

Local Plan
Proposed Changes to Proposed Submission
March 2013

Appendix 5: Summary of Consultation

Contents

	Page
Section 1: Public Consultation Arrangements	4
Section 2: Representations Received	5
Section 3: Proposed Plan Changes	31
Section 4: Sustainability Appraisal – Update	42
Appendix A: Statement of Representation Procedure, Representation Form & Guidance Note	45
Appendix B: Press Notice	47
Appendix C: Letters to Stakeholders and Libraries	49
Appendix D: Summary of Representations to the Proposed Changes to the Proposed Submission Local Plan	51

Section 1: Public Consultation Arrangements

Proposed Submission Local Plan

The Proposed Changes to the Proposed Submission Local Plan were publicly consulted upon from 28 March 2013 to 23 May 2013. The consultation was originally advertised as 28 March 2013 to 9 May 2013 before being extended.

Purpose of the Consultation

The consultation process was carried out in conformity with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and in particular Regulation 19 and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement which contains the Council's agreed protocols for the consultation on Development Plan Documents such as the Local Plan.

Who we consulted

All those on the consultation database including the designated general consultation bodies and specific consultation bodies.

How we consulted

A programme of consultation took place over the eight-weeks between 28th March 2013 and 23rd May 2013. A representation form and guidance note was produced and made available for all consultees - **Appendix A**.

The following consultation methods were used at this stage of the process:

- Public notices in local newspapers: Banbury Guardian and Bicester Advertiser - **Appendix B**.
- Letters to all bodies on our consultation database and all local libraries – **Appendix C**.
- The Council's website was updated and all relevant material was made available.
- The Council accepted representations either by email or by letter.
- A summary of all representations received by the Council during the consultation period is presented in **Appendix D**.

Section 2: Representations Received

In total, approximately 300 organisations and individuals submitted a comment on the Local Plan Proposed Submission Focused Consultation, generating over 1,000 individual comments/points.

This report sets out a summary of the content of the representations received. It does not offer a commentary on those representations. It has been prepared to provide an overview of the challenge of addressing a complex set of issues raised by respondents. Summaries of all comments were presented to the District Council's Executive on the 7th October 2013. Full representations can be viewed on line at www.cherwell.gov.uk/publicationscheme. The main issues identified are shown below.

Introduction

- Comments about the Plan reflecting the revocation of the South East Regional Spatial Strategy, overall levels of housing growth, the Plan's emphasis on Kidlington, and later policies in the Plan.

Duty to cooperate

- No evidence of the Council having complied with the Duty to Cooperate.
- The Council should consider neighbouring authorities housing requirements – through an up to date SHMA.
- The scale of housing need in Oxford should be considered.
- Discussions needed between Cherwell District Council, Oxfordshire County Council, Buckinghamshire County Council and Aylesbury Vale District Council to discuss the possible strategic relief roads at Bicester.
- Discussions will need to take place between Cherwell District Council and Scottish and Southern Energy prior to planning permission being granted.
- Oxford City Council would welcome a discussion with Cherwell District Council on concerns for Bicester. Concerned over the significant emphasis given to the knowledge economy. The type of employment development proposed at Bicester will overlap significantly with key sectors of Oxford's economy.

Strategy for Development in Cherwell

New Policy: PSD 1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development

- The policy should be extended to make clear that the Council should ensure they identify and update annually a supply of developable housing sites that forms part of the five year housing land supply.
- Policy should be worded to make it clear the definition of "out of date" matches that within the NPPF.
- The final paragraph is incomplete.

Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy

Policy SLE 1: Employment Development

- The vision for employment is difficult to achieve.
- The Plan should allocate further employment sites.
- The Plan has only allocated one employment site in Banbury which is insufficient, why has no further employment land been allocated in Banbury?
- Reconsider the inclusion of the marketing requirement.
- No overall requirement of employment land is set for the Plan period.
- There is no overarching framework upon which to ascertain whether the site allocations will meet objectively identified development requirements.
- The Policy should be more flexible and recognise that employment sites on the periphery of the settlement can be developed without harm to surrounding land.
- The policy criteria are inclusive rather than exclusive.
- There is only a limited number of sites allocated for B2 and B8 employment uses and there is uncertainty over the mix of uses expected to be delivered on these sites.
- The Policy is silent on the redevelopment/regeneration of existing employment sites for employment uses.
- No target identified for the amount of employment development to the rural areas.
- The Plan does not address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester, and fails to create clear policy-based opportunities for established rural businesses to expand/improve their premises.
- Proposed Green Buffers at Bicester could limit opportunities to locate large employment areas close to Bicester.

Policy SLE2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres

- The thresholds for retail impact assessment should be re-worded in order to provide greater clarity - retail impact assessment for retail proposals in edge of centre or out of centre locations if they are over 2,000sqm within the catchment area of Banbury, 1,500sqm in the catchment area of Bicester, and 350sqm elsewhere.
- A range of scale of floorspace should be indicated for the type of floorspace required for each local centre in each strategic housing allocation to ensure that sustainable communities are delivered.
- Retail evidence base should be reviewed every 5 years to ensure a robust assessment of estimated capacity and appropriate planning of any identified growth in floorspace.
- The Plan should not prejudge the outcomes of the planned town centre boundary review.
- Paragraph B.53 should be deleted or rephrased to reiterate the sequential approach.
- Inconsistencies exist with respect to retail policy.

Policy SLE4: Improved Transport and Connections

- 3 routes were identified in the Bicester Movement Study therefore the Plan should make reference to all 3 routes.

- Include reference on the northern relief road proposals - Howes Lane/Lords Lane are unsuitable as a northern 'ring' road.
- Paragraph B.69 should also include the possible route at North West Bicester.
- Maps from the Movement Study ignore the existence of Ambrosden which gives a false impression of the Plan's population impact.
- No mention of the potential impact on Wendlebury of the proposed relief road.
- The paragraph should also include the possible route at North West Bicester.
- All 5 Wretchwick properties are Grade II listed but they do not appear as listed buildings on the Movement Study's maps.
- Paragraph B.74 does not qualify the degree of growth potential at London Oxford Airport within its existing boundaries.
- Amend the name of the airport to London Oxford Airport.
- The Plan must consider impacts on Junctions 9, 10 and 11 of the M40 and the A34 with the A43. A credible and realistic transport evidence base required.

Policies for Building Sustainable Communities

Policy BSC1: District Wide Housing Distribution

- The rate of housing delivery from the South East Plan has continued to be used which is likely to lead to an overestimate/underestimate of need.
- Revocation of South East Plan noted - new SHMA is required.
- The Plan fails to address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester.
- Object to Bicester being the main location for growth as it ignores wider opportunities.
- Further explanation needed for the increase in housing numbers at Bicester.
- The housing figure for Bicester should be reduced by at least 10% and allocated to Rest of District.
- Bicester's traffic congestion will continue to worsen due to the planned growth therefore growth should be focused at Banbury.
- There is overreliance on windfall sites in the Plan.
- The increase to the housing requirement (16,750 dwellings) due to the plan period being extended for a further 5 years is over ambitious.
- The Council has failed to acknowledge more up to date and robust evidence on demographic change and migration provided through ONS and CLG population and household projections.
- The new landscape evidence has resulted in changes to the capacity of the strategic sites within Banbury and has brought a greater imbalance in the housing distribution between Banbury and Bicester.
- Explanation needed on the suggested windfall allowance.
- The Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply with 5% or 20% buffer therefore current housing policies are out of date. The 2012 Annual Monitoring Report shows a consistent under delivery of housing in the District since 2007. The Plan should identify housing land beyond the housing target to build in a contingency.

- There must be recognition that there is a continuing need for new development in rural areas.
- Support the recognition that Kidlington should be targeted for economic development, featuring alongside Banbury and Bicester.

The housing requirement should be increased to:

- 688 per annum to reflect interim Household Projections (2011)
- 800 dwellings per annum and 20,000 dwellings over the Plan period
- 968 dwellings per annum and 24,199 dwellings over the Plan period

Policy BSC2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land – Brownfield Land and Housing Density

- Revise the housing strategy to allow for a combination of strategic housing sites alongside a number of rural housing allocations for the larger villages, to encourage developments between 10 and up to 100 dwellings to come forward in those more sustainable locations.
- The minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare raises concern as it is difficult to provide family housing and housing for the elderly.
- The density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare is too prescriptive and should be subject to the individual circumstances
- There is no guidance as to what would be expected in urban locations.
- Advocate a density of (at most) 25 dwellings per hectare to allow for adequate garden space for families.
- The 45% PDL target appears too ambitious.
- Bicester will not achieve the 45% of new homes to be developed on brownfield sites as shown in the Housing Trajectory. The changes to allocations and commitments on brownfield will be approximately 30%. Deleting Policy Bicester 1 will substantially improve proportion towards target.

Policy BSC3: Affordable Housing

- Unclear if the identified need for affordable housing considers the significant backlog of need.
- The Plan does not consider the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans". Affordable housing requirements should be based on robust viability.
- Local Plan allocations should not be subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the Plan's viability.
- The policy on the provision of affordable housing should use a net figure when referring to the threshold and capacity.
- The policy lacks flexibility and should be amended to be dealt with on a case by case basis and in accordance with the most up to date evidence.
- Include wording on 'open book' financial analysis.
- Object to the affordable housing requirement of 30% in Banbury.
- The updated SHMA 2012 suggests a need for 831 homes per year however there has been no consultation on the SHMA. Lack of up to date available evidence.
- The requirement of financial contribution is supported.

- The requirement would result in large family dwellings in order to subsidise affordable housing. Smaller dwellings will not be delivered in settlements that require them. This will allow the elderly people to downsize into smaller units.
- The affordable housing requirement should be reduced to address specific local needs.
- The affordable housing threshold for Kidlington should be reduced to 3 due to the high land values.

Policy BSC4: Housing Mix

- Supports the removal of Housing Mix table from the policy and the proposed wording change.
- It is unclear what constitutes a strategic housing site.
- Unclear why 45 self-contained extra care dwellings has been chosen. No assessment of the implications on the viability of development and subject to negotiations.
- Policy should exclude development schemes where a proposed development addresses a specific local need.
- The requirement for self-contained extra care dwellings should be deleted.
- Extra care dwellings should be exempted from providing affordable housing.
- The Council now only wishes to prescribe residential mix in terms of 1 bed units at strategic sites.
- Provision of extra care dwellings is too restrictive as other types of accommodation may be required later in the plan period.

Policy BSC7: Meeting Education Needs

- There is very little evidence in the Plan of effective assessment of school provision within rural areas.

Policy BSC10: Open Space, Outdoor Sport and Recreation Provision

- The Council's evidence base is not considered up to date.
- The South West Sports Village at Kingsmere will address the known shortfall in outdoor sports and recreation provision to 2008/09.
- Provision should be made for substantial public transport in rural areas, and safe cycle and walking routes during the hours when local residents could take advantage of the provision. It is also essential to ensure that the facilities remain in public ownership to ensure constant availability.
- Concerns over viability of open space standards.

Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development

Policies ESD 1 - 5

- Policies have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared.
- Concerns over the impact of the policy requirements on viability

Policy ESD1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change

- The Policy is inflexible.
- Concerns over the impact of the policies on viability

Policy ESD2: Energy Hierarchy

- Policy ESD2 should be deleted. Methods of construction and sustainability should be addressed through the Building Regulations and not the planning system. Do not support additional burdens to development.
- The requirement for developers to submit an Energy Statement is unnecessary as this is not a planning matter.

Policy ESD3: Sustainable Construction

- Construction standards required for new homes should be at least in line with the prevailing Building Regulations.
- Object to all new dwellings to meet at least Code Level 4 with immediate effect as this will affect the deliverability of a site (viability issues).
- Delivery of sites will be put at risk due to the financial burden placed upon them.
- The Plan could seek to 'encourage' higher environmental performance by reducing financial obligations on a development schemes.
- The evidence base omits the cost of certain policies including Lifetime Homes and space standards.
- Concerned at Bicester and Banbury when there is a requirement to achieve Code for Sustainable Homes Level 5.
- The Policy does not set out a minimum size requirement below which BREEAM is not required.
- The cost of achieving the required Code for Sustainable Homes only encourages medium and large size developments.
- References to "embodied energy within buildings" are ambiguous.
- No reference to off-site 'allowable solutions'.
- Clarification is needed on the references to "standards" and "immediate effect".

