      | Developer contributions are required to maintain appropriate level of policing for new and existing population. Policy wording to be amended to reflect police infrastructure.   |
| 38         | Rachael    | Blakey      | Bucknell Parish Council                   | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | Masterplan has not considered how energy, water and sewage needs of new industry and housing are going to be met.  |
| 87         | Colin      | Cockshaw    | Bicester Against Eco-Con (BaECON)         | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | It is understood that the County Council have no Plans for a Secondary School in Bicester and instead children maybe required to take up places at the proposed Free School at Upper Heyford. Plan should make clear proposals for locations and implementations of Secondary School places. |
| 177        | Vic        | Keeble      | Chesterton Parish Council                 | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | Support rational behind park and ride provision at Bicester. Query if South East Relief Road will access the Park and Ride facility. Recommend a footpath is made for local residents at Chesterton to access site and the footpath / cycle way is extended to connect other villages.       |
| 189        | David      | Keene       | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | IDP contains no costings. No cost for Canalside or the relocation of existing employment uses or Banbury FC. Plan should be supported by a robust IDP.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 250        | Ruth       | POWLES        | Kirtlington Parish Council                                    | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | Plans fails to meet infrastructure requirements in Bicester including East West Rail and Project Evergreen 3. Suggest out of town rail station.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Waste Management  | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | Support reference to Bicester RE-use and Sustainable Living Centre.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Ecology   | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | IDP lacks reference to ecology and Green Infrastructure. Amendment supplied.   |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh         | Natural England   | Table                              | Tables 13-16                       | Infrastructure Plan                 | Advise adequate consideration for the delivery of the natural environment aspirations of the Plan within tables 13-16.   |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne      | CPRE Bicester District  | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | Agree that infrastructure is critical and should be provided prior to development.   |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild         | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | Reference to park and ride facility originally intended for North West Bicester Residents and not wider. Land has already been transfer to Oxfordshire CC - no longer a requirement in policy. Further clarity required.           |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease         | RPS / Thames Valley Police                                    | Table                              | Table 13                           | Infrastructure Plan: Bicester       | Support reference to police infrastructure. Under current status add 'to maintain an appropriate level of service', additional floor space required at Bicester Police Station to accommodate impact of growth,                    |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3                      | Table                              | Table 14                           | Infrastructure Plan: Banbury        | Object to Table 14. Does not reflect viability.  |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones         | Boyer Planning  | Table                              | Table 14                           | Infrastructure Plan: Banbury        | Support proposed housing trajectory for land at West of Bretch Hill.   |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease         | RPS / Thames Valley Police                                    | Table                              | Table 14                           | Infrastructure Plan: Banbury        | Support reference to police infrastructure. No Plans to relocate Thames Valley Policy HQ from Kidlington. Additional floor space required at Banbury Police Station to maintain appropriate level of service and impact on growth. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                            | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police               | Table                              | Table 15                           | Infrastructure Plan: Kidlington     | No Plans to relocate Thames Valley Police HQ from Kidlington. Delete from table.   |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward              | Table                              | Table 16                           | Infrastructure Plan: Rural Areas    | Mention the Free School.   |
| 250        | Ruth       | POWLES      | Kirtlington Parish Council               | Table                              | Table 16                           | Infrastructure Plan: Rural Areas    | Plans fails to meet infrastructure requirements in Bicester including East West Rail and Project Evergreen 3. Suggest out of town rail station. Improvements to A34. Concern at rat runs.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Environment & Energy Strategy Team | Section                            | E.1                                | Monitoring Arrangements             | Monitoring targets should be positively worded. E.g. Permissions granted contrary to EA advise and AONB lost to development.   |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England                          | Section                            | E.1                                | Monitoring Arrangements             | Monitoring indicator 'Area of biodiversity habitat/number of species' should show clearly what it is measuring. Advise that a pragmatic but meaningful indicator is chosen. Amend Indicator 'Amount of AONB lost to development' to 'Permissions granted contrary to AONB advice'. |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                 | Section                            | E.1                                | Monitoring Arrangements             | Consistent under supply of housing. 20% buffer should apply.   |
| 342        | Helen      | Lease       | RPS / Thames Valley Police               | Section                            | E.1                                | Monitoring Arrangements             | Proposed monitoring is insufficiently flexible. New monitoring section that stipulates that any policy objective that is failing should be reviewed and changes made to the Plan.  |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                              | Paragraph                          | E.6                                | The Monitoring Framework            | Supports this paragraph  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                     | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)            | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 173        | Alasdair   | Jones       | Marrons / Hallam Land Management  | Paragraph                          | E.6                                | The Monitoring Framework                       | Housing monitoring should be measured against the trajectory and policy targets for Banbury & Bicester. Combining monitoring areas risks not having a five year housing land supply and consequently growth being redirected to rural areas and not Banbury. Windfall target should be broken up between Banbury, Bicester and the Rest of the District. Wording supplied.  |
| 113        | Julia      | Edwards     | Corylus Ltd                       | Paragraph                          | E.9                                | The Monitoring Framework                       | Objects that villages are grouped as they need to be looked at on a village by village basis  |
| 40         | Geoff      | Bolton      | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd | Paragraph                          | E.10-E.12                          | Building Sustainable Communities               | The Plan does not contain contingency measures in the event that strategic housing sites do not come forward within the planned timescales. The deliverability of sites has not been supported by the required evidence and the Plan should not proceed without publishing a SHLAA update, Infrastructure Plan and a viability assessment and there should be then an opportunity for submitting representations. Have concerns with the deliverability / timescale of the following sites: Banbury 1, Banbury 2 and Banbury 4. |
| 194        | James      | Macnamara   | The Astons and Heyford Ward       | Paragraph                          | E.14                               | Building Sustainable Communities               | Coordinating the number of new schools will require serious commitment to the county School Organisation Stakeholder Group.   |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District            | Paragraph                          | E.16                               | Theme Three - Ensuring Sustainable Development | New indicator to monitor Green Belt loss.   |
| 40         | Geoff      | Bolton      | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd | Table                              | Table 17                           | Proposed Housing Trajectory                    | The Plan does not contain contingency measures in the event that strategic housing sites do not come forward within the planned timescales. The deliverability of sites has not been supported by the required evidence and the Plan should not proceed without publishing a SHLAA update, Infrastructure Plan and a viability assessment and there should be then an opportunity for submitting representations. Have concerns with the deliverability/timescale of the following sites: Banbury 1, Banbury 2 and Banbury 4.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 125        | Peter      | Frampton      | Framptons / Mr J Phipps                                       | Map                                | 5.2 Key Proposals: Bicester        | Key Proposals: Bicester             | The LP contains no evidence why it is necessary to identify land as green buffer to the east of the allocation for North West Bicester and therefore is not justified. The LP is not consistent with national policy as it does not contain a criteria based policy against which any development on a 'green buffer' - a locally designated site will be judged. This frustrates the delivery of a developable site for housing which is needed to improve the supply of housing in the District.  |
| 136        | Sarah      | Hamilton-Foyn | Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes - 1 of 3                      | Table                              | Table 17                           | Proposed Housing Trajectory         | Support housing trajectory - Hanwell Fields.  |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | Table                              | Table 17                           | Proposed Housing Trajectory         | Update to reflect Kidlington allocation.  |
| 174        | Chloe      | Jones         | Boyer Planning  | Table                              | Table 17                           | Proposed Housing Trajectory         | Support the use of Greenfield sites to meet housing need.   |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey     | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd                            | Table                              | Table 17                           | Proposed Housing Trajectory         | Housing trajectory is supported in principle - in particular early delivery of Banbury 2. Greater need for housing in Banbury.  |
| 231        | Steven     | Neal          | Boyer Planning / Redrow Homes & Wates Developments            | Table                              | Table 17                           | Proposed Housing Trajectory         | Housing trajectory is not realistic. Period between 2016 - 2022 is unlikely to deliver a rate of 100 dwg per annum. Early deliver concerns with Graven Hill and North West Bicester Eco-town. East Bicester is capable of early delivery.   |
| 328        | Tom        | Whild         | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd | Table                              | Table 17                           | Proposed Housing Trajectory         | Object to proposed housing trajectory delaying development at North West Bicester until 2022/2023 and after the completion of phase 1 South West Bicester. No capacity or infrastructure constraints to prevent development from beginning as early as September 2014 subject to planning application process being successful. Expect phase 2 to start well before the conclusion of phase 1. Sites can be managed as one. Housing trajectory in Plan differs from trajectory in Masterplan. Delivery rate should be raised from 75dwg pa to 80. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion   | Table                              | E.2                                | Proposed Housing Trajectory         | Plan does not cover requirement for a 5-year housing land supply or trajectory. Plan has not met housing target since 2006 - requirement for 20% buffer brought forward in the plan period.  |
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion   | Table                              | E.2                                | Proposed Housing Trajectory         | Completions to commence within exemplar site in 2013/14. For wider site, occupation to begin in 2017/18 rising to 150 per annum once exemplar is fully occupied. Construction estimated to begin in 2015/16.   |
| 45         | Gemma      | Brickwood   | Turley Associates / Sainsbury  | Table                              | E.3                                | Proposed Employment Trajectory      | Bicester Business Park estimated employment floorspace (46,200 sqm) does not match extant outline planning permission (50,250 sqm).  |
| 73         | Colin      | Clark       | Banbury and Cherwell Green Party   | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Plan should be supportive of other CDC strategies & be holistic. Plan should cross refer to Housing Needs Estimate and Low Carbon Strategy. Welcome a risk analysis of Plan. Welcome emphasis on sustainability - safeguarding green spaces & biodiversity, intention to walk and cycle, self build. Plan should be considered in the context of other neighbouring plans. |
| 99         | Maureen    | Cossens     |  | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Insufficient evidence of how cleaned water from sewage works will be dispersed. Increasing flood risk from River Ray. Proposed attenuation measures (Reed beds and Ponds) offer inadequate protection. Suggest new sewage works with different outflow area.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park  | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Add following documents to evidence base; RSS (May 2009), Ove Arup's Report Economic and Social Impacts of a Potential Eco-town at Weston Otmoor (Jan 2009), Oxford Technology Park: The Compelling Case (Dec 2009) & (Oct 2012) & A Small Scale Local Green Belt Review for Oxford Technology Park (forthcoming).   |
| 188        | Rob        | Linnell     | Savills / Trinity College Oxford   | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Not aware of any published SHLAA in the District. The LP could be found unsound in that is not consistent with NPPF paragraph 159. SHLAA should be published prior to examination of the LP to justify the number of dwellings in the rest of the District.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | See comment 1.3  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                       | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 238        | Cathleen   | Nunn        |                                     | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Plan based on a lack of evidence.   |
| 238        | Cathleen   | Nunn        |                                     | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | SFRA is out of date.  |
| 240        | Ellen      | O'Grady     | Defence Infrastructure Organisation | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Procedural: consultation & evidence | Given the introduction of fundamental and significant changes at a late stage, the Council should have afforded another consultation stage. The process followed does not comply with para. 2.4 of the SCI. The following documents were not available to the public: Affordable Housing Viability Assessment Update 2012, Retail Study Update 2012, Strategic Housing Land Viability Assessment 2012, and Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2012. The lack of accessible information is not in compliance with para. 6.6 of the SCI. |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency                     | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Concern that Integrated Transport and Land Use Studies for Banbury, Bicester and the rest of Cherwell Rural Areas are out of date. Questions regarding the package of infrastructure measures needed for each study area remaining outstanding.   |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency                     | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Plan should provide clarification as to the operation of M40 J11 and whether the proposed development in the district can be accommodated on the key junction that provides access to Banbury.  |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency                     | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Content that M40 Junction 9 can mitigate development at Graven Hill and C site. Although still require further evidence to support Eco-town.  |
| 249        | Anthony    | Powell      | Highways Agency                     | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Attached: Cherwell Local Plan Technical Note 01 prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff - 28 September 2012. Issues include; M40 Junction 9, 10 & 11 as well as access to Oxford.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England                                      | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Unclear how the biodiversity, landscape and amenity value of each site has been considered. The Plan is considered unsound unless the Council demonstrates how it has addressed paragraphs 110 and 165 of the NPPF and paragraphs 98 and 99 of ODPM Circular 06/2005 in the process of allocating sites. On biodiversity terms, advise that at least a phase one survey should be undertaken for each allocated site.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage                                     | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | EH welcomes the historic environment related documents listed in Appendix 3 but expected to see listed the Historic Environment Record and EH's Heritage at Risk Register.   |
| 286        | Emily      | Sparrow     | JPPC / Merton College                                | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | There is a clear need for further employment land and affordable housing.  |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                             | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Local Plan should be based on a full and robust evidence base of housing need including consideration of Household formation rates, Net Inward Migration, Backlog/ Hidden Homeless, Census 2011, Housing Vacancy Rates, Economic Factors, Off-setting a falling work age population, addressing affordability, duty to cooperate, Non-delivery of Local Plan Allocations, Phasing Policy, Spatial Distribution & Flexibility. Plan does not consider historic shortfall and persistent under delivery. |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd                             | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Incomplete evidence base, SHMA and SHLAA unavailable. Oxfordshire SMA (2007) is out of date. Draft SHMA 2012 - does not reflect inward migration or newly forming households.  |
| 331        | Matthew    | Williams    | Drivers Jonas DeLoitte / Aberdeen Property Investors | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Welcome refresh of the Council's retail evidence base. As per NPPF paragraph 161.  |
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion                         | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence Base                       | Evidence base is not up to date. Policies relating to housing mix are not robust. Council has not published SHMA & IDP. Undermines consultation on plan and SEA/SA. Plan will require further consultation.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 336        | Melissa    | Wilson      | Drivers Jonas Deloitte / CEMEX UK                               | Appendix                           | Appendix 3                         | Evidence base                       | The Local Plan evidence base is not robust. The Council does not have an up to date SHLAA and the latest Housing Land Supply Position Update note (August 2012 indicates that it can only demonstrate a 3.2 year housing supply. This undermines development being brought forward in accordance with the spatial strategy and increases the threat of unplanned greenfield and rural development. The Council's AMR indicates the Council broadly agrees with the suitability of the CEMEX site at Merton Street. |
| 231        | Steven     | Neal        | Boyer Planning / Redrow Homes & Wates Developments              | Map                                | 5.1 - 5.2                          | Key Proposals - Map                 | Should show new link road on the South east of Bicester.   |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District  | Maps                               | Maps                               | Maps                                | Map 5.1 and the eight thematic maps are poor quality being too detailed and too small.   |
| 40         | Geoff      | Bolton      | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd                               | Map                                | 5.2 Banbury                        | Banbury Key Proposals               | Objects to the designation of much of the Broughton Road site as a green buffer. The policy and related designation on the Proposals Map should be deleted and replaced with a new policy relating to areas of separation. The 'green buffer' surrounding most of Banbury is a new and arbitrary designation and not based on any evidence. A detailed landscape assessment is required.   |
| 66         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association                    | Map                                | 5.2                                | Key Proposals: Bicester             | Concern that Pringle Fields falls within both the Town Centre Action Area and Green Buffer.  |
| 72         | Peter      | Chambers    | David Lock Associates   | Map                                | 5.2                                | Key proposals Bicester              | Residential development of 500 homes at Gavray Drive Bicester is supported.  |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Appendix                           | Appendix 5.2                       | Bicester                            | Extend Bicester Gateway to include Faccenda Chicken Farm for better frontage. Omission Site.   |