Policy ESD4: Decentralised Energy Systems

- Object to combined heat and power at district level.
- Carbon emission reduction targets should be a matter for developers to determine and not stipulated by the Council.
- The systems identified may not be the most effective when other solutions are available.
- Justification needed on thresholds

Policy ESD5: Renewable Energy

- Places onerous burdens upon the development
- Policy ESD 4 and ESD 5 should be combined.
- Justification needed on thresholds

- The policy should be more flexible and recognise that viability is a key factor

Policy ESD6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management

- Flood Risk Assessments should explore all potential sources of flood risk and water contamination to water sources further from the immediate flood risk zone.

Policy ESD7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)

- Concerned over the adequacy of infrastructure. The Plan may need to allocate more land to allow an expansion of SuDS to cope with increased intensity of rainfall events with climate change.

Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment

- Policy needs to be more flexible and recognise that viability is a key factor

Policy ESD13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement

- The Policy and supporting text needs to acknowledge that some landscapes will be more sensitive than others, and where specific development proposals come forward, a specific appraisal of the landscape character will need to be undertaken.
- Salt Way is not a 'key landform and landscape feature' of the District.
- Objects to the removal of reference to the Grade II* Wroxton Abbey Park and the borrowed vistas up the Cherwell Valley from Rousham.

Policy ESD14: Oxford Green Belt

- The Green Belt is of national significance and a strategic priority.
- Changes to the development boundaries of settlement within the Green Belt should be given consideration through the Local Plan.
- A review of the Green Belt boundaries must not be left to any subsequent Area Action Plan or Neighbourhood Development Plan.
- Villages should be included in the Green Belt only if they contribute significantly to the openness of the Green Belt.
- Realigning the Green Belt to exclude Charlton-on-Otmoor's built village envelope would not detract from the openness of the Green Belt.
- There is no flexibility for smaller local communities to accommodate local development needs or address settlement issues through development, where supported by the local community.
- Supporting text does not report the outcome of the legal challenge.
- Support small scale local review of the Green Belt boundary in the vicinity of Langford Lane Kidlington and Begbroke Science Park.
- Objecting to small scale local review of the Green Belt boundary in the Kidlington and Begbroke area.
- Suggest labelling the sites as Kidlington 1a and 1b to avoid confusion.

- Begbroke Science Park has very different Green Belt characteristics to the land at Oxford Technology Park and has no obvious long term defensible boundary.
- Housing should be considered as part of the small scale local review of the Green Belt boundary.
- Clarification needed on phrase "exceptional circumstances".
- No reference to the forthcoming joint Oxfordshire SHMA update.
- Concerned that Yarnton and Begbroke appear to be unconstrained in their potential to impinge upon the Green Belt.
- The small scale local review of the Green Belt at Kidlington should consider associated housing needs.

Policy ESD15: Green Boundaries to Growth

- Support principle and reference to revised Green Buffers.
- The Council should base policy on up to date and relevant evidence base and objectively assessed.
- The Green Buffer around Launton should be extended to cover 200 - 300m the other sides of the railway lines to the North West and South West of the village.
- The proposed South East relief road would risk destroying the environment where the Green Buffer should be protecting.
- Green Buffers policy should be deleted since it gives rise to the establishment of "quasi" Green Belt areas.
- Green Buffer Policy is not supported by the NPPF.
- Clarification needed when referring to Para 157 of the NPPF.
- There is no need for Green Buffers as housing allocations restrict growth.
- Green buffers, duplicates the objectives of Policy ESD 13, which are designed to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the landscape around the urban fringe.
- The Bicester Green Buffer report by LDA directly conflicts with the draft Bicester Masterplan.
- Development at Banbury and Bicester should address the relationship with the open countryside.
- The Plan should indicate that proposals for the future growth of Banbury and Bicester beyond 2031, will be included in a review of the Local Plan – including the green boundaries to growth
- The Green Buffer will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury.
- The separation between Banbury and Drayton Village needs to be maintained.
- Development at South West of Banbury can be sensitively laid out and designed to maintain Banbury's distinctive identity and setting.
- Caversfield is physically joined to Bicester and has visual functional and social relationship with the urban area of Bicester. The narrowest point is 250m wide which undermine its purpose.
- The Green Buffer at Caversfield should be removed.

- Coalescence has already occurred and Plan promotes further coalescence with Bicester 1 and 8 allocations
- Do not agree that sites on urban fringes of the towns have been discounted as locations for future development due to the designations of Green Buffers.
- Wording allows the Council to amend and change the boundaries to allow development.
- The Policy should be reworded to be more positive towards the creation of community woodland where this is appropriate in landscape and ecological term.
- The Plan does not offer sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change due to the increased tightly drawn Green Buffers.
- Why has the Green Buffers not been extended to include land west of Bicester 1, south of Bicester 2, east of Bicester 12 and southeast Bicester 11.
- Should only be applied in cases where the local authority is able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply.
- Explanation needed on the protection of important views.
- Concerned over the distance between Bankside development / Bankside Phase 2 and Adderbury. The proposed Green Buffer zone between the two areas should be maintained.
- The Green Buffers show extensive areas of land that are not between the settlement and surrounding villages, nor related to proposed new development.

Sites suggested to be removed from the Green Buffers at Banbury and Bicester:

- Land West of Warwick Road, Banbury
- Land to the south of Bodicote, (Cotefield Farm) Banbury
- Land at Salt Way, Banbury
- Land at South West of Bicester (between the A41 and the Wendlebury Road)
- Land owned by Power Park Limited, Banbury
- Land South of Broughton Road, Banbury

Policy ESD16

- The policy appears to give equal weight to designated and undesignated assets and makes no distinction between the significance of impacts inconsistent with advice in the NPPF
- The policy needs to recognise that design objectives have to be practical and deliverable in the context of the NPPF.
- Recommended re-wording re the use of Article 4 Directions at paragraph B.264.
- Consider removing the requirement for the preparation of a Design Codes on Strategic Sites.
- No definition or explanation for a 'strategic site'.

Policy ESD17: The Oxford Canal

- The policy should be expanded to cover the needs of boaters who need moorings, sanitary facilities, etc. Clarification needed for the inclusion of supporting ancillary facilities.

- Constraints such as topography and location need to be recognised. The policy needs to be flexible.
- The Policy should be amended to ensure that harm to the biodiversity value of the Oxford Canal is avoided.

Policy ESD18

- Add wording on equestrians.
- Include reference to woodlands.
- A definition for Green Infrastructure is needed.
- No explanation as to how sites have been chosen for incorporation into Green Infrastructure and why others have not.

Bicester

Bicester Masterplan

- Support the Bicester Masterplan that confirmed the need to attract over 20,000 new sustainable jobs at all skill levels over the next 20 years. Reliance on home working and self employment will not deliver either the number or types of employment opportunities required.
- There is no mention of the proposed Park and Ride at Bicester.

Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town

- Support the identification of Bicester as an area of growth and NW Bicester as an Eco Town.
- Question the housing target for North West Bicester 1,793 dwellings to 2031, 3,207 dwellings after 2031. How was this calculated?
- Planning permission was granted in 2011 for the exemplar first phase but no work has been started.
- The Masterplan for NW Bicester should address the issues and link it with the Local Plan. There is currently a gap between the Local Plan and the town Masterplan.
- The rate of housing delivery for the site seems very conservative.
- Consistency needed on requirements for non-residential and residential.
- Object to the requirement to meet Level 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, PPS1 Supplement sets only Level 4.
- Question the change in the Code for Sustainable Homes from Level 6 to Level 5.
- The Policy should be amended to enable greater flexibility and certainty.
- Wording on BREEAM requirement could be revised to read as "non-residential dwellings to aspire to be BREEAM Excellent".
- The requirement for Building for Life Silver should be deleted as it is not a mandatory scoring system.
- The Environment Agency has published a guidance document on water cycle studies which should be referenced in the Policy.
- Clarification needed for the requirement of 40% of the site to be green open space.

- In order to avoid 'urban creep' within the masterplan there should be provision for a Green Buffer to the west and north west of Bicester extending as far as the M40.

Policy Bicester 2: Graven Hill

- The Policy merely mentions B1, B2 and B8 which is unduly restrictive.
- The Policy should consider and encourage other uses included in the outline planning application (11/01494/OUT).
- The number of new jobs is questioned.
- The site cannot link to Bicester Business Park due to land ownership constraints and the physical barrier of railway embankment.
- MOD cannot control access over land outside its ownership.
- Location of the rail freight interchange will have a considerable impact on residential properties as the proposed route of the relief road no.3 passes Wendlebury and the vehicles using such a facility are large, noisy and polluting.
- A number of requirements should be deleted as they are either not necessary or there is no evidence to justify them.

Related objections to the Bicester Movement Study:

- Ambrosden has been omitted from the Plan and Movement Study giving a false impression on the impact of the village.
- The chicken farm and 5 Wretchwick properties have all been designated as 'green buffer' on the Movement Study which is not the purpose of the Green Buffer.
- All 5 Wretchwick properties are Grade II listed but they do not appear as listed buildings on the Movement Study's maps.
- In the route maps the proposed route corridors 2C and 3C appear to pass through the Wretchwick Farm properties.
- An ecological survey should be required to determine the impact of the proposed routes on Merton.

Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2

- Supports the removal of reference on employment requirements.
- The proposed housing should increase from approximately 650 to 700. This would reflect provision of extra care housing.
- The requirements for extra care provision and community self build should not put viability at risk.
- The removal of 'Two Forms of Entry' could marginalise Chesterton School.
- The reference to St Edburg's School is not appropriate for the policy as the primary school is not intending to locate to the Phase 2 site.
- The removal of the requirement for health provision is supported.
- Object to the requirement for a community facility.
- No evidence shown for a local centre to be provided at Phase 2.
- Consider removing the requirements for improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the A41, provision of green infrastructure and protection of Whitelands Farm.

Policy Bicester 4: Bicester Business Park

- The Tesco store will make the site more viable and attractive as a potential location for businesses.
- Clarify the meaning of 'developments at risk of flooding'.

Policy Bicester 5: Strengthening Bicester Town Centre

- The extension of the Bicester town centre boundary should include Bicester Village and Bicester Town Railway Station.
- Further clarity required on the implementation and scale of the extension as this is unknown.
- Any town centre boundary extension should be approached with careful consideration and kept very tightly constrained to the boundaries of the existing centre.
- The increasing number of vacancies within the town centre is the primary reason for not considering the extension of the town centre boundary.
- The proposed new town park at Pingle Fields/Bicester Sports Association will be unsafe for users due to the busy road (Pingle Drive).
- No suggestions made for the replacement of playing pitches.
- Supports the Council's aspiration for additional playing fields and sports provision for Bicester.
- Supports the principle of relocating its existing facilities from Oxford Road (Pingle Fields) and proposes to concentrate its facilities on to the one site at Chesterton (Akeman Street).

Bicester 7: Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation

- Give some flexibility by stating that the rugby club and other sports uses should be located in or close to the town.

Related objections to Stratton Audley Quarry

- The site name should be extended to include Elm Farm Quarry as the site consists of two parts.
- Those limited numbers of organisations currently using the sites for a long period of time should remain the sole users".

Bicester 10: Bicester Gateway

- The reference to high technology industries does not go far enough to protect other, sequentially preferable sites identified for conventional B1 Business uses.
- Clarify the meaning of 'developments at risk of flooding'.

Bicester 11: North East Bicester Business Park

- Restricting the potential use to B1 uses will not remove the risk to the adjacent RAF Bicester a designated conservation area. Potential impact should be considered at the development management stage.
- The policy should include other uses such as B2 and or B8 and not be restricted to only B1 uses.

- A revised site boundary extended to the north and east is proposed.
- The policy needs to be more flexible.

Bicester 12: East Bicester

- Reference to the development area should be amended to "approximately" to align with the area proposed by the developer in an indicative site masterplan.
- The proposed extended site could accommodate approximately 800 dwellings during the plan period.
- Supports the proposed wording change however the wording may result in an equal split of the uses being required.
- Amend the wording to support uses within the B class of the use classes orders.
- Reference to 'Jobs created' should be deleted.
- No evidence to suggest 250 dwellings is appropriate at Bicester 12 or alternative sites have been considered. The SA does not consider the implications of this increase in housing number.
- Reduce the number of dwellings at Bicester 12 from 400 dwellings to 325 dwellings and allocating 75 dwellings to Skimmingdish Lane.
- The paragraph should also include the possible route at North West Bicester.
- Explanation needed for the 3 identified routes in the Bicester Movement Study.