| 240        | Ellen      | O'Grady     | Defence Infrastructure Organisation                             | Map                                | Map                                | 5.2 Key Proposals: Bicester         | The proposed green buffer sits within MOD land ownership boundary, reducing developable land. The buffer cuts off the safeguarded Energy Centre areas as contained within the submitted planning application. This part of the policy is unsound.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 241        | Jane       | Olds        | Stratton Audley Parish Council                                  | Map                                | Map                                | 5.2 Key Proposals: Bicester         | Supports the zoning of the quarry areas as Local Wildlife site and the adjacent Landscape Buffer Zone between Stratton Audley and RAF Bicester   |
| 3          | Alec       | Arrol       | Kennet Properties / Thames Water                                | Appendix                           | Appendix 5                         | Banbury Proposals Map               | Object to the designation of Grimsbury Reservoir as green open space. KLP has no plans to permit public access and CDC has not approached KPL regarding the future of the site. Without some form of enabling development KPL would not support public access on this site. The designation provides no means to implement changes that would be supported by the landowner. |
| 43         | Rowland    | Bratt       |   | Map                                | Map                                | Banbury                             | The Green Buffer should be removed from proposals maps at Cotefield Farm, Bodicote.  |
| 94         | John       | Colegrave   |   | Map                                | Map                                | Banbury                             | Suggest that the Green Buffer is removed from proposals maps at Wykham Park Farm adjacent Salt Way.  |
| 297        | Robert     | Thompson    |   | Map                                | Map                                | Banbury                             | Suggest Green Buffer is removed from the Proposals Map at South of Broughton Road and that this land is allocated for residential development within the Local Plan.   |
| 85         | Will       | Cobley      | Terrence O'Rourke Ltd / Blenheim Palace Estate                  | Map                                | Map 5.5                            | Kidlington                          | Map 5.5 should be amended to include a wider area of search than depicted. Map supplied.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Appendix                           | Appendix 5.1                       | Proposed Submission Policies Map    | Remove Oxford Technology Park, Langford Lane, Kidlington from the Oxford Green Belt.   |
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | Appendix                           | Appendix 5.5                       | Kidlington Insets                   | Amend legend to state 'Oxford Technology Park' and not 'Langford Lane Technology Park'.  |
| 190        | Nik        | Lyzba       | JPPC / Oxford University Press                                  | Map                                | Map                                | Kidlington                          | OUP support Policy Kidlington 1 however they have concerns about its identification on the map. Element of pre-determination. Suggest notation is changed to reflect wider area of review.   |
| 283        | Roger      | Smith       | Savills / The Bulford trust                                     | Map                                | Map                                | Kidlington                          | Amend map to extend Kidlington 1 to include land east of Banbury Road and north of The Moors to allow small scale review of the Green Belt to provide for a mix of uses.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|---------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 334        | Alex       | Wilson        | Barton Willmore /A2 Dominion  | Map                                | 5.3                                | Bicester Insets                     | Plan depicts a rectangle shape for the site. The precise boundaries and extend of development will be determined through a Masterplanning process.   |
| 26         | Ed         | Barrett       | Turley Associates/ Scottish Widows / Scottish Widows Unit Funds Ltd | Consultation                       | Consultation                       | Consultation                        | Extension to consultation period not granted. Request made on the grounds that the Retail study Update was not finalised.  |
| 46         | David      | Broadley      | Aylesbury Vale DC   | Consultation                       | Consultation                       | Consultation                        | Request for an extension to consultation period.   |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch         | HFDAG   | Other                              | Other                              | Other                               | Public consultation has not complied with T&C Planning Act or the Localism Bill. No member of the public who resides in Hanwell Fields estate has been asked to consult or provide opinion on the 2012 local plan.   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson        | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council                                   | Consultation                       | Consultation                       | Consultation                        | Difficult to 'round robin' such lengthy document in the time allocated.  |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society   | Consultation                       | Consultation                       | Consultation                        | The Proposed Submission Draft Local Plan is very different document to the Draft Core Strategy. Containing new policies, revised housing numbers and new set of allocated sites. Including some previously rejected. E.g. Banbury 2. At pre-submission stage there is limited opportunity to comment on these new proposals. |
| 192        | Colin      | Macklin       |   | Consultation                       | Consultation                       | Consultation                        | Insufficient consultation has been carried out with Aynho Parish Council.  |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale         |   | Consultation                       | Consultation                       | Consultation                        | Insufficient community consultation  |
| 238        | Cathleen   | Nunn          |   | Consultation                       | Consultation                       | Consultation                        | Community has not been consulted.  |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne      | CPRE Bicester District  | Resourcing                         | Resourcing                         | Resourcing                          | Plan is silent on resourcing issues, to adequately deliver plan and ensure aims are achieved and monitored.  |
| 21         | Angela     | Atkinson      | Marine Management Organisation                                      | General                            | Other                              | Bicester Master Plan                | The geographical area of the document does not include any area of sea or tidal river and therefore the MMO has no comments.   |
| 37         | Claire     | Berry         | West Northants Joint Planning Unit                                  | General                            | Other                              | Local Plan and Bicester Masterplan  | West Northamptonshire Joint Planning Unit has no comments on either the Proposed Submission Local Plan or the draft Bicester Masterplan.   |
| 38         | Rachael    | Blakey        | Bucknell Parish Council   | General                            | Other                              | General                             | Number of jobs proposed will be difficult to deliver. Propose a new 'Industrial Development Officer'. Delivery strategy is vague.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)                  | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|---|
| 45         | Gemma      | Brickwood   | Turley Associates / Sainsbury    | General                            | Other                              | Inconsistencies with other planning policy documents | Plan is inconsistent with Bicester Masterplan - Town centre Boundary.   |
| 166        | Ben        | Jackson     | Bicester Chamber                 | General                            | Other                              | Draft Bicester Masterplan                            | The Local Plan contradicts the Masterplan in places. The Local Plan should be aligned with the masterplan which better meets the town's needs.  |
| 193        | Susan      | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council            | General                            | Other                              | Draft Bicester Masterplan                            | Plan should be flexible and not set out limitations and determinants. Town is fast growing and this will put strains on transport, employment, health, education and social and community challenges. Welcome specific chapter on Bicester and supporting Bicester Masterplan. Master plan duplicates Bicester Local Plan Chapter. Concern raised at inconsistencies.   |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England                  | General                            | Other                              | Draft Bicester Masterplan                            | A number of allocations ( in particular Bicester 3) have significant roads running through green space provision. This is likely to detract from the value of such space.   |
| 1          | A S        | Adams       |                                  | General                            | Other                              | Map  | The 'Framework Masterplan' leaflet does not depict Wendlebury.  |
| 3          | Alec       | Arrol       | Kennet Properties / Thames Water | General                            | Other                              | LP structure and content                             | Part C of the LP covers the 3 main settlements and, the villages and rural area. It is noted CDC does not intend to progress a site specific allocation DPD and that the Master Plans for Bicester and Banbury are progressed as SPDs. SPDs cannot make site allocations and this requires the LP to ensure that it has made all the necessary allocations within Bicester and Banbury to deliver the development requirements for the lifetime of the LP. Having a LP which concentrates on strategically important sites and progresses smaller sites through a site allocations DPD provides greater flexibility. CDC approach does not make the LP unsound but underpins why KPL considers parts of the LP unsound. |
| 19         | Ken        | Atack       | Cropredy Ward                    | General                            | Other                              | Canalside  | Happy with the Local Plan which demonstrates a sound and legally compliant document subject to relocation of business from Canalside.   |
| 21         | Angela     | Atkinson    | Marine Management Organisation   | Other                              | Other                              | Other  | The geographical area of the document does not include any area of sea or tidal river and therefore the MMO has no comments.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 27         | Peter      | Bateman     | Framptons/ Amber Developments                | General                            | Other                              | General                             | Design of height & extent of built development - could make reference to topography  |
| 42         | John       | Braithwaite | South Newington Parish Council               | General                            | Local Plan                         | General                             | Welcomes the general aims and policies set up in the Local Plan and considers the Plan well funded.  |
| 45         | Gemma      | Brickwood   | Turley Associates / Sainsbury                | General                            | Other                              | Retail                              | Level of retail provision at North West Bicester Eco-town, Graven Hill, South West Bicester Phase 2 & East Bicester are unjustified.   |
| 49         | Kathryn    | Brown       | Stoke Lyne Parish Council                    | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Agree with the premise that Bicester Town needs to be improved   |
| 49         | Kathryn    | Brown       | Stoke Lyne Parish Council                    | General                            | Other                              | Retail                              | Bicester already has more supermarkets than many other towns   |
| 49         | Kathryn    | Brown       | Stoke Lyne Parish Council                    | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Light pollution from Bicester is already an issue in surrounding villages. What can be done to prevent the impact of lighting new roads and development? What proposals are there to mitigate noise pollution? What compensation are in place for those affected by the SE Link Road?                        |
| 64         | Terry      | Byrd        | Merton Parish Council                        | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | 466 pages of documents are a significant challenge to any reader. Nonetheless it reflects on hard work and the covering summary leaflet is particularly well done.   |
| 64         | Terry      | Byrd        | Merton Parish Council                        | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Local Plan allocates resource to the "already haves - more sustainable" at the expense of the "have nots - less sustainable". There is a danger of this latter group becoming unsustainable. Merton Parish received negligible mention in the Plan with no specific mention in the Sustainability Appraisal. |
| 65         | Tim        | Byrne       | Jones Lang LaSalle / Horton General Hospital | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Expect future documents e.g. Site Allocation Document to consider development needs of Horton General Hospital   |
| 96         | Philip     | Collett     |  | General                            | Other                              | Motoway                             | M40 issues - Canal, River Cherwell I & Railway all run north south. Road near M40 are over crowded. Junction 9 acts as a junction for two other routes.  |
| 96         | Philip     | Collett     |  | General                            | Other                              | Motorway Junctions                  | Maps A-D supplied - depicting example junctions onto Motorways at M27 & proposed at M40  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 107        | Richard    | Cutler      | Bloombridge LLP / Hill Street Holdings / Oxford Technology Park | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Report Attached: Bloombridge Appendix: Commentary on the Social-Economic Profiles of Bicester, Banbury & Kidlington prepared by Colin Buchanan & Partners' April 10 & Hill Street Holdings *<br>Bloombridge Report Oxford Technology Park the Compelling Case Part 2 (Oct 2012), Flood Risk Assessment & Drainage Strategy, Preliminary Transport appraisal, Extended Phase 1 Habitats Survey  |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG   | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | The Local Plan misleads the public by adopting the revoked SE Plan for a greater housing number than is actually required. The fixed 5 year housing land supply has been fulfilled with planning permissions at Bankside 1 and Canalside.  |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG   | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Areas designated on the local plan have not been measured or assessed on equal or fair criteria. Banbury 5 has been added to the plan yet West of Warwick Road has been removed without a valid reason. Saltway is considered equal to Banbury 5 and Banbury 2 but is not present in the Local Plan. Banbury 5 has more negative points than positive according to the sustainability report and 70% of respondents to the draft plan said they opposed it; yet the site has been added. |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG   | General                            | Other                              | Banbury Masterplan                  | The Local Plan is misleading: Disconnected to previous plans, with sites previously dismissed, and incorrect information to justify their choice. The underlying Banbury master Plan has not been consulted on or issued.<br>Poor quality of documentation and incoherent website.   |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG   | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | CDC have failed to deliver houses in the past, failed to regenerate the Town Centre, create jobs and opportunities and provide infrastructure. CDC has a poor track record delivering large housing projects (Phase 1 Hanwell Fields, Banbury 5). Finance is key to deliver a housing Plan yet Bankside 1 is a failure due to no finance for builders or buyers.   |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG   | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Lack of proposed infrastructure for education, transport, health and water. The Plan has only 1 area allocated for employment use and no answers to tackle crime, antisocial behaviour and policing.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG                  | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Local Plan is environmentally unsound: no wildlife survey has been conducted, excessive development in the Green Belt, CDC Brownfield delivery is lower than Government targets, aesthetics and prominent position of Banbury 5 and landscape impact of Banbury 2.   |
| 117        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons              | General                            | Other                              | Rural Employment Opportunities      | Omission - New policy that encourages the provision of rural employment opportunities with the rural areas not confined to existing settlement boundaries. The policy should be criteria base and focused on PDL and other operation sites.  |
| 120        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Montpelier | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | New Policy - Encouraging the provision of specialist housing to meet the needs of the elderly. Should recognise that specialist accommodation provides employment opportunities - development maybe suitable on employment land (B1 Use's or where general employment is located near residential development. NPPF para 17 & 50. Ageing population - between 2008 - 2033 population will increase by 25,300, over 65-79 expected to grow by 77% & additional 19,600 people aged 65. Supported by Cherwell Community Plan 2006-2011. |
| 126        | Rose       | Freeman     | The Theatres Trust     | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Not a Local Plan but a Development Management document including elements of the Core Strategy. Plan is too long and deals with minutia of proposed developments. Plan should describe broad principles and parameters of future development with detail expanded in lower documents.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name    | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|----------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 144        | Jane       | Hennell        | Canal and River Trust                  | General                            | Other                              | New Policy                          | The Trust suggests that for the plan to be justified when considered against reasonable alternatives and as a response to the known pressure for moorings of all types, either Policy ESD17 is amended to include specific section on moorings, including residential moorings, or preferably a new policy is inserted into the document to cover the provision of all types of moorings and boating facilities. Without such a policy the plan does not give clear guidance on this type of development and therefore may not be positively prepared. The Trust would wish to advise on the wording of the policy to ensure consistency with its national policy which seeks to promote residential moorings as an alternative housing choice and recommends off line moorings in either basins or lay-bys to reduce the number of on line moorings i.e. those alongside canal banks. |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett          | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | New Pedestrian and cycle bridges - too vague   |
| 149        | Caroline   | Huett          | Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Good accessibility to public transport - no evidence to justify  |
| 158        | Chris      | Hone           | CPRE Banbury District                  | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | CPRE supports the concept of sustainability which is embraced throughout the plan.   |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith  |  | General                            | Other                              | Building Sustainable Communities    | Local allocation for Kidlington.   |
| 161        | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith  |  | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Provide new section explaining the development pressure on Kidlington.   |
| 168        | Patricia   | Jesson         | Wroxton & Balscote Parish Council      | General                            | Other                              | Parish Plans                        | There is no mention of Parish Plans  |
| 178        | Andrew     | Raven          | Savills / Barwood Strategic Land LLP   | General                            | Other                              | General                             | Wording throughout plan should be positively written 'development will be permitted unless...' rather than current wording development will not be permitted where...'   |
| 181        | Mike       | Kerford-Byrnes | The Astons and Heyfords Ward           | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Endorse comments by Cllr James Macnamara ref 194   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith  | Banbury Civic Society                  | General                            | Other                              | Housing Numbers                     | Concern a housing Numbers. Increase in Plan target at Banbury and Bicester do not reflect extension to Plan period.  |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society          | General                            | Other                              | Natural & Historic Environment      | Do not believe the Plan recognises the importance of the Natural & Historic environment. Noted in Core Assets but given very little exposure in the rest of the plan. Clarity required on the weight afforded the protection of the built and natural environment.  |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society          | General                            | Other                              | Banbury South-to-East Link Road     | Plan is silent on additional road infrastructure within Banbury. Concern given existing capacity issues and additional housing numbers. Need for a South East link road. Recommend a route corridor is allocated.   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society          | General                            | Other                              | Village Bias                        | Plan has a village bias in respect of growth.   |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society          | General                            | Other                              | Sustainable Communities             | Support policies on housing mix. Should also apply to existing housing stock. Retain family homes.  |