Related objections to the Proposed Relief Road (Route 3) at South East Bicester

- Wendlebury should be referenced on relevant maps.
- Consider removing the proposed strategic relief roads at south east and east of Bicester.
- Routes have only been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown no thought to inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Route 3 cannot be carried forward for the following reasons:

- It sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester;
- The route directly impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone;
- The route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester and is longer than necessary;
- It is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument;
- It will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury and cause a decline in the air quality;
- Flooding is a major and continuous issue for Wendlebury;
- There will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid Junction 9;
- Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road and;
- Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created;

Banbury

Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside

- Concerns that the site is cannot be relied on due to the multiple ownerships. There are over 40 separate freehold ownerships and many more leasehold interests. The only way to redevelop the site is by complex compulsory purchase.
- There are viability concerns.
- No reference made on how to relocate existing businesses, secure of donor sites and timescales.
- The reduction in the number of dwellings expected to be delivered at Canalside (1,050 to 950) will still fail to deliver the requisite amount of completions during the plan period.
- Change Canalside to a housing reserve area and remove the site from the housing trajectory.
- The requirement of affordable housing is inflexible and is likely to hinder residential development coming forward in the Canalside area.
- The CEMEX site should be included as part of the Banbury 1 site.
- The existing employment B uses should be kept as the site is in a very sustainable location where people could walk, cycle or use the public transport.

Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)

- Object to Banbury 2: East and West of Southam Road being allocated.
- No evidence to demonstrate that Banbury 2 is more sustainable than other sites such as Drayton, Warwick Road site.
- The eastern part of the site offers a poor living environment due to the close proximity to the M40 and employment.
- The defensible urban boundary will be lost which was carefully set in the 1996 adopted Local Plan and the Hanwell Fields Brief 1997 based on topographic considerations.
- East of Southam Road is defined by physical boundaries such as topography and any development will have an impact on landscape.
- The sites are physically separated from Hanwell Fields and by providing a school on site will lead to safety issues.
- Farmland will be lost and the expected housing numbers may not be delivered.
- The Policy needs to safeguard the setting of the Crematorium which is a sub-regional facility.
- Supports the allocation of Banbury 2 for residential development.
- Object to reduction in site capacity from 800 to 600 dwellings.
- Contributions to on-site community facilities and contributions to the community hall at Hanwell Fields is excessive and unreasonable.

Policy Banbury 3: West of Bretch Hill

- Supports the deletion of the minimum density requirement and the reference to Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix.
- Reference on extra care housing could be removed as it is set out later in the policy.

- The proposed deletion of "Employment" is incorrect which will need reinstating.
- The inclusion of Thames Valley on-site Police drop in facility is questioned.
- Improvement should be made to existing surgeries rather than provision of a new surgery.
- There is no consideration of the additional traffic that will be generated by the new development West of Bretch Hill both the Bretch Hill and the Warwick Road/Stratford Road Junction.
- Development will impact the rural nature of the Sor Brook Valley, Drayton and North Newington Conservation Area, listed buildings including the Drayton Arch, light and sound pollution.
- Development will make North Newington feel like a satellite of Banbury, changing the character of the village.

Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2

- Support the removal of the amount of land that will be developed for employment.
- Concerned about Bankside Phase 2 due to coalescence to Adderbury.

Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields

- Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. No evidence to demonstrate that Banbury 5 is more sustainable than other sites such as Drayton, Warwick Road site.
- The eastern part of the site offers a poor living environment due to the close proximity to the M40 and employment.
- The defensible urban boundary will be lost which was carefully set in the 1996 adopted Local Plan and the Hanwell Fields Brief 1997 based on topographic considerations.
- Development will erode the strategic physical gap of open countryside between the urban area and Hanwell village.
- Impacts on the landscape and light pollution.
- The sites are physically separated from Hanwell Fields.
- Farmland will be lost.
- No explanation for the increased in housing numbers.
- The landscape assessment and conclusion are also supported.
- Policy BSC 4 is too prescriptive.
- The policy needs greater flexibility.
- Mechanisms for delivery of community self-build extra care housing is questioned.
- A strategic education solution is needed. i.e. locations of schools and requirements for financial contributions
- Green Buffer policy should recognise differences between the two parts of the site.
- Reference should be made to the topography as at the higher parts of the allocations the impact on Hanwell will be more significant than at the lower sections.
- Further detail required in relation to any specific heritage assets.

Strategic Development Banbury 6 - Employment Land West of M40

- Support the proposed allocation.
- Should include reference to Filling Factory Scheduled Monument on the east side of the M40 and the associated archaeological remains of the filling factory on the west side of the motorway.

Policy Banbury 7: Strengthening Banbury Town Centre

- The paragraph needs redrafting to confirm the expansion of the town centre boundary as a commitment and not merely a proposal to 'explore' potential changes in associated DPDs.

Policy Banbury 8: Land at Bolton Road

- No reference has been made on an anchor foodstore at Bolton Road.
- Land at Bolton Road is not suitable to accommodate a supermarket. Such a use could be accommodated on the Kraft Employment Opportunity site.
- Clarification needed on definition of small scale A1.
- Object to the removal of the emphasis of the scheme being a retail led mixed use proposal with emphasis on anchor food store.
- Welcome the reference of the bingo hall however do not support the loss of Gala's existing unit on Bolton Road leasehold does not expire until 2023.
- The possible larger units on the Castle Street frontage is accepted however they should present a welcoming and attractive streetscape and an active frontage.
- The Local Plan should set the development policy requirements and not rely on a SPD.

Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area

- Policy should reference the potential foodstore provision on the Spiceball Development Area.
- The Local Plan should set the development policy requirements and not rely on a SPD.

Policy Banbury 12: Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC

- Sport England will need to be involved in relocation of the football club.
- Alternative sites were proposed however there was no argument presented as to why these sites are not suitable. e.g. environmental issues such as traffic and pollution.
- The Plan should consider relocating the Banbury United FC to BAN14 which is currently being proposed as a Country Park.

Kidlington

Kidlington Masterplan

- Clarify throughout the Plan the role of the Kidlington Framework Masterplan.
- The Kidlington Masterplan should be the opportunity for resetting a new Kidlington housing target based on a new review of local needs.
- It is not reasonable to suggest that needs originating in Kidlington should be met in Bicester or further afield.

- There is likely to be a need for more housing and the policies for the villages and rural areas should be more flexible in this respect.
- Clarification needed that open space and recreational use of land would be supported in suitable locations in the Green Belt areas adjacent to the built up centre.

Kidlington Housing Target

- The allocation of 50 dwellings at Kidlington is inadequate and is already exceeded by an existing sheltered accommodation proposal for 54 units within the village.

Policy Kidlington 1: Accommodating High Value Employment Needs

- Supports the small scale local review of the Green Belt at Kidlington and Begbroke Science Park. Employment growth potential offered by the airport, technology and science park should be maximised.
- Objecting to the identified small scale local review of the Green Belt boundary in the Kidlington and Begbroke area. Expansion of the Science Park will further diminish this space which is locally valued as a recreational and visual amenity as well as for traditional uses.
- Investment in high-tech industries at Langford Lane is supported.
- The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review and reflected in Policy Kidlington 1.
- The term "Framework" needs clarification in terms of adding statutory weight to planning applications and policy.
- New employment should not put pressure on housing.
- The exact boundary of the review is needed.
- Confirmation need that area of search defined in Plans is indicative.
- Langford Lane employment area and Oxford Airport should be encouraged to accommodate higher value employment uses
- Reference to Begbroke Science Park should be deleted.
- Supporting text should set the context and scope for airport expansion such that it is not unlimited. Uncontrolled expansion of the airport is undesirable.

Related Omission site to Policy Kidlington 1.

- The land owned by Blenheim Palace Estate which is located between Langford Lane and Begbroke Science Park.
- Merton College land, Begbroke
- Land to the rear of the A44 at Begbroke

Related objections to omission site at Land at Webbs Way, Kidlington

- Residents near Webbs Way have raised concerns regarding land rear of the properties at Webbs Way. The land is within the Green Belt.

Villages

Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation

- Greater flexibility is needed for Policy Villages 1.

- Villages in Category 'C' will be left to stagnate or decline as Village Policy 1 only provides for conversions.
- The categorisation of villages does not take into account thresholds and capacity constraints to services.
- The Plan needs to clearly set out a criteria for villages in terms of size, shape, facilities and character.
- Clarification is needed on the criteria informing the judgement on sustainability.
- A robust study is needed to assess the sustainability of villages.
- The infilling or minor development should be in line with the Neighbourhood Development Plan of a village.
- The housing density could be agreed through the NDP and DPD.
- The number of schools in Cherwell is not declining.
- The categorisation of villages based on sustainability considerations indicates that the development provided in these settlements will in turn support their service function.
- The provision of specialist accommodation for the elderly should be specified by a quantum or target to meet the growing needs of the elderly.
- Bloxham should be in higher category as it is one of the Districts most sustainable villages.
- Adderbury should not be in the group identified as there is a lack of services provided in the village.
- Hook Norton should be removed from the first group as planning permission has already been given for 40 dwellings therefore meeting the village's requirement.
- Deddington has absorbed many new houses in the past and suggest that allocations should be distributed evenly across the Plan period. Traffic issues, no jobs.
- Hook Norton, Bloxham and Chesterton should receive a high proportion of growth in order to take account of the sustainability of the settlements and opportunities at Bourne Lane, north of Milton Road and land to the north of Green Lane.
- Milcombe is a sustainable location with a good level of services and facilities and could accommodate a large share of the overall housing target.
- Adderbury has not received any significant growth in recent years.
- Charlton-on-Otmoor should be classified on its merits.
- Merton Parish Council would like to produce a Neighbourhood Plan.
- Deddington as a Category A village is supported.

Neighbourhood Planning

- The Plan should acknowledge the rights of all communities to develop and adopt their own policy through Neighbourhood Plans, subject to it being 'in general conformity with the Development Plan', whether in urban or rural neighbourhoods.

Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas

- The Plan should allocate more homes to rural areas to allow flexibility and not over relying on delivery rates at Banbury and Bicester.
- Concern at the lack of delivery from sites of 10 or more dwellings in rural areas from 2018/19.
- There is no provision for the objective assessment of 'local' housing need in the rural areas (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) over the remainder of the Plan period.
- It would be more appropriate to incorporate small sites and 'windfalls' and set a target for sites of 'up to 10 homes'.
- 'Local' housing need is not defined nor are any criteria specified.
- Consider including a maximum of 20 dwellings for sites in villages.
- The provision for increased infrastructure such as schools has not been adequately covered.
- A revised village grouping reflecting current planning permissions is more realistic.
- Infilling and conversions in Adderbury will be more suitable.
- A clear rationale needs to be set out for housing distribution to the villages. Consider reinstating paragraphs C.236 and C.237.
- CRAITLUS does not provide a logical methodology of how the various factors determine the appropriate categorisation of villages.
- It is unclear whether the allocation relates to the anticipated requirements of people who live and, if in employment, work in the locality, or whether it also includes workers who choose to sleep in a particular village but who commute to a place of work some distance away.
- An up to date housing needs assessment needed.
- The Plan should include a requirement for any planning proposal to be accompanied by a current housing needs assessment for the relevant village.
- The proposed rural allocations policy should be revised to take account of the proposed Rural Categorisation policy and its associated evidence base to ensure development is guided to the most sustainable villages.
- Housing allocation should be distributed equally across the villages within the group.
- The housing need of individual villages is unknown therefore there is no certainty over the groupings of villages and the distribution of growth.
- Object to the windfall allowance in rural areas as there is no compelling evidence for the figure of 980 dwellings which conflicts with the 2012 SHLAA.
- Concern that there is no limit on the size of the developments that can be built in the villages.
- Do not agree with the number of new homes allocated in the villages as they appear to be too low.
- Insufficient development proposed within settlements to support existing and new service provision.
- The categories in Policy Villages 1 and the groups in Policy Villages 2 do not translate.
- A call for sites is needed as the Council does not have an up to date assessment of all potential sites.
- The changes to the village groupings and distribution needs an explanation.

- There is no reference to specific issues and challenges faced in respect of the housing requirements of an ageing population within the villages.
- The provision of specialist accommodation for the elderly should be specified by a quantum or target to meet the growing needs of the elderly.
- The Plan should make some statements about consulting with Parish Councils that do not have a Neighbourhood Plan, or delaying applications where a Plan is in development.
- The final added sentence is ambiguous because it is not clear whether it applies to the whole of the Green Belt boundary within the district or just the two villages mentioned (Bletchington and Weston on the Green).
- Villages such as Deddington should be limited to a maximum size of 30-35 houses.
- More weight should be given to the need to preserve agricultural land for farming.

Policy Villages 3: Rural Exception Sites

- There is no justification for applying the upper limit and a clarification is needed.

Policy Villages 5: Upper Heyford

- Plan should identify the opportunity for Upper Heyford to accommodate further windfall and significant growth.