| 183        | Rob        | Kinchin-Smith | Banbury Civic Society          | General                            | Other                              | Natural & Historic Environment      | Support reference to natural, built and historic as core assets. Concern at the lack of policies covering the built and historic environment. Policy ESD.16 is confusing and not really about the built environment. Welcome commitment to Article 4 Directions, concern that policy applies to villages only and not Oxford Canal, Upper Heyford and RAF Bicester. LPA should use its enforcement power to police. |
| 187        | Duncan     | Ledger        | Bletchington Parish Council    | General                            | Other                              | Neighbourhood Plan                  | Bletchington Parish Council are preparing a Neighbourhood Plan that will incorporate hamlets of Heathfield and Enslow. May challenge planning restrictions placed upon Enslow.  |
| 190        | Nik        | Lyzba         | JPPC / Oxford University Press | General                            | Other                              | Household Waste                     | Plan should take into account a household waste and commercial waste recycling centre has been approved on the site and identified in the Oxfordshire Minerals and Waste Local Plan. Amendments supplied.   |
| 230        | Lucy       | Murfett       | South Oxon DC                  | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | No comment.   |
| 237        | Wayne      | Neale         |                                | General                            | Other                              | Banbury Masterplan                  | Banbury Masterplan has not been consulted upon  |
| 238        | Cathleen   | Nunn          |                                | General                            | Other                              | NPPF                                | Plan is not compliant with NPPF.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name   | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|---------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 241        | Jane       | Olds          | Stratton Audley Parish Council         | General                            | Other                              | General                             | PC welcomes both plans which have been well thought out and structured.   |
| 243        | Placi      | O'Neil-Espejo | Bicester Vision                        | General                            | Other                              | Bicester Masterplan                 | Concerned with inconsistencies between the LP and the Bicester Masterplan   |
| 252        | Dennis     | Price         |  | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Unclear definition used throughout.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Wording should be consistent with NPPF. A lot of repetition and inconsistency in particular the policies for sites.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Propose separate policies for public transport, walking & cycling. Public transport needs to be considered in the wider context. Plan should consider opportunities between modes.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations | General                            | Other                              | SuDS                                | All sites should consider SuDS.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations | General                            | Other                              | Phasing                             | Phasing of education statement varies in detail.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Business & Skills Team           | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Support plans to growth economic sectors. UTC maybe unrealistic.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Enterprise & Innovation Team     | General                            | Other                              | Oxfordshire LEP                     | Economy section should mention Oxfordshire LEP and in particular the relationship with Bicester.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Waste Management                 | General                            | Other                              | Household Waste                     | New residential development will put pressures on existing Household Waste Recycling Centres (HWRCs). Contributions should be sought towards increased capacity and re-use facilities.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Community Safety, Fire & Rescue  | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Currently emergency cover requirements are appropriate but are subject to regular review. Oxfordshire Fire & Rescue Service (OFRS) assumes access to proposed sites will comply with Approved Document B to the Building Regulations Volumes 1 & 2. Recommend access to water hydrants & relevant codes. Support the use of Automatic Water Suppression Systems .Recognise flood management. Proposed development may have an adverse affect on emergency response times. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round         | OCC - Archaeology                      | General                            | Other                              | Natural and Built Environment       | Phase 'Natural & Built environment should include historic environment.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                 | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                                 | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Phase 1 survey carried out at options for growth stage are no longer current and additional survey work is required. In all development existing landscape, and biodiversity features should be retained. Bicester site should be screened for Brown Hairstreak butterfly. Development that impacts on Conservation Target Areas should be resisted. Detailed habitat surveys should be carried out.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology                                 | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Support aim to achieve net gain in biodiversity.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Library Services                        | General                            | Other                              | Libraries                           | Libraries are good - Banbury, Bicester & Kidlington libraries are core libraries. Adderbury, Deddington, Hook Norton designated as community libraries. New library at Banbury & Bicester. Increased pressure.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Education & early Intervention Services | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Policy detail is variable.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Education & early Intervention Services | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Disagree - rural schools are not closing, OCC policy seeks to resist this trend. Excess demand.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                  | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Lot of repetition and inconsistency in the document, particularly in policies for individual sites. Public transport considerations are picked up in some strategic development policies but no in others and the same with walking and cycling. Potential for new transport policies to remove repetition. Consistency errors. Financial contributions should be used to pump prime cross town services that link the town centre with core transport interchanges. Operate at a regular frequency. Contributions should be used to upgrade public transport infrastructure. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport                  | General                            | Other                              | Transport                           | Wider public transport network and sustainable transport links within the development towns need to be considered rather than only in terms of access to individual strategic development sites. Opportunities and integration between modes, especially walking, cycling & public transport in order to maximise journeys by sustainable means. All sites are capable of supporting SuDS.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport | General                            | Other                              | Terms of Reference                  | Clarify terms; knowledge economy, green knowledge & visitor economy.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport | General                            | Other                              | Terms of Reference                  | Define terms Performance Engineering, eco-innovation hub along the Oxford - Cambridge technology corridor. Contradictions in reference to skills shortage / highly skilled. Excellent transport links should mention public transport. Home working & flexible working benefits should be expanded. List of employment development should include logistics and distribution and tourism. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Plan is missing reference to sustainable modes & modal shift.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Highways and Transport | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Wording could be clearer. E.g. are mixed developments only sought in town centres. Should cover sustainable modes.  |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England              | General                            | Other                              | Structure of Local Plan             | All policies in the plan relate to 'Ensuring sustainable development'. The third theme would be better titled 'Ensuring a sustainable environment'.   |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England              | General                            | Other                              | Light pollution                     | There is no reference to light pollution other than in the context of Hanwell Community Observatory. As consequence it is unclear how the plan is consistent with paragraph 125 of the NPPF, and hence sound.   |
|            |            |             |                              | General                            | Other                              | Empty Properties                    | Does the Local Plan consider NPPF para 5.1 bring back into residential use empty housing and buildings using CPO powers.  |
| 285        | Victor     | Smith       |                              | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | While there is reference to existing employment conditions there does not appear to be any correlation between spare space and anticipated future employment.   |
| 285        | Victor     | Smith       |                              | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | NPPF para 198 states that were a Neighbourhood Development Plan has been adopted and a planning application conflicts with the Plan, planning permission should not normally be approved. When a Planning Officer rejects an application because it contravenes the Local Plan his recommendation should not in future be ignored.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd   | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Object to policies BSC5, BSC6, BSC7, BSC10, BSC12, ESD1, ESD2, ESD8, ESD10 & ESD17. Inconsistent references to Council.   |
| 289        | Chris      | Still       | Gladman Developments Ltd   | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Report attached: Assessment of Future Housing Requirement in Cherwell, A Report for Gladmans October 2012   |
| 290        | Clare      | Stretcher   | The Coal Authority   | General                            | Other                              | Other                               | Have no specific comments to make at this stage.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations                           | HRA                                | Habitats Regulation Assessment     | Habitats Regulation Assessment      | HRA conclusion need to be explained in full.  |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England  | HRA                                | Habitats Regulation Assessment     | Habitats Regulation Assessment      | The HRA report assessed the Proposed Submission Draft May 2012. Assuming that there are no material differences between this and the consultation document (August 2012) we have no reason to disagree with the report's conclusion that the plan will have no effect on any European sites.  |
| 3          | Alec       | Arrol       | Kennet Properties / Thames Water                                 | DtC                                | Duty to Cooperate                  | Duty to Cooperate                   | The Plan should discuss the duty to cooperate and Cherwell should work with the City Council  |
| 3          | Alec       | Arrol       | Kennet Properties / Thames Water                                 | DtC                                | Duty to Cooperate                  | Duty to Cooperate                   | Wording is suggested to be added that acknowledges that the housing requirements of the City Council cannot be met in the City and that Cherwell will work with other authorities to identify how needs are met.  |
| 23         | Janice     | Bamsey      | West Oxfordshire District Council                                | DtC                                | Duty to Cooperate                  | Duty to Cooperate                   | West Oxfordshire District Council support the continued on-going engagement between the two Local Authorities and in particular future joint work on the assessment of the wider traffic implications of development, a review of the Green Belt near Oxford Airport, the scale of employment growth upon Local Jobs, commuting Patterns and the West Oxford economic objectives. |
| 54         | Phil       | Brown       | Savills for Magdalen Development Company / Kennet Properties Ltd | DtC                                | Duty to Cooperate                  | Duty to Cooperate                   | Plan should reference the Duty to Cooperate.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations   | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 84         | David      | Coates      | Kingerlee Homes   | DtC                                | Duty to Cooperate                  | Duty to Cooperate                   | No reference to the 'Duty to Cooperate'. No understanding of cross-boundary issues. Housing provision, transport infrastructure & journey to work catchments. Para A.6 could be the relocation for considering this issue.   |
| 333        | Rachel     | Williams    | Oxford City Council   | DtC                                | Duty to Cooperate                  | Duty to Cooperate                   | Stronger reference should be inserted in the Plan to the Duty to cooperate, similar to the wording proposed as a modification by the Inspector to the South Oxfordshire Core Strategy, recognising the established needs within the Central Oxfordshire Sub-region and identifying the importance of cross-boundary working in the attempt to address these needs.   |
| 383        | Laura      |             | Vale of the White Horse                                       | DtC                                | Duty to Cooperate                  | Duty to Cooperate                   | Under the 'duty to cooperate' we have reviewed your proposed submission local plan and Bicester masterplan and have no comments to make. This is an interim response as we are still awaiting confirmation under a delegated decision.   |
| 3          | Alec       | Arrol       | Kennet Properties / Thames Water                              | Omission site                      | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Grimsbury Reservoir is the only remaining site within Banbury that could bring forward new employment land without either further extending the boundaries of Banbury in an unsustainable manner, or introducing employment uses next to more sensitive uses. An employment led mixed use development could help enabling publicly accessible green open space provision and establishing a potential link between Spice Ball Park and Site allocation 'Banbury 14'. Further uses could include leisure provision linked to that provided by the Oxford Canal and the reservoir. After completion of the Banbury Flood Alleviation Scheme, the majority of the site will be removed from flood zone 3. This is identical to the effect on Canalside (Banbury 1). |
| 102        | Sam        | Croft       | RPS Planning & Development / Banner Homes Ltd / Rowland Bratt | Omission site                      | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Object to the Plan delaying employment allocation into subsequent DPD. Omission Site - Cotefield Business Park, site identified in plan under policy BO5. Suitable for employment development. Refer to Masterplan Concept Study.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                       | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 217        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Albion Land PLC                         | Omission site                      | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Omission Site for employment - Land off Waterworks Lane, Banbury. Plan attached.  |
| 218        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Mr C Hawes                              | Omission site                      | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Omission Site - North East Quadrant of Junction 9 M40. Plan attached.   |
| 219        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Mr D Mahon                              | Omission site                      | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Omission Site for employment - Land off Waterworks Lane, Banbury. Plan attached.  |
| 220        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Barwood Developments                    | Omission site                      | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Omission Site - Land Comprising Twenty-Twenty Cricket Ground, Thorpe Way - Allocate for commercial use  |
| 223        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Barwood Developments                    | Omission site                      | SLE.1                              | Employment Development              | Omission Site - Land at M40 should be allocated for employment or identified as an area of Development restraint to meet potential needs for economic development that are anticipated. Should a major investor not be accommodated on land at Overthorpe Road. Map attached.   |
| 330        | Kiran      | Williams    | BNP Paribas Real Estate UK Ltd / Cawdor Capital Ltd | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Site - Land off Camp Road, Upper Heyford. Land located adjacent Policy Villages 5: Upper Heyford. Majority of land is located in the Green Belt. Support local plan policies relating to housing growth. Site suitable for residential development. Located next to the New Settlement Area and employment opportunities at RAF site. Site is deliverable.   |
| 222        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Barwood Developments                    | Omission site                      | SLE.2                              | Securing Dynamic Town Centres       | Omission Site - Kraft Factory, Southam Road - Suitable for major retail food store, hotel and limited non food retail development. Will not adversely affect vitality and viability of the town centre. The requirements of a food store operator can not be met at land at Bolton Road which is unavailable and assembly would require CPO powers. Failure to allocate a food store will impede sustainable economic growth. Will provide jobs, enhanced retail offer and add to retail choice, accessible location well connected to the town centre. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                               | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|---|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 36         | Reuben     | Bellamy     | CALA Homes Ltd                              | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Site - South Lodge Riding Stables, Bicester. Site is suitable, available and viable and has no physical or technical constraints and is in a single ownership. Compliant with NPPF para 147 & 157. Capacity for 220 units. Offers a logical rounding of the Bicester edge and is in easy walking distance of open space employment opportunities at RAF Bicester. As well as retail/ leisure and medical facilities at Bure Farm. Preliminary landscape, ecology, transport and drainage / flood risk work have not identified any issues.  |
| 40         | Geoff      | Bolton      | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd           | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Land South of Broughton Road is considered to be deliverable for up to 400 dwellings. It could make a significant contribution to the 5 year housing land supply and facilitate the expansion of existing community facilities in Banbury. It should be identified as a potential reserve site.  |
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission site - Warwick Road, Banbury should be allocated. Further evidence is needed in respect of the Quantum of growth at the rural villages.   |
| 56         | Steven     | Brown       | Woolf Bond Planning / Miller Strategic Land | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Site - Land off Warwick Road, Banbury. Site allocated in Draft Plan as the first reserve site. Located in a sustainable location close to shops, services, schools and frequent bus service. Topography of site means it is visible from the West and forms an urban backdrop to the site. Vegetation marks the boundary to prevent long distance views. There is a range of residential styles. Site is not subject to flood, environmental and other known constraints. A masterplan for the site indicates public open space & retail could be provided. Baseline tech studies on highways, ecology, noise, landscape, visual impact, heritage & archaeology. Site capacity is 12ha or 300 dwg. Omission site should replace either Hardwick Farm or Hanwell Field . Review Banbury Section once Banbury Masterplan is prepared. |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                                | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 66         | Gemma      | Care        | Barton Willmore /Bicester Sports Association | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Site: Pinglefields - Suitable for retail or residential development,  |
| 106        | Russell    | Crow        | Barton Willmore / Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd       | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Site - Bourne Lane; site located north of Hook Norton, on the Western Side of Bourne Lane. 3.28ha site size. Adjacent landlocked parcel of land owned by District Council.  |
| 125        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Mr J Phipps                      | Omission                           | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | The Plan is not positively prepared in the provision of sufficient housing land to meet the objectively assessed housing needs of Cherwell District. Additional land needs to be identified for housing in locations that are available, suitable and achievable. Land shown in the accompanying plan meets these criteria and should be allocated for housing on the proposals map. (No site description or name given - triangular parcel of land north of the A4095 and bounded by the A4100 to the west and Fringford Road to the east (Bicester)) |