D: The Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- The Infrastructure Delivery Plan must include provision for a northern ring road to serve the NW Bicester development, the Garden Quarter.
- The Plan does not consider the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans".
- The Plan should recognise that developer contributions, including Community Infrastructure Levy.
- It would be inappropriate for levies on development in Banbury to fund the Bicester SE Relief Road.
- South East relief road should not be specifically mentioned as no decision has been made and there are 3 possible routes.
- The proposed wording fails to recognise that planning obligations can only be applied if it meets the three statutory tests set out in the CIL Regulation 122.
- The Plan should be mindful of the implications of viability both from specific policy requirements and the cumulative impact of all financial burdens placed on development to ensure that it does not adversely affect the ability to bring development forward viably.
- The Local Plan should ensure that planning obligations are properly referenced and in conformity with CIL Regulations and NPPF.
- Objects to the deletion of all references to the Banbury South to East Link Road.
- The Plan needs confirmation that a proportion of CIL money will be passed to Parish Councils.

E: Monitoring Delivery of the Local Plan

- 5-year housing land supply should be linked to the early release of sites.

E2: Proposed Housing Trajectory

- Support the Plan period extension up to 2031.
- Consider revising the Housing Trajectory to show the rural allocations being distributed evenly throughout the Plan period.
- The housing delivery between 2015 and 2019 seems unrealistic when over 1,200 units will be built per year. The average annual completions over the last 15 years is 577 and only once has the 1,000 dwelling mark been met in 2005/06.
- Concerned over the delivery rates at Bicester as over optimistic. The annual completion rates at Bicester since 1996 has not reached the expected numbers in the Housing Trajectory. The Plan should consider wider opportunities for growth.
- Support the accelerated trajectory for Land West of Bretch Hill.

Appendix 3: Evidence Base

- Support the updating of the evidence base.
- Concerns regarding the SHMA and SHLAA and lack of consultation on these documents.
- There is no evidence to show that the Council has considered the impact on flooding from developments.

Appendix 5: Maps

- The Bicester Green Buffer boundary should be extended beyond the two railway lines to extend the buffer around Launton.
- No evidence to support central green space within Bicester 12. The Map should be amended to include the green space designation around the scheduled ancient monument only.
- The site area of Bicester 12 could be increased to reflect full landownership and indicative masterplan.
- The proposed Green Buffer sites within the current MOD land ownership boundary, reducing developable land and should be redrawn.
- The Prodrive Site has been drafted as an "existing employment site" but the Plan ignores the planning permission that has been granted on this site for retail development.
- Site 12 within the Key should be labelled "Proposed Banbury United FC relocation".
- Amend the Key to read Indicative Location of Limited Green Belt Review.
- Worton Farms Ltd, Kidlington is incorrectly shown as existing green space.
- May's Builders Yard on the Moors, Kidlington is incorrectly shown as existing green space.
- Proposals Map for Kidlington should be amended to include a broader area of search to be reviewed in the Langford Lane area.
- Land off Webbs Way (Kidlington) should remain land designation as Green Belt.
- The extent of the site, Land at Holm Square is incorrectly drawn on the proposals map and should be changed to reflect S106 agreement.

New Policies / issues

- Equestrian uses linked with public rights of way / tourism – Detailed criteria supplied.
- No reference made on the potential use of empty buildings or reference to the scale of the problem.
- There is no reference on garden land developments. There should be a clear endorsement of the need to prevent the loss of gardens.
- Future Burial need.
- A specific strategic policy should be included to address the impact of development on crime, referencing Secured by Design accreditation.
- Larger, well designed play areas to accommodate for all ages.
- New criteria based policy relating to the sustainability of villages.
- New policy that provides an alternative way to bring forward new housing development as an exception to the countryside and settlement boundary policies and to encourage residential development to come forward through neighbourhood plans.

Omission sites include:

- Wykham Park Farm, Banbury - Mixed use strategic allocation
- Land south of Milton Road, Adderbury
- Land off Webbs Way, Kidlington
- Land adjacent to Oak Farm
- Land to the South of Bodicote (land within a Green Buffer)
- Land to the South of Banbury – circa 100 dwellings
- Thames water Land – Grimsbury Reservoir, Banbury.
- Land west of Water Eaton Lane, Gosford
- Land West of Warwick Road - circa 300 dwellings.
- Land to the South of Skimmerdish Lane - circa 60 dwellings
- Land at Gavray Drive - circa 500 dwellings
- Land rear of A44 at Begbroke
- Merton College land, Begbroke
- Land between Langford Lane and Begbroke Science Park, Begbroke
- Land south of Broughton Road
- South West of Bicester (Positioned between the A41 and the Wendlebury Road) – employment / hotel / leisure use (land within a Green Buffer)

Specific Consultees

English Heritage

English Heritage generally supported a number of the proposed wording change however would like to see additional changes to strengthen the wording or add clarification in some areas.

An additional key site-specific design and place shaping principle was requested for Policy Banbury 6 in respect of Banbury No 9 Filling Factory Schedule Monument on the east side of the M40 and the associated archaeological remains of the filling factory on the west side of the motorway.

Environment Agency

The Environment Agency note that although they previously found the plan unsound in their correspondence dated 10 October 2012, the comments provided were in the main, advisory points which have been considered and revised according to the LPA requirements. As such the Environment Agency now find the Cherwell Local Plan sound. Supports the proposed wording changes at Policies Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-town, Bicester 4: Bicester Business Park and Bicester 10: Bicester Gateway, Banbury 1: Canalside, Banbury 2 Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West) and Banbury 9: Spiceball with only minor clarifications.

Highways Agency

The Plan must consider impacts on Junctions 9, 10 and 11 of the M40 and the A34 with the A43. The Secretary of State for Transport is particularly concerned about the significance and the severity of the impact on its roads relating to traffic arising from new development. The Highways Agency is concerned that Cherwell District Council when producing a new plan should supply a credible and realistic transport evidence base to underpin its policies and accompanying land-use allocations. Where the potential impact of new proposals would be significant the Secretary of State for Transport needs to be shown that this impact can be mitigated to safeguard congestion and safety on the national network.

Natural England

Natural England have reviewed the Proposed changes to the Cherwell Local Plan in the context of earlier responses (10 October 2012) focusing solely on matters we raised previously which we regarded made the plan unsound. Recommend that Policy ESD 10: Protecting and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment repeats the substance of NPPF paragraph 118 rather than references. Support changes to Policy ESD13. Natural England notes that there is no reference to light pollution other than in the context of the Hanwell Community Observatory. As such, it is unclear how the Plan is consistent with the NPPF and is unsound. Strategic Development Sites - Reference on species surveys is not sufficient. More evidence needed on the site allocations.

District, Town and Parish Councils

Aylesbury Vale District Council

Discussions with Buckinghamshire County Council, Aylesbury Vale District Council, Oxfordshire County Council and Cherwell District Council are needed to discuss the proposed transport improvements at Bicester. Concerned over the capacity along the A41.

Banbury Town Council

Concerned with the proposed wording change in Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside. More reference to the Banbury South to East Link Road is needed.

Bicester Town Council

A number of concerns raised: the deficiency in recreational open space remains unaddressed due to the accelerating need for recreational open space and green space

through the Plan period; The Plan does not address the future burial needs or make reference to provision; Insufficient land allocated for employment use in Bicester; The Plan does not consider the implications of garden land developments or in small green spaces.

Kidlington Parish Council

Kidlington Parish Council does not agree with the housing numbers in the Plan therefore not supporting the allocation of 50 homes in the village. The Parish Council felt that the village could accommodate further homes and would like the Kidlington Framework Masterplan to reassess the local needs of the village. The Parish Council would also like housing to be considered as part of the small scale local review of the Green Belt, but also for the affordable housing threshold to be reduced from 10 to 3.

Oxford City Council

Oxford City Council generally supported a number of the proposed wording change however would like to see additional changes to strengthen the wording or add clarification in some areas. Concerned over the significant emphasis given to the knowledge economy at Bicester as this will have an impact on Oxford's economy therefore a meeting was suggested by Oxford City Council.

Oxfordshire County Council

The County Council have suggested a number of minor changes to the wording used in the Plan which helps with clarification. No specific reference should be made on the proposed relief road at South East Bicester. This should be replaced with "transport improvements at Banbury and Bicester". Community and social issues should be addressed across the whole of Banbury and not the identified wards.

Parish Councils

A number of Parish Council have made comments on the Local Plan¹.

Housing: The rate of housing delivery from the South East Plan was used in the Plan which is likely to lead to an overestimate of the need is questioned. The estimated housing delivery at northwest Bicester is also questioned. No reference on garden land developments

Transport: Reference on the southeast Bicester relief road is questioned. It was felt that consultation is needed as it is an important local issue and the likely impacts on Wendlebury village. The relief road is only an option and there has been no decision made yet therefore the Plan should make this clearer. Reference on the proposed park and ride at Bicester is needed. There were concerns over traffic caused by future developments. There was limited information on Community Infrastructure Levy therefore more information on this would be welcomed.

Villages: Categorisation of villages is questioned and clarification is needed when assessing sustainability of villages. It was suggested that the categorisation of villages should take account of current planning permissions. Development in villages should be more flexible and not limited to conversions only.

Sites: Bankside Phase 2 is objected as it is seen as coalescence of Adderbury and Banbury. Objections were also raised on Banbury 2 and Banbury 5. The Plan needs to make it clearer that the relocation of Banbury United FC has not been decided.

¹ Adderbury Parish Council, Bloxham Parish Council, Bodicote Parish Council, Chesterton Parish Council, Deddington Parish Council, Drayton Parish Council, Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council, Hanwell Parish Council, Launton Parish Council, Merton Parish Council, Middleton Stoney Parish Council and Wendlebury Parish Council.

Green Buffers: Generally the proposed Green Buffers were supported with the exception of Launton. Whilst other Green Buffers have increased, the Launton Green Buffer is the only one that has seen a reduction therefore Launton Parish Council would like the Green Buffer to be expended beyond either sides of the railway lines.

South Oxfordshire District Council

Reference to the forthcoming joint Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment update is needed in the Plan.

Vale of White Horse District Council

Reference to the forthcoming joint Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment update is needed in the Plan.

Action Groups / Protest Letters

Hanwell Fields Development Action Group, Hanwell

- The Council has continued to use the housing requirements set in the South East Plan which equates to 670 houses/year (or 240 houses/year in Banbury). It is incorrect to rely on this as the demand has significantly decreased. For example, planning permission was previously given at Bankside1 but it has not yet been implemented.
- No evidence given on build numbers for numerous sites in Banbury.
- No consultation was held with local communities on the proposed allocations.
- Disagree with the housing numbers.
- A number of changes suggested throughout the Plan.

South East Relief Road, Wendlebury – Approximately 70 representations

- A number of proposed relief roads have been identified in the Bicester Movement Study which was commissioned by Oxfordshire County Council.
- One of the options was Route 3 which is a relief road at South East Bicester.
- Residents of Wendlebury are opposing Route 3 with a number of reasons which includes impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone, Ancient Monument, noise and air pollution, increased traffic in Wendlebury and increased risk of flooding.
- Residents would like the Council to reconsider Route 1B where the impact will be reduced.
- A standard representation was put together which residents all used therefore resulting in a larger number of representations.

Green Buffer, Launton – Approximately 70 representations

- The Green Buffer boundary has been reduced since the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Aug 2012) whilst other villages have seen an increase to the boundary. The current proposed Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose to avoid development inappropriate locations and coalescence with neighbouring settlements.
- Coalescence of Launton and Bicester remains a concern.
- Local residents and Launton Parish Council would like the Green Buffer boundary returned to its original scale (PSLP 2012) or even extended. i.e. across the railways lines to the north and to the south.

- A standard representation was put together which residents all used therefore resulting in a larger number of representations.

Land at Webbs Way, Kidlington – Approximately 10 representations

- Residents near Webbs Way have raised concerns regarding land rear of the properties at Webbs Way. The land is within the Green Belt.
- Concern that land is in the flood plain.
- A representation made on behalf of Pye homes was received as part of the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Aug 2012) which had made reference to land at Webbs Way and suggested that the site could be removed from the Green Belt making it available for development.
- Representations received as part of the latest consultation were made in reference to the Pye Homes representation (Aug 2012).
- A standard representation was put together which residents all used therefore resulting in a number of representations.

Village housing maximum, Deddington - Approximately 15 representations

- Residents from villages are concerned that large inappropriate developments will take place which will impact the characteristic of the villages.
- Policy Villages 2 does not set a maximum figure for a development size therefore it has been suggested that a number should be identified to prevent over sized developments in villages.
- The Housing Trajectory indicates that there will not be any new developments (10 or more dwellings) in rural areas from 2018. This doesn't seem to be very realistic.
- Clarification needed for the categorisation of villages.
- Housing allocation in the rural areas should be increased.

Section 3: Proposed Plan Changes

All representations have been considered and, where comments have been agreed with, consequential minor amendments to the Plan have been made. Other changes to the Plan are not the result of specific representations but have been made in the interests of accuracy and clarity. Some issues have been addressed through further work on the Council's evidence base rather than by changes to the Local Plan itself.

Final changes are being tested through the Sustainability Appraisal and Habitats Regulations Assessment processes. The changes will be 'tracked' in a final plan text and identified in a table of further changes. Following Submission of the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, there will be a public Examination. This will provide an opportunity for remaining substantive concerns about the 'soundness' of the Plan to be tested and debated.

This section explains how the main issues have been addressed in making further proposed changes to the Local Plan. It does not seek to respond to individual representations in full. The summary of representations is set out in appendix 5 – D.

HOW THE MAIN ISSUES HAVE BEEN ADDRESSED

Introduction

- Further changes to references to the South East Plan and the importance of the NPPF
- Explanation of the appropriateness of the housing growth proposed
- Additional references to the role of Kidlington and reference to the preparation of a Kidlington Framework Masterplan.

Duty to Cooperate

- Explanation of Duty to Cooperate and the cooperation that has occurred with other authorities and stakeholders in preparing the Plan. Explanation of how this has helped shape the Plan. Cross reference to the compliance statement being prepared.
- Meetings held with Oxford City Council and Aylesbury District Council to discuss representations. Clarity in the Plan that it does not specifically propose a relief road and that the County Council is considering future options for its Local Transport Plan.
- Reference in the Plan to preparation of a new County wide SHMA and the cooperation agreement between the District Councils.

Strategy for Development in Cherwell

- Policy PSD1: Presumption in favour of sustainable development revised - The policy is consistent with the NPPF.

Theme One – Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy

- Change para B.33 to clarify the location of any small scale employment growth at Kidlington.
- Change para B.41 to clarify the sites identified in the Employment Trajectory cover 155 hectares.
- Change para B.44 to clarify that the new allocated employment sites in Banbury and Bicester along with existing employment sites are considered to ensure a sufficient employment land supply.
- Policy SLE1 allows for a mix of employment uses to be provided.
- The Local Plan encourages the use and protection of existing employment sites.
- The District Council has met with the City Council and the aims of the two Council's regarding employment development are not incompatible.
- Rephrase Policy SLE1 as a consequence of changes to Regulations.
- Re-locate the criteria of Policy SLE1 to form text under the Policy requirements.
- The Plan allows for development in the rural areas.
- Rephrase para B.53 to clarify that development will be focused in the town centres following the sequential approach relating to the location of town centre uses.
- Add a sentence to para B.54 to clarify that the Council will support the evening economy in appropriate locations.
- Change Policy SLE2 to cross refer to other policies to ensure that applications will be considered in accordance with location specific policies.
- Policy SLE2 follows the requirements of the NPPF.
- Change para B.69 to further clarify that there are a number of Options for highway improvements at Bicester.
- Change para B.69 to clarify that there will also be improvements to the Windsor Street/Upper Cherwell Street Corridor.
- Re-phrase the final sentence of para B.69 to set out that the environmental impact of the proposals including the impact on the purposes of the green buffer policy will need to be taken into account.
- Update paragraph B.71 to set out the aims of County Council Oxfordshire Transport Plan 2011 to 2030.
- Change paragraph B.72 to explain that the Movement Strategies will inform the Banbury and Bicester Masterplans.
- Clarify in Policy SLE4 that transport Improvements at Banbury and Bicester will be in accordance with the County Council's Local Transport Plan and Movement Studies.
- Delete reference to a South East Link road as there are other options
- Change Policy SLE4 to delete reference to Evergreen 3 as this is covered by the 'East-West rail' reference and other references.
- Add reference to the improvements to M40 junctions to Policy SLE4 to show these are key proposals.
- Reference to a Banbury Inner Relief Road was removed from the Plan but land has been identified if this is required in the future (see Banbury 6).
- The Plan has been produced in conjunction with the Highway Authority and further consultation will take place with the Highways Agency before submission.

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font color: Auto

Formatted: Font: Bold

Theme Two – Policies for Building Sustainable Communities

- Added explanation on the general consistency between former South East Plan requirements, 2008 and 2011 household projections and the appropriateness of the proposed level of housing growth
- Added reference to the new Countywide SHMA which will consider latest demographic information. Reference to the cooperation agreement between the District Councils to consider the results of the SHMA.
- Proposed distribution strategy is considered to be appropriate in light of the growth needs of Bicester, the role of Banbury and to ensure a sustainable approach to development in rural areas, particularly in the context of recent high levels of development. No change.
- The District's 5 year land supply position has improved significantly and there is contingency in the North West Bicester Eco-Town. No change.
- Highway requirements at Bicester seeks to address the needs of the County Council as Highway Authority – no change
- Further updating to more consistently reflect South East Plan revocation
- Windfall allowance is evidence based (SHLAA) and realistic – no change
- In addition to a rural housing allocation the Plan seeks to encourage rural exception sites, allowing for a potential market element where required for viability reasons. No overall change but some additional references to the potential of rural exception sites added. Change to the plan to also demonstrate commitment to supporting Parish Councils on Neighbourhood Plans
- Policy BSC2 considered to be appropriate and justifiable. No overall change but reference added to lower density development where there are justifiable planning reasons. The % of homes on previously developed land is broadly in line with the housing trajectory. No change
- Policy BSC3 considered to be viable based on two viability reports and record of delivery. The policy also provides sufficient flexibility. There is a need to strike a balance at Kidlington between the delivery of affordable housing and the need to optimise the potential for housing more generally in the context of Green Belt constraints. No overall change. A plan-wide viability assessment is also being prepared
- The Policy BSC4 seeks to balance housing needs with market demand and delivery. No overall change to this approach. Clarification on the Council's definition of a strategic housing site (400 homes) added. Extra care element of the policy has been informed by both housing needs and viability considerations. Some additional flexibility now added for other forms of housing for older people in circumstances where extra care housing would not be desirable. Reference to other specialist housing needs also added.
- BSC7 – Education. The Plan makes provision to meet the Education Authority's requirements. The final IDP will be able to reflect on further work by the County Council on its education strategies.
- References to the possible need for viability assessments added to Policies BSC10 and BSC11. Policy requirements are based on latest available evidence and will be updated in subsequent DPDs if required.

Theme Three – Ensuring Sustainable Development

- Further work has been carried out on viability of the policies in the Plan
- Policies ESD1- ESD5: The particular circumstances of the district as set out in the Local Plan evidence base is considered to justify the requirements sought in Policies ESD1-5

- Whilst the government has recently published proposals concerning housing standards and the use of allowable solutions in achieving zero-carbon homes the proposals are at the consultation stage only and will take some time to implement. Some changes have been made to increase the flexibility of the policies (set out below) and the lower text indicates that regular review will be required.
- The requirement for an energy statement to be submitted was a recommendation of the Sustainable Construction and Renewable Energy Study and enables the applicant to demonstrate how the requirements of the sustainable construction/renewable energy policies have been addressed. The thresholds are consistent with the Council's definition of strategic sites
- No minimum size requirement is specified for non-residential development below which BREEAM is not required, as available evidence indicates the additional costs involved are minimal and setting a threshold could limit the number of developments seeking to achieve the standard.
- Re-word the second paragraph of Policy ESD1 for clarification
- At Para B.185 add that it will not always be cost effective or technically feasible to meet the zero carbon standard through on site measures and the government is therefore proposing that the zero carbon standard could be achieved by mitigating the remaining emissions off-site through the use of allowable solutions.
- Policy ESD3: Sustainable Construction: Insert new paragraph at the end of Policy ESD3 regarding the production of a viability assessment.
- Include a definition of embodied energy in buildings in the Glossary.
- Policy ESD4: Decentralised Energy Systems: The Council's Renewable Energy and Sustainable Construction Study indicated that District Heating and Combined Heat and Power were particularly important in delivering renewable and low carbon energy in the district, with the inclusion of a policy being a specific recommendation of the study. No change required.
- At Policy ESD4 add that an alternative solution to a decentralised system could be provided.
- Policy ESD5: Renewable Energy: At Paragraph B.195 - Reference to new "Planning practice guidance for renewable and low carbon energy: July 2013."
- The final paragraph of ESD5 should read 'Where feasibility assessments demonstrate that on site renewable energy provision is deliverable and viable, this will be required as part of the development unless an alternative solution would deliver the same or increased benefit. This may include consideration of 'allowable solutions' as Government Policy evolves.
- Policies ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management and ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems: The Plan and accompanying Strategic flood Risk Assessments contain advice and guidance on flood risk assessments and use of SUDS. No further change considered necessary to ESD 6 and ESD 7.
- Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment: The Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessments incorporate ecological assessments for each of the strategic sites. In addition site promoters have undertaken ecological surveys
- Policy ESD 12: Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty: At Para B.224 add reference to Addendum to the HRA
- Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment, re-word reference to conserve and enhance biodiversity to reflect paragraph 118 of the NPPF
- At Paragraph B.244 update reference to new Cotswold AONB Management Plan.
- Policy ESD 13: Local Landscape Protection and enhancement: Paragraph B.249 has been amended to reflect the findings of the landscape evidence base documents. This paragraph lists key landform and landscape features of value around Banbury and Bicester, but not the district as a whole.

- At Para ESD13 Add “and be accompanied by a landscape assessment where appropriate” to the end of the last paragraph of the Policy. This will provide recognition to the fact that some landscapes will be more sensitive to development than others.
- Policy ESD 14: The Oxford Green Belt: Green Belt boundaries should only be reviewed in exceptional circumstances. The Council's housing requirements and development strategy can be achieved without the need for strategic review of the Green Belt.
- The Council does not consider that exceptional circumstances exist at the present time to justify a small scale local review to meet local housing needs. Kidlington's housing needs are being examined in more detail as part of the Kidlington Masterplan Framework. Policies allow for small scale affordable housing schemes in Green Belt villages.
- It is considered appropriate for the Local Plan to indicate the need for small scale local Green Belt review to meet employment need, but the review of the boundary itself is a detailed matter more appropriately undertaken as part of the Development Management DPD.
- At para B.255 amend the reference to the legal challenge to the South East Plan
- Amend paragraph B.256 to highlight that housing needs in Kidlington will be examined in more detail in the Neighbourhood Plan and to include a cross reference to Begbroke Science Park .
- Policy 15: Green Boundaries to Growth: Policy ESD15 is not intended to establish “qual” Green belt areas; it is intended to complement Policy ESD13. Policy ESD 13 is a district wide policy whereas Policy ESD15 applies to development proposals adjacent to Banbury and Bicester and defines the areas of land which are particularly important to the identity and setting of the two towns and neighbouring villages, preventing coalescence and protecting the gaps between them.
- Representations concerning the landscape evidence base studies, including the inclusion of sites in the green buffers, have been re- examined by the Council's consultants and where considered justified amendments have been made. The consultants have identified the potential for small changes to be made to the Launton Green Buffer and the Bodicote Green Buffer (see below).
- At Paragraph B.260a & 261, insert clarification of application of Policy ESD15: Green Boundaries to Growth in respect of essential infrastructure and woodland planting.
- Policy ESD16: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment, add reference in paragraph B.264 to the use of Article 4 Directions to maintain the character of our historic villages and towns.
- Policy ESD16: add reference to light pollution, secured by design accreditation and use of design codes.
- The policy indicates that the impact of development proposals on designated and non designated assets will be assessed in accordance with advice in the NPPF including the significance of the asset as set out in the NPPF. No further change considered necessary in this regard.
- At Policy ESD 17: The Oxford Canal: add reference in paragraph B.274 to boater's facilities. Add reference in the policy to the biodiversity value of the canal corridor being protected.
- Policy ESD 18: Green Infrastructure: Insert reference to woodlands in the definition of green infrastructure in paragraph B.275.
- At paragraph B.278 add reference to the County Council responsibility for public rights of way and include reference to provision for horse riders

General

- Changes to the Plan to reference possible highway capacity improvements to peripheral routes. Added clarity that the Plan does not include a specific proposal for a relief road. The County Council is testing options and will pursue improvements through its Local Transport Plan. Reference added to the need to consider the impacts on nearby villages.
- Strategic site identification considered to be appropriate in meeting the needs of the town, delivering on eco-objectives, delivering employment land to reduce reliance on out-commuting and to diversify the economic base of the town, making effective use of previously developed land, building sustainable communities and protecting the identity of nearby settlements. Non-strategic development sites will be considered through the Local Neighbourhoods DPD
- The identification of the Green Buffers is based on landscape evidence. Upon reviewing the representations, only a potential small change to the north of Launton village is being identified by the consultants.