| 164        | Ian        | Inshaw      |  | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | The Plan should retain the rail link between Graven Hill and Arccott sites of the MoD depot and the Arccott and associated MoD sites should be included in the development framework .   |
| 189        | David      | Keene       | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates    | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Site - Land at Wykham Park Farm. Design and Access Statement supplied. 1000 new homes and 2 ha employment land (B1 & B2). Local Centre (A1, B1, A2-A5, D2 & D1). New entry primary school. Green Infrastructure & Transport Infrastructure. Road, light & drainage. No issue with Coalescence with Bodicote. Site is deliverable.   |
| 274        | Tom        | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Leda Properties                | Omission Site                      | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                         | Omission Site - Exclusion of land at Langford Park Farm for Bicester 2 is unjustified by evidence.   |
| 274        | Tom        | Smailes     | Kemp & Kemp / Leda Properties                | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission site - Langford Park Farm measures 12ha and can deliver approximately 390 dph enabling Policy Bicester 1 target to be met. Sustainable location with good access to Station and Town Centre. Encourages connectivity with adjacent communities.   |
| 286        | Emily      | Sparrow     | JPPC / Merton College                        | Omission Site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Sites - Merton Collage Land; land at Begbroke (west of A44), land at Pear Tree, land at Yarnton (West of A440) & land at Gosford Bridge, Kidlington.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 291        | Neville    | Surtees     | Barton Willmore / J A Pye Ltd  | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Site - Land at Webb Way - suitable for residential development. Located in a sustainable location. Within built up area on three sides. Would create a definitive and defensible boundary. Kidlington is a sustainable settlement.   |
| 299        | Bruce      | Tremayne    | CPRE Bicester District   | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Site - Shipton-on-Cherwell quarry. Should not be ignored.  |
| 336        | Melissa    | Wilson      | Drivers Jonas Deloitte / CEMEX UK  | Omission Site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | CEMEX site east of the railway line at Merton Street Banbury is a brownfield site previously in employment/industrial use. CEMEX no longer has operational requirements for the site and considers it suitable for residential led mixed use development. The site is in an accessible location in close proximity to a wide range of services and facilities including the railway station and Banbury town centre. Development of this site would help meet housing requirements, would ensure efficient use of land, and link development at Canalside with the Cattle Market redevelopment. |
| 374        |            |             | Berry Morris / Tappers Farm  | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission Site - Land at White Post Road, Bodicote. Site area 2.192 ha. Canalside site is undeliverable. Site surrounded by development including at Bankside. Bodicote will remain separated at Salt way, Kingsfield and Cricket Club.  |
| 387        | Kiran      | Williams    | BNP Paribas Real Estate UK Ltd / Trustees of Norman Collision Foundation | Omission site                      | BSC.1                              | District Wide Housing Distribution  | Omission site - Land of Merton Road, Ambrosden should be allocated for residential development and the framework boundary re-drawn. Site is located in a sustainable village with access to key services. Site is deliverable and has no significant infrastructure issues. Forms a logical extension to the settlement boundary.   |
| 254        | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council   | Omission site                      | Banbury 13                         | Burial Site Provision in Banbury    | Whilst supporting the allocation, it has increased 'hope value' for residential development attached to the land to the north of Hardwick Hill Cemetery which is needed to secure the extension to the existing cemetery. TC would like to see an additional allocation of the field to the north of the cemetery for a cemetery extension.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                     | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 40         | Geoff      | Bolton      | Berrys / Gleeson Developments Ltd | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA  | The SA does not clarify how the need for additional growth and alternative sites were assessed and why other previously excluded sites were not included in the Proposed Submission LP. The SA does not demonstrate that for the growth of Banbury the plan is the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives. as required by NPPF para 182.               |
| 43         | Rowland    | Bratt       |                                   | SA                                 | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth                  | There has been no Sustainability Appraisal of Policy ESD 15.  |
| 94         | John       | Colegrave   |                                   | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA  | Policy has not undergone Sustainability Appraisal.  |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG                             | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA  | Why have you ignored the results of the report  |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG                             | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA  | Why doesn't the report look at other areas other than those proposed  |
| 114        | Malcolm    | Finch       | HFDAG                             | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA  | Why hasn't the report been conducted on an equal and fair system  |
| 170        | Alan       | Jones       | Hanwell Village Residents         | SA                                 | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Do not see how the overall conclusions on the sustainability of sites Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 can be reached on the evidence available.   |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council            | SA                                 | ESD.15                             | Green Boundaries to Growth                  | Not in this context.  |
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council            | SA                                 | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road                 | Do not see how the overall conclusions of the SA of Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 can be reached on the evidence presented. There are serious issues about Banbury's long term capacity to expand given its topography and physical constraints. The sustainability of these sites is questionable and the potential mitigating measures needs further evidence and further careful assessment. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 171        | Jayne      | Gordon      | Hanwell Parish Council | SA                                 | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Do not see how the overall conclusions of the SA of Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 can be reached on the evidence presented. There are serious issues about Banbury's long term capacity to expand given its topography and physical constraints. The sustainability of these sites is questionable and the potential mitigating measures needs further evidence and further careful assessment. |
| 172        | Alan       | Jones       |                        | SA                                 | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road         | Do not see how the overall conclusions of the SA of Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 can be reached on the evidence presented. There are serious issues about Banbury's long term capacity to expand given its topography and physical constraints. The sustainability of these sites is questionable and the potential mitigating measures needs further evidence and further careful assessment. |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |                        | SA                                 | Banbury 2                          | Hardwick Farm, Southam Road         | Do not see how the overall conclusions of the SA of Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 can be reached on the evidence presented. There are serious issues about Banbury's long term capacity to expand given its topography and physical constraints. The sustainability of these sites is questionable and the potential mitigating measures needs further evidence and further careful assessment. |
| 176        | Karen      | Jones       |                        | SA                                 | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields             | Do not see how the overall conclusions of the SA of Banbury 2 and Banbury 5 can be reached on the evidence presented. There are serious issues about Banbury's long term capacity to expand given its topography and physical constraints. The sustainability of these sites is questionable and the potential mitigating measures needs further evidence and further careful assessment. |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations  | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 189        | David      | Keene       | David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates  | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA                                  | SA underplays sustainability of Wykham Park Farm. Scoring low in terms of access to the town centre and employment areas. Cycle way and bus route available. Omission site will deliver 1.66ha of employment land., a local centre. Conversely Canalside does not support economic growth. Proposal at Salt way would enhance the wildlife corridor. Landscape sensitivity report highlights land west of Bretch Hill as having a high sensitivity. Site will improve services and access to facilities including schools & recreation facilities. Site is in one ownership and is deliverable. Site is sustainable. |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Canalside                           | Sustainability is overstated. Unclear what the alternative sites are? Delivery risk associated with CPO powers & viability. Issues not addressed by the SA.  |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Hardwick Farm                       | SA fails to adequately justify sites inclusion within the Plan despite acknowledging disadvantages. Sites has low landscape capacity due to visual sensitivity, ecological & archaeological value and noise.   |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | West of Bretch Hill                 | SA fails to give adequate justification as to how the site would achieve the objective of reducing poverty and social exclusion. Justification is not site specific. SA overstates community benefits against landscape sensitivity.   |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | North of Hanwell Fields             | SA fails to record sustainability credentials.   |