Sites

- Bicester 1: The housing trajectory builds in cautious expectations about the rate of delivery in view of the size and complexity of the eco-town project. It does not preclude earlier or accelerated delivery. No overall change
- Bicester 1: In addition to viability work being undertaken for the project, a Plan wide viability assessment is modelling a policy compliant Code 5 assumption. No change
- Bicester 1: Some changes to Policy detail made to address individual comments including cross reference to EA guidance on water cycle studies, further clarity on Code requirements, referencing to Building for Life and on green space standards.
- Bicester 2: Removed reference to the relief road as the County Council is testing options for its Local Transport Plan but retaining the potential for a road to be accommodated in the future if required.
- Change Bicester 3 to delete reference to improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the A41.
- Bicester 4: Added clarification on the flooding sequential test
- Bicester 5: Amendments to clarify the approach of this policy in the interest of protecting the existing town centre while providing the opportunity to review the town centre boundary. The policy makes clear that only A1 and A3 uses will be permitted at ground floor in the primary shopping frontage
- Bicester 7: Added reference to alternative name for Elm Farm Quarry
- Bicester 11: No overall change due to the site's sensitive location
- Bicester 12: No increase in housing numbers due to the constraints of the site. Corrected job numbers to reflect the current site boundary.
- Bicester 12: Added clarification that a safeguarding area is required for the Wretchwick Deserted Medieval Settlement.

Banbury

General

- Strategic site identification considered to be appropriate in meeting the needs of the town, delivering on regeneration / renewal objectives, protecting the historic

landscape setting of the market town, making effective use of previously developed land, improving the town centre, building sustainable communities and protecting the identity of nearby settlements. Non-strategic development sites will be considered through the Local Neighbourhoods DPD

- The identification of the Green Buffers is based on landscape evidence. Upon reviewing the representations, only a potential small change to the south of Bodicote is being identified by the consultants. Amend paragraph C.104 to more accurately reflect constraints to development

Sites

- Banbury 1 – site specific viability work and plan-wide viability work is being undertaken. The site is not expected to be delivered in the short-term but is fundamental to achieving regeneration and renewal. Completion of the SPD and the preparation of an Action Plan provide scope to provide for some flexibility in implementation / delivery. The 'Cemex' site is a remaining part of another completed regeneration site (former Cattle Market) and identified for development in the Non-Statutory Local Plan. It will be reviewed through the Local Neighbourhoods DPD. No specific need for a relief road has been identified but this will be considered further by the County Council in reviewing the LTP. No overall change.
- Banbury 2 – the lowering of the number of dwellings takes into account landscape evidence. Site requirements take into account the site's location and its relationship with development at Hanwell Fields as well as the requirements of service providers. No overall change but reference to a 'youth wing' removed as flexible use of the community hall is desirable.
- At Banbury 3 – minor changes reflecting comments made regarding the requirements for Thames Valley Police and the settings of historic assets. Correction to allow re-insertion of a requirement for some small scale enterprise space (should not have been removed). The reference to health requirements provides some flexibility. No objection from the County Council as Highways Authority.
- Banbury 4 – clarity that specific employment requirements are not identified other than by way of a local centre
- Banbury 5 – correction to housing numbers in supporting text
- Banbury 6 - added reference to the Banbury No 9 Filling Factory Scheduled monument on the east side of the M40
- Banbury 7 - Amendments to clarify the approach of this policy in the interest of protecting the existing town centre while providing for an extension onto the Spiceball site and a review of the town centre boundary in the northern area of the Canalside site. Now states that A1 will not be permitted in the Town Centre Commercial Area and that only A1 and A3 uses will be permitted at ground floor in the Primary Shopping Frontage.
- Banbury 8 – retention of a flexible approach to town centre uses on the site. A change from a supermarket to 'food retailing' in the supporting text to reflect this and previous changes in March 2013.
- Banbury 9 – deletion of 'small-scale' to reflect the opportunities of this larger site
- At Banbury 12: Land for the relocation of Banbury United FC - Inserted "Sport England will be consulted on the proposed relocation" The site is well located adjacent to the existing Rugby Club
- Banbury 14 - Insert reference to the Grade 2 listed lock and Lock Cottage in paragraph C.182 in response to representation from English Heritage

Kidlington

- The Local Plan's housing requirements and development strategy can be achieved without the need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in the district. At the current time it is neither considered that the 'exceptional circumstances' required by government policy exist to justify a small scale local review of the Green Belt to meet local housing needs.
- The housing numbers for Kidlington are not a ceiling on development within the built-up limits. Plan changes include references to assessing local needs at Kidlington through the on-going Kidlington Framework Masterplan and using this work to inform the Local Neighbourhoods DPD or a future Neighbourhood Plan. Non-strategic sites will be considered through the Local Neighbourhoods DPD.
- The plan changes reflect further Kidlington's economic role and the Council's approach allows for a limited Green Belt Review for employment uses in two areas based on an identified need. This is explained further in the Local Plan.
- A new paragraph is added concerning the needs of Begbroke Science Park
- At Policy Kidlington 1: Accommodating High Value Employment Needs, clarification is added on the two separate areas of search for London Oxford Airport / Langford Lane & Begbroke Science Park. Kidlington has potential to establish a 'high-tech' cluster but a careful Green Belt boundary review will be needed to protect the long term integrity of the Green Belt whilst meeting these employment opportunities
- The Plan does not prevent appropriate recreational use within the Green Belt
- The Plan does not allow for uncontrolled expansion of the airport but does recognise its growing role.

Villages

- The rural areas have recently experienced a comparatively high level of development. The Plan seeks to ensure a sustainable level of growth in the rural areas while retaining an emphasis on growth at Bicester to meet the town's needs.
- The Council's approach to categorisation and the distribution of growth within the rural areas is considered to be robust. Categorisation (Villages 1) is based on reviewing the sustainability of villages using a set of criteria, assessing the transport sustainability of the rural areas and by considering the relationships between villages (clustering). Housing distribution (Villages 2) also takes into account recent planning permissions and potential land availability.
- The Plan changes clarify that not all services and facilities are declining.
- The Plan changes include reference to the potential of Neighbourhood Planning which together with Rural Exception Site policy (Villages 3) provide further opportunities to meet local needs.
- Clarify of the role of Neighbourhood Planning. Neighbourhood planning and rural exception site policy will provide further opportunities
- Policy BSC 4 (Housing Mix) addresses the needs of older people
- The policy approach to Green Belt villages is clarified
- Reference is added to Policy Villages 4 to open space deficiencies being met where possible

- The Plan reflects the approved proposals for Former RAF Upper Heyford which have not yet been implemented. Bicester and Banbury are more sustainable locations for further growth.
- A limit on the size of sites in at villages would not be appropriate in a strategic plan
- The housing market needs to be able to function within a planning framework and cannot be restricted to meeting particular local needs
- The windfall allowance is evidence based (SHLAA)
- The Council's SHLAA identifies site opportunities
- Market housing on rural exception sites needs to be a subsidiary component in meeting local affordable housing needs
- The plan changes include a reference to the importance of food production in rural areas

The Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- In order to avoid pre-empting the outcome of the Movement Studies and the Local Transport Plan as requested by the County Council the Plan makes reference to the potential for highway improvements including those on peripheral roads.
- A Plan wide viability assessment is being undertaken
- Additional references to the possibility of Policy specific viability testing have been added
- Work on developer contributions/Cil will be undertaken separately from, but informed by the Local Plan.
- The IDP within the Plan has been reviewed pending completion of a fuller, separate IDP which is being prepared
- Amended Paragraph D.14 to reflect clarification of Local Transport Plan priorities requested by the County Council by inserting "promoting sustainable travel" into the first sentence of the paragraph.
- Table 13: Amended table to reflect latest position on delivery of park and ride, delete reference to Policy Bicester 3, and add cross reference to the securing Section 106 agreement.

Monitoring and Housing Trajectory

- A monitoring framework is to be prepared
- The 5 year supply is reviewed on a regular basis principally on the AMR process
- The Housing Trajectory seeks to provide a realistic estimate of the delivery of sites. It does not preclude early delivery.
- The projected high level of delivery in the medium term reflects the concurrent development of major sites and recent under delivery

Appendix 3: Evidence Base

- The Council has completed Level 1 and Level 2 SFRA's and these have informed the sustainability appraisal, policies in the Plan and the sequential test.
- A draft SHLAA was made available during the consultation period on proposed changes. This is now being finalised in the light of comments.
- Supplemental work to 2007 SHMA was published in December 2012. A new County SHMA has now been commissioned and the District Council's have a co-operation agreement to consider the results in due course.

Appendix 5: Maps

5.2 Policies Map: Bicester

- Green Buffers- Bicester: The identification of the Green Buffers is based on landscape evidence. Upon reviewing the representations, only a potential small change to the north of Launton village is being identified by the consultants
- Bicester 12: Remove the central green space designation to be consistent with the approach taken on other strategic sites and amend to show an Indicative Safeguarding Area for Wretchwick Medieval Settlement.
- The site boundary of Bicester 12 remains unchanged due to constraints in the area.
- Holm Square Bicester is shown as existing green space to reflect its use at the time the existing open space layers were updated in 2011. If the Section 106 is implemented resulting in essential community facilities being provided this will be reflected when the existing green space layers are updated. No change required.

5.3 Policies Map: Banbury

- The Prodrive site at Banbury was granted planning permission for retail development but the permission is not reflected on the policies map as it is the subject of a legal challenge.
- Amend the key to read "Proposed Banbury United Football Club relocation"

5.4 Policies Map: Kidlington

- Amend the Key to read Indicative Location of Limited Green Belt Review but retain the indicative boundary as this shows the approximate focus of the Green Belt boundary review to be undertaken as part of the Development Management DPD.
- The representation regarding Worton Farms Kidlington refers to an area of land currently used for allotments. The existing green space designation merely reflects the use of the site and is therefore correctly shown.
- The existing green space layer has been amended to exclude an area of land off the Moors Kidlington as it forms part of a builder's yard and was incorrectly shown.
- The land off Webbs Way Kidlington referred to in the representations is located in the Green Belt. No change required.

Bicester 5: Strengthening Bicester Town Centre

- Primary shopping frontage to be added to the Inset map for Bicester to reflect that shown in the Non Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011.

Banbury 7: Strengthening Banbury Town Centre

- Primary shopping frontage to be added to the Inset map for Banbury to reflect that shown in the Non Statutory Cherwell Local Plan 2011.

- Amend town centre boundary to show extended town centre shopping area and town centre commercial area, and town centre area of search boundary.

New Policies/Issues

- Equestrian use: The policy wording supplied relates to a policy in the West Berkshire Local Plan on the equestrian/racehorse industry; an area where the race horse industry is of particular importance to the economy. This is not a strategic issue in Cherwell district. Consideration can be given to the need for a criteria based policy on horses/equestrian use in the preparation of the Development Management DPD.
- The potential need for policies on the re-use of empty buildings and development of garden land and crime is more appropriate for consideration in the preparation of the Development Management DPD.
- The existing open space policy BSC 11 allows for larger combined areas of play for all ages where this is appropriate. An additional new policy is not therefore required.
- The Council's approach to categorisation and the distribution of growth within the rural areas is considered to be robust. Categorisation (Villages 1) is based on reviewing the sustainability of villages using a set of criteria, assessing the transport sustainability of the rural areas and by considering the relationships between villages (clustering). Housing distribution (Villages 2) also takes into account recent planning permissions and potential land availability. A criteria based policy relating to the sustainability of villages is therefore considered unnecessary.
- Policy Villages 3 allows for rural exception sites.

Section 4: Sustainability Appraisal – Update

The Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) Directive requires responses to consultation to be taken into account during the preparation of the plan or programme and before its adoption or submission to a legislative procedure. Consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal took place alongside the Local Plan between 28 March 2013 – 23 May 2013. The consultation was originally advertised as 28 March 2013 to 9 May 2013 before being extended.

CDC received specific responses to the SA from 11 individuals and organisations. .

Organisations responding

- Hanwell Fields Development Action Group
- Launton Parish Council
- Hives Planning on behalf of Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity
- Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited
- David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates Ltd
- Rapleys LLP on behalf of Pandora Ltd
- Boyer Planning on behalf of Wates Developments and Redrow Homes
- Drayton Parish Council

Individuals responding

- Mr D Sullivan
- Mrs J Burrett
- Mr G Baldwin

The main comments relate to the following issues:

Methodology

- Query the scoring method and items listed for the analysis for each site
- Not possible to benchmark proposed sites against approved sites

Evidence based used in the SA

- Study the 2013 work has been a post-hoc justification of policies and text that previously had minimal evidence-based support
- Green Buffer policy and extent were given post-hoc justification only in January 2013
- Flood risk evidence around Wendlebury

Assessment

- Query discrepancies between the findings of the SA and the Green Buffer report regarding Launton
- Distinction between minor and major negative effects of proposals/sites.

- Query the similar level of presumption against development for valuable assets, such as the AONB, Green Belt and designated heritage assets, as for assets of only local value, notably Salt Way and its setting.
- Lack of assessment of Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth
- Query that landscape constraints limit development at Banbury to the extent claimed by the Council and the SA
- Query the account of the sustainability credentials of the options for strategic development at Banbury and whether proposals within the PSLPC represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives.
- Sustainability Assessment has been undertaken fully and correctly, but we suggest that the findings should be presented in a slightly different way in order to distinguish the future role of Kidlington. SA should have differentiated between the two 'Kidlington 1' areas identified to be subject to a Green Belt review.
- Increase in dwelling capacity from 150 to 400 for South East Bicester not fully reflected in the SA
- Inconsistency in the assessment of the sites in Banbury in terms of the impacts identified relative to each of the housing sites.

Infrastructure

- Plan is not sustainable without the required transport infrastructure
- Effect of "possible strategic Bicester Relief Road" on Wendlebury including additional flood risk
- Effect of "possible strategic Bicester Relief Road" on Wretchwick farm Grade II listed properties
- Effect of increased development in Bicester on sewage treatment for surrounding communities

Note:

A number of errors and inaccuracies and potential areas of improvement were also identified in the Sustainability Appraisal following publication. These comprised:

- *misplaced site information in site summaries (Appendix B)*
- *inconsistency in referencing*
- *the need more consistency in 'scoring' policies against objectives*
- *reflecting mitigation requirements more accurately in the main SA report*
- *the need for the SA to give further regard to mitigation measures already proposed in Plan*
- *improving readability by including a clearer comparative assessment of sites*

How is the Final Submission Sustainability Report addressing these issues?

The Final Submission SA is responding to the March 2013 representations by:

- incorporating a clearer assessment of sites proposed and rejected to be assessed as potential sites for development rather than policy assessments. This will help understanding of the comparative assessment of sites and their benchmarking. It will also further help understanding the reasonable alternatives which informed the LP strategy.
- The Final Submission SA is updated having regard to the latest available evidence (having taken representations into account) and the constraints, opportunities identified within it. This includes topographical and any other constraints in Banbury and elsewhere.

- Response to representations not reported in the earlier stage now incorporated;
- Policy ESD 15 was assessed in the March 2013 SA together with the rest of the Ensuring Sustainable Development Policies in Table B6 of Appendix B and reported in Table 8.1 of the main March 2013 SA report which summarises the results of the SA process;
- SA methodology using colour coding and indicating the significance of the effect is considered a well established method to assess the effect of policies and has not been changed;
- The Final Submission SA now reflects the intention that all 400 dwellings at South East Bicester will be developed by 2031 (and not 150 as anticipated in August 2012);
- Policy Kidlington 1 indicated two areas for small scale Green Belt review as part of the Proposed Changes Local Plan, these are now clearly labelled. The Final Submission SA screens this clarification change to the Plan moving to Submission stage.
- Transport infrastructure commitments are reflected within the County Council Local Transport Plan. The County Council are in the process of reviewing their LTP and the Movement Strategies for Bicester and Banbury are part of the evidence to support this review and conclude commitments for infrastructure to support CDC's Local Plan. The County Council are also considering a number of options to increase transport capacity in Bicester and Banbury as part of the LTP process. The potential implication of different options including the effect on existing settlements and historic assets will be considered. The SA reflects this position.
- Site policies indicate site infrastructure needs as known at the time of writing including utilities. The SA assesses the policies in their entirety but in some instances assessment depends on the implementation of proposals which is picked up during the development management process when planning applications are received.
- The Sustainability Appraisal assesses BSC1 which addresses housing growth distribution. Directions of growth were explored in 2008 as part of Options for Growth consultation and subject to formal sustainability appraisal in 2010 before the Council proceeded to its preferred strategy.
- The Sustainability Appraisal assesses the policies taken forward in the Local Plan including the mitigation and requirements inbuilt within them. This includes transport infrastructure requirements required to deliver the Plan identified in liaison with the County Council as Highways Authority. The SA scoring is appropriate it is an assessment of the policies and not the means by which policies will be implemented.
- The Green Buffer Report published in March 2013 was at Final Draft stage. Amendments to the report are being carried out following the review of March 2013 consultation responses.

Appendix A
Representation Form & Guidance Note

CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN

Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission (2013)

Guide to making representations

Introduction

On 29th August 2012, the Council published for consultation the Local Plan and Proposals Maps which proposed to submit to the Secretary of State of Communities and Local Government (The Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission Document 2012). The Plan was consulted upon for 6 weeks alongside the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan.

A number of changes are proposed to the Local Plan arising from a combination of responses received to the consultation on the Plan (August – October 2012), and evidence documents completed since the Plan was consulted upon.

Cherwell District Council is now consulting on a table of focused changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission, amended Proposals Maps and an updated Sustainability Appraisal. The consultation runs for 6 weeks from **Thursday 28th March to 5pm Thursday 23rd May 2013 (please note that the consultation period has been extended by 2 weeks from 9th May).**

The Representations Form can be found at www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013.

This is the last opportunity to make comments on the Local Plan before it is submitted to the Secretary of State for independent examination by an independent Planning Inspector. Comments will be submitted to the Planning Inspector along with the Local Plan. This guidance note has been designed to help anyone who wishes to make a formal representation to this consultation.

What will happen to your response?¹

Following this consultation, the Council will submit the Local Plan and supporting information to the Secretary of State for Community and Local Government Independent Examination.

The Council will submit the:

- table of Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission 2012, amended Proposals Map, and updated Sustainability Appraisal;
- the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission 2012, its accompanying Proposals Map and Sustainability Appraisal;
- copies of all the responses received during this consultation (March – May 2013) and the August – October 2012 consultation and a summary of the main issues raised.
- statement setting out how and which bodies and persons were invited to make representations to the Draft Core Strategy 2010 and to the Proposed Submission Local Plan (Aug 2012) and how these representations were taken into account;
- Supporting documents relevant to the preparation of the Local Plan.

A Planning Inspector will be appointed to carry out an Independent Examination and will consider the representations made before making a recommendation on the Local Plan. The Planning Inspector will identify the issues for debate and how best to proceed with the debate.

¹ This is only a summary of the requirements, full details can be found in The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012
<http://www.legislation.gov.uk/ukxi/2012/767/contents/made>

How to respond to this consultation

The Council is consulting on focused changes to the Local Plan which are presented in a table of changes indicating the change number, the section of the Plan it relates to and the reason for the change.

Change Number	Section of Proposed Submission Plan (August 2012)	Location of Change: Policy/Paragraph/Table/Heading etc	Proposed Change	Reason for Proposed change
---------------	---	---	-----------------	----------------------------

The representations received during the August – October 2012 consultation on the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission can be found in full and in summary form at www.cherwell.gov.uk/publicationscheme.

All these representations have been taken into account when preparing the Changes to the Local Plan and will all be sent in full to the Planning Inspector following the submission of the Local Plan for consideration. Therefore, comments are now invited on the proposed focused changes.

Your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations. Further submissions will only be accepted at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for Examination.

The purpose of the examination is to consider whether the Local Plan is **legally compliant** (i.e. if it has been prepared in accordance with regulations) and is **sound**.

Therefore any representations received on the Changes to the Local Plan must address these concerns. These concerns are explained in more detail within this guidance, but, as a general rule:

1. If you are seeking to make representations on the way in which the Council has prepared the Local Plan, it is likely that your comments or objections will relate to a matter of legal compliance.
2. If it is the actual content on which you wish to comment or object, it is likely it will relate to “Soundness” – whether the Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective or consistent with national policy.

Your comments need to be made in writing (either electronically or on paper) and received by Cherwell District Council by **5pm on Thursday 9th May 2013**. We will not be able to accept comments that are received after the deadline and we cannot accept anonymous responses.

Respondents should also note that representations are not confidential and that they will be published on the Council’s website and copies will be made available for public inspection, although personal information, e.g. the addresses, telephone numbers and email addresses, of representations from individuals will be removed.

The next section of this guide provides detailed information on how to fill in the representation form.

It is strongly recommended that you use the Representation Forms provided by the Council to make your representation to ensure that it relates to the issues of legal compliance or soundness

Unfortunately the online consultation system Limehouse will not be used for this particular consultation. Apologies for any inconvenience caused.

How to fill in the representation form

Part A: Contact Information

You must complete all your contact details. This is used to identify who has made the comment(s), so it is important that you complete this fully.

Questions 1 & 2

The first column relates to representation from individuals. The second column should be completed if an agent is being used.

Part B: The Representation

This is where you need to make your comments on the legal compliance or soundness of the Changes to the Local Plan. **It is important that you use a separate Part B sheet for each comment you want to make.** Keep your comments clear and concise.

Please include your name/organisation at the top of each of Part B form that you use

Question 3

Please state which Change your representation relates to. **If you wish to comment on more than one change, please complete a separate Part B sheet for each of them.**

Questions 4 – 8

Please provide your comments and state whether they relate to legal compliance or soundness and your reasons for this.

Question 4.(1) Legal Compliance

The Inspector will first check that the Local Plan meets the legal requirements under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (referred to as 2004 Act in this guidance note) as amended by the Localism Act 2011, before moving on to test for soundness. You should consider the following before making a representation on legal compliance:

- The Local Plan should be within the current Local Development Scheme (LDS) and the key stages should have been followed. The LDS is effectively a programme of work prepared by the Council, setting out the documents it proposes to produce over a set period. It sets out the key stages in the production of any documents the Council propose to bring forward for independent examination. If the Local Plan is not in the current LDS it should not have been published for representations. The LDS is available for inspection at the Council's Office (Bodicote House, Bodicote, OX15 4AA) and a link is provided on the website www.cherwell.gov.uk/localdevelopmentframework
- The process of community involvement for the Local Plan should be in general accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI)². The SCI is a document that sets out the Council's strategy for involving the community in the preparation and revision of documents for the Local Plan and the consideration of planning applications. The SCI is available for inspection at the Council's Office

² View the SCI online at www.cherwell.gov.uk/localdevelopmentframework

(Bodicote House, Bodicote, OX15 4AA) and a link is provided on the website www.cherwell.gov.uk/localdevelopmentframework

- The Local Plan should comply with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012³. On publication of the Proposed Submission Local Plan, the Council must publish the documents prescribed in the regulations, and make them available at its principal offices and on the website. The Council must also place local advertisements and notify the Local Plan bodies (as set out in the regulations) and any persons who have requested to be notified.
- The Council is required to publish a Sustainability Appraisal Report when it publishes a Local Plan. This should identify the process by which the Sustainability Appraisal has been carried out, the baseline information used to inform the process and the outcomes of the process. Sustainability Appraisal is a tool for appraising policies to ensure they reflect social, environmental, and economic factors. The Sustainability Appraisal is available for inspection at the Council's Office (Bodicote House, Bodicote, OX15 4AA) and a link is provided on the website www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013
- The Local Plan must have regard to the Sustainable Community Strategy (SCS)⁴. The SCS is prepared by the Local Strategic Partnership which is representative of a range of interests in the District. The SCS is subject to consultation but not to an independent examination.
- The Council is required to fulfil the Duty to Co-operate in preparing the Local Plan as required by Section 119 of the Localism Act 2011 and Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

4. (2) Soundness

Soundness is explained fully in the National Planning Policy Framework⁵ in paragraph 182. The Inspector has to be satisfied that the Local Plan is positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy. **If you wish to comment on more than one of the four matters of soundness in relation to a specific policy, please complete a separate Part B sheet for each matter of soundness**

To be sound, a Local Plan should be:

Positively prepared

The plan should be prepared based on a strategy which seeks to meet objectively assessed development and infrastructure requirements, including unmet requirements from neighbouring authorities where it is reasonable to do so and consistent with achieving sustainable development;

Justified

The plan should be the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives and be based on proportionate, adequate, up to date and relevant evidence base;

Effective

The plan should be deliverable over its period and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic priorities;

Consistent with national policy

³ View the Planning Regulations online at <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/contents/made>

⁴ View the SCS at: <http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=3563>

⁵ View the NPPF online at <http://www.communities.gov.uk/documents/planningandbuilding/pdf/2116950.pdf>

The plan should enable the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF);

If you wish to make a representation seeking a change to the Proposed Changes to the Local Plan you should make it clear why you think it is unsound, having regard to the four tests set out above. You should try to support your representations by evidence showing why the Local Plan should be changed and how you think it should be changed, including your suggested wording to amend the Local Plan and make it sound.