| 198        | Rebecca    | McAllister  | Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance / trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | South Banbury - Omission Site       | SA does not reflect benefits - well connected to existing services including Schools, supermarket, hospital and employers. Good permeability. Located in least sensitive location re landscape. Deliver new cricket pitch. Secure separation of Banbury & Bodicote. Reduce poverty and social exclusion, deliver affordable housing, protect biodiversity and access to countryside and accessibility by sustainable modes.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations                          | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| 222        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Barwood Developments       | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA                                  | No assessment of Para B.53 that retail outside two town centres will not be supported.   |
| 223        | Peter      | Frampton    | Framptons / Barwood Developments       | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA                                  | SA has not assessed alternative strategies for the provision of employment land at Banbury. No consideration of need.  |
| 224        | Paul       | Morley      | Cropredy Parish Council                | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA                                  | The number of dwellings proposed for villages such as Cropedy and the smaller villages that make up the cluster is about right. It should reflect current population and the type and mix of housing, and materials should reflect the characteristics of the village.   |
| 226        | Sinéad     | Morrissey   | Rapleys LLP / Bedworth Trading Ltd     | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA                                  | Table 8.1 - Banbury Sites is inconsistent. Full benefits of Banbury 2 are not recognised relative to other sites. Approximately 800 dwg to meet housing targets. Reduction in poverty and social exclusion through mixed tenure. Wider benefits of open space, schools and local retail. Directly adjacent established housing and employment. Minor positive effects in relation to health, road congestions. Banbury 2 is considered better relative to Banbury 3 & 5. Inconsistency within Theme 2 Housing and SA objective 1 as sites should be assessed relative to each other. Table 8.3 refers to positive cumulative effect in respect of new development - this is not recognised in Table 8.1 reference Banbury 2. |
| 238        | Cathleen   | Nunn        |  | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA                                  | Lack of information regarding renewable energy & consideration given to sustainable sourcing of material and flood risk. Object to BAN5 & BAN2.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Strategic Planning Consultations | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA                                  | SA should show how site / policy performs against each of the sustainability objectives to facilitate easier comparison. Policies have not been considered against flora and fauna or landscape. Biodiversity is mentioned only in a more general way. Education and extra care homes for the elderly have not been included. BAN1 limited opportunities to retain sites in Banbury for small businesses. BAN2 - disagree with minor effects on biodiversity. Report does not reference HRA and impact on Oxford Meadows (SAC).  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology                      | SA                                 | Box 2.1                            | Our Vision for Cherwell District    | Should refer to Historic Environment. List as challenge and objectives.  |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations     | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)          | Summary of Representation  |
|------------|------------|-------------|-------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | Table 5.1                          | 10 Landscape and Historic Assets             | District contains around 16000 undesignated heritage assets recorded on the Historic Environmental Record.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | Table 6.1                          | SA Framework                                 | Support Objective 12.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | Bicester 1                         | North West Bicester Eco-Development          | Mitigation section should refer to further archaeological survey work.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                                  | Mitigation section should refer to a phrase of archaeological investigation.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park            | Mitigation section should refer to further archaeological survey work.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                                | Deserted medieval village of Wretchwick and surrounding furrows & earthworks could be considered a major constraint. Should be listed as a major negative impact.      |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | Banbury 2                          | Hard wick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) | Impact on setting of grade II* listed building of Hardwick House. Negative impact.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40                  | No archaeological features found. Site lies near WW1 munitions factory - no remains extend this far.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | Banbury 8                          | Land at Bolton Road                          | Requirement for desk based assessment & trenched archaeological field evaluation.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Archaeology | SA                                 | BAN14a                             | Banbury Country Park                         | Mitigation section should refer to further archaeological survey work.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology     | SA                                 | Objective 10                       |  | Need for networks of habitats should be included. Does not have full access to SA. Habitats Regulation Assessment (Oxford Meadows SAC) will also need to be explained. |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology     | SA                                 | Bicester 2                         | Graven Hill                                  | Does not consider harm to LWS and UK & European Protected Species.   |

Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx)         | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|---|---|
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Bicester 3                         | South West Bicester Phase 2                 | Result of survey required - little evidence.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Bicester 4                         | Bicester Business Park                      | Consent granted.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Bicester 10                        | Bicester Gateway                            | BIC 10 adjoins western boundary of LWS but LWS outside site boundary.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Bicester 11                        | North East Bicester Business Park           | Disagree, unimproved grassland takes along time to be created is loss can not be easily mitigated.                      |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Bicester 12                        | East Bicester                               | Bicester 12 is part within Ray Conservation Target Area and potential BAP Priority Habitat.                             |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Banbury 2                          | Hard wick Farm, Southam Road (East and Wes) | Survey required. Grater Crested Newts.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Banbury 3                          | West of Bretch Hill                         | Query minor negative.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Banbury 4                          | Bankside Phase 2                            | Agree - given information supplied.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Banbury 5                          | North of Hanwell Fields                     | Potential ecological constraint.  |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Banbury 6                          | Employment Land West of M40                 | Agree - given information supplied.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Banbury 12                         | Land for the Relocation of Banbury FC       | Query minor negative.   |
| 264        | Daniel     | Round       | OCC - Ecology    | SA                                 | Kidlington 1                       | Langford Lane Technology Park               | Disagree - survey work yet to be carried out. Important and protected habitat and species could be indirectly affected. |
| 268        | Charles    | Routh       | Natural England  | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Sustainability Appraisal                    | No comments to make on this document.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SLE.4                                       | The SA fails to identify the potential harm of the proposed relief road on the Alchester Roman Town                     |



Appendix D: Summary of Representations (as of 4th March 2013)

| Rep ID no. | First Name | Second Name | Organisations    | Type (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Name (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Title (Policy, Para, Map, SA, Appx) | Summary of Representation   |
|------------|------------|-------------|------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---|
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Bicester 12                         | SA fails to recognise the substantial harm that development within the setting of the scheduled monument of Wretchwick Deserted Medieval Settlement might cause.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | ESD.16                              | EH agrees with the SA conclusion in the assessment of this policy and proposed mitigation measure but considers more changes are required for the policy to accord with the NPPF.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Bicester 1                          | SA fails to identify the potential impact of the proposed development on the designated heritage assets within and close to the North West Bicester Eco-Town (Bicester 1). EH agrees with the suggested mitigation but more detail is required. |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Bicester 2                          | The SA fails to identify the potential harm from this section of the relief road on the historic environment.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Bicester 5                          | EH does not see the justification for the SA's conclusion that Bicester 5 will enhance the town centre conservation area.   |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Bicester 10                         | EH concurs with the SA conclusion in terms of the policy impact on the historic environment.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Bicester 12                         | SA fails to recognise the substantial harm that development within the setting of the scheduled monument of Wretchwick Deserted Medieval Settlement might cause.  |
| 279        | Martin     | Small       | English Heritage | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | Banbury 2                           | EH concurs with the SA conclusion for this Policy.  |
| 340        | Dominic    | Woodfield   | Bioscan          | SA                                 | Sustainability Appraisal           | SA                                  | Concern at SA process. Concern at the proposed use of amenity space adjacent Gavray Drive for informal recreation compromising ability to manage land (a designated wildlife site).   |