If you think the content of the Proposed Change to the Local Plan is not sound because it does not include a policy where it should do, you should consider the following before making representations:

- Is the issue with which you are concerned already covered specifically by any national planning policy? If so, it does not need to be included.
- Is the issue with which you are concerned already covered by any other policies in the Local Plan? If so there is no need for repetition.
- If the policy is not covered elsewhere, in what way is the Local Plan unsound without the policy?
- If the Local Plan is unsound without the policy, what should the policy say?

Supporting the Changes to the Local Plan

Question 8

If you support a Change to the Local Plan, you should express your support so that the Inspector has the full picture in considering the Local Plan, expressing why the policy (or policies) is sound.

The Examination

Question 9 & 10

Please state here whether you wish to present your representation to the Planning Inspector during the Examination and why. The Examination will involve a series of Hearing sessions chaired by the Inspector and it is here that individuals will be invited to verbally contribute to the discussion and debate on the legal compliance and soundness of the Local Plan and, in this way, to present their representation to the Inspector. However it is likely that the majority of representations will be considered using the written representations submitted at this publication stage, which carry equal weight to those heard in person by the Inspector.

Please note that the Inspector will decide who will be invited to speak at the Hearing sessions, not the Council, and the Inspector will decide the topics to be covered in each Hearing session, based on the issues raised by the written representations at this publication stage and the August-October 2012 consultation.

Sustainability Appraisal

Question 11

Please state here whether you have any comments on the updated Sustainability Appraisal

General advice

- Representations are only valid if your name and address are supplied. If agents are completing forms on behalf of clients, agents should please state the full name or organisation of who they are representing.
- Make clear why you feel the strategy does or does not meet the legal compliance check and/or the tests of soundness.
- Be clear and to the point.
- Note that after this stage, further submissions will only be accepted at the request of the Inspector.
- Written and oral representations carry the same weight and will be given equal consideration at examination.

Group Representations

Where there are groups who share a common view on how they wish to see a Local Plan changed, it would be very helpful for that group to send a single representation which represents the view, rather than for a large number of individuals to send in separate representations which repeat the same points. In such cases the group should indicate how many people it is representing and how the representation has been authorised.

What happens next?

At the end of the consultation, the representations will be passed to the Planning Inspector and he/she will identify the issues for debate. The Inspector will also decide how best to proceed with this debate, known as the Examination in Public (EiP). An EiP usually includes Hearings, chaired by the Inspector.

A programme officer will be appointed from outside of the Planning Department and will be responsible for managing the arrangements of the Examination process, including all documents, organising the Inspector's site inspections and dealing with all correspondence. The Programme Officer reports to the Planning Inspector and will be the main point of contact during the EiP.

Please note that the ability to speak at the EiP is limited to those who make representations at this publication stage. Any representations submitted in previous consultations (i.e Draft Core Strategy, Options for Growth) cannot be considered as part of the Publication process.

Further Help

We know that this can be a technical and confusing process. We've tried to make this guidance note as easy to follow as possible but if you require further assistance in completing the Representation Form or with any part of this guidance note, please contact the Planning Policy Team, on 01295 227970 or email planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Other issues

All of the Local Plan documents can be viewed and downloaded at www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013 or at the Council's offices, Link points and libraries between **Thursday 28th March to Thursday 23rd May 2013**. Paper copies can also be purchased for a charge.

Written representations should be emailed to planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk or posted to Strategic Planning and the Economy, Cherwell District Council, Bodicote House, Bodicote, OX15 4AA.

If you wish to submit documentation in support of your representation, the Council would appreciate receiving this in electronic format and it should be no more than 5MB in size to allow it to be uploaded to the Council's website.

Please note that all representations will be made public on the Council's website, although contact details (address, email and telephone numbers) will be hidden. We cannot accept anonymous responses.

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified when:

- the document has been submitted for independent examination
- the Planning Inspector publishes his/her recommendations
- the document is adopted

Representations received after 5pm on Thursday 23rd May 2013 will not be accepted.

Further detailed guidance on the preparation, publication and examination of Local Plans is provided in the National Planning Policy Framework and The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each representation

Name or Organisation:

3. To which Change to the Local Plan Proposed Submission does this representation relate?

Change number

4. Do you consider the Change to the Local Plan Proposed Submission is:

4.(1) Legally compliant

Yes

No

4.(2) Sound*

Yes

No

****The considerations in relation to the Local Plan being 'Sound' are explained in the National Planning Policy Framework in Paragraph 182. (Please see guidance notes)***

*If you have entered **No** to 4.(1) and 4.(2) please continue to Q5. Otherwise please go directly to Q6.*

5. Do you consider the Change to the Local Plan Proposed Submission is unsound because it is not:

(1) Positively Prepared

(2) Justified

(3) Effective

(4) Consistent with national policy

6. Please give details of why you consider the Change to the Local Plan Proposed Submission is not legally compliant or is unsound. Please be as precise as possible.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

7. Please set out what change(s) you consider necessary to make the Changes to the Local Plan Proposed Submission legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at Question 5 above where this relates to soundness. You will need to say why this change will make the Local Plan/Sustainability Appraisal legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

8. If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Changes to the Local Plan Proposed Submission, please also use this box to set out your comments.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

9. If your representation is seeking a change, do you wish to express an interest to participate in the Examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

Return completed forms to:

Email: planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Post: Strategic Planning and The Economy, Cherwell District Council, Bodicote House, Bodicote, OX15 4AA

10. Do you have any comments on the updated Sustainability Appraisal?

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

If you wish to be informed of the date of the submission of the document to the Secretary of State, please tick this box✓

Signature:

Date:

PLEASE RETURN THIS FORM BY 5PM ON THURSDAY 23rd MAY 2013

***Please note** your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested change, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations. Further submissions will only be accepted at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for Examination.*

Return completed forms to:

Email: planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Post: Strategic Planning and The Economy, Cherwell District Council, Bodicote House, Bodicote, OX15 4AA

Appendix B

Statement of Representation Procedure and Press Notice

[Blank Page]

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND)
REGULATIONS 2012**

REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION

**NOTICE OF PUBLICATION OF CHANGES TO THE CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN
PROPOSED SUBMISSION, PROPOSALS MAPS, AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF
LOCAL PLAN**

STATEMENT OF REPRESENTATIONS PROCEDURE

Title

Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission and Proposed Submission Policies Map

Subject Matter and Area

Cherwell District Council has made changes to the Local Plan and Proposed Submission Policies Maps which it proposes to submit to the Secretary of State of Communities and Local Government.

The Local Plan will, upon adoption, set the broad planning framework for meeting the future needs of Cherwell District. The Plan will:

- Develop a sustainable local economy
- Ensure sustainable development
- Build sustainable communities

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission and Proposed Submission Policies Map are being published for consultation from **Thursday 28th March 2013 until 5pm Thursday 9th May 2013**. Simultaneously, the Council is also consulting on the updated Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan.

All comments must be received by 5pm **Thursday 9th May 2013**

The consultation paper on the Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan and supporting documents will be available online at www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013 from **Thursday 28th March 2013**. It will also be made available at the locations below.

How to make your representations

Please make your representation on the representations form and refer to the accompanying Guide to Making Representations before completing the form. The representation form can be completed online or downloaded from the website at:

www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013

The representation form is also available at the Deposit Locations (see below).

Alternatively completed forms can be returned by:

Post: Strategic Planning and the Economy
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxon
OX15 4AA

Email Planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Fax: 01295 221856

All comments received during the consultation will be made available for public inspection. Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

- i) the submission of the Local Plan for independent examination under section 20 of the Act,
- ii) the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Local Plan under section 20 of the Act, and
- iii) the adoption of the Local Plan

Where and when to inspect the document:

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission (2013), the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission (2012), amended Proposals Map (2013), updated Sustainability Appraisal and other supporting documents can be viewed and downloaded through the Council website at:

www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan and its supporting documents are also available to inspect at the Deposit Locations listed below. Copies of the representation form and guide can also be obtained at these Deposit Locations.

Cherwell District Council Offices, Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA

8.45am - 5.15pm Monday -Friday

Banbury Library, Marlborough Road, Banbury, OX16 5DB

Monday 9am – 1pm, Tuesday 9am-7pm, Wednesday 9am – 8pm, Thurs and Friday 9am – 7pm, Saturday 9am – 4.30pm, closed Sunday

Neithrop Library, Community Centre, Woodgreen Avenue, Banbury OX16 0AT

Monday 10am – 7pm, Tuesday Closed, Wednesday 2pm – 5pm, Thursday 10am – 1pm, Friday 10am- 5pm, Saturday 9.30am – 1pm, closed Sunday

Bicester Town Council, The Garth, Launton Road, Bicester, OX26 6PS

Monday – Thursday 9am – 5pm, Friday 9am – 4pm

Bicester Library, Old Place Yard, Bicester OX26 6AU

Monday 9.30am – 7pm, Tuesday 9.30-5pm, Wednesday and Thursday 9.30am – 7pm, Friday 9.30am – 5pm, Saturday 9am-4.30pm, closed Sunday

Kidlington Library, Ron Groves House, 23 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 2BP

Monday 9.30am – 5pm, Tuesday 9.30am – 7pm, Wednesday 9.30am – 1pm, Thursday 9.30am – 5pm, Friday 9.30am – 7pm, Saturday 9.00am – 4.30pm, closed Sunday

Adderbury Library, Church House, High Street, Adderbury, OX17 3LS

Tuesday: 10 am –12 noon & 3 – 7pm, Thursday: 2pm – 5pm & 6 – 7pm, Friday: 10am – 12 noon & 2 pm – 5pm, Saturday: 9.30 am –1pm, closed Monday & Sunday

Deddington Library, The Old Court House, Horse Fair, Deddington, Oxon. OX15 0SH

Monday 2pm - 5pm, 5.30pm - 7pm, Tuesday Closed Wednesday 9.30am - 1pm, Thursday 2pm - 5pm, 5.30pm - 7pm Friday Closed Saturday 9.30am - 1pm, closed Sunday

Hook Norton Library, High Street, Hook Norton, Banbury, Oxon, OX15 5NH

Monday 2pm - 5pm, 6pm - 7pm, Tuesday Closed, Wednesday 2pm - 5pm, Thursday Closed, Friday 2pm - 5pm, 6pm - 7pm, Saturday 9.30am - 12.30pm, closed Sunday

Copies will be available on the North, Central and West Mobile Library Services. For details of locations and times of the mobile library visit www.oxfordshire.gov.uk or phone 01865 810240

Banbury LinkPoint, 43 Castle Quay, Banbury, Oxfordshire, OX15 5UW

8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

Bicester LinkPoint, 38 Market Square, Bicester, Oxfordshire, OX26 6AL

8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

Kidlington LinkPoint, Exeter Hall, Oxford Road, Kidlington, Oxon, OX5 1AB

8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

**THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND)
REGULATIONS 2012**

REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION

**NOTICE OF PUBLICATION OF CHANGES TO THE CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN
PROPOSED SUBMISSION, PROPOSALS MAPS, AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF
LOCAL PLAN**

Cherwell District Council is consulting on Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission, amended Proposals Maps and an updated Sustainability Appraisal. The documents are being published for consultation from Thursday 28th March 2013 to Thursday 9th May 2013 prior to submission to the Secretary for State of Communities and Local Government.

The Local Plan will, upon adoption, set the broad planning framework for meeting the future needs of Cherwell, and replace the Cherwell Local Plan 1996. The Plan will:

- Develop a sustainable local economy
- Ensure sustainable development
- Build sustainable communities

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission (2013), the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission (2012), updated Sustainability Appraisal and supporting documents will be available online at www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013 from Thursday 28th March 2013. They will also be made available at the locations below.

All comments must be received by 5pm Thursday 9th May 2013.

How to make your representations

Please make your representation on the representations form and refer to the accompanying Guide to Making Representations before completing the form. The representation form can be completed online or downloaded from the website at:

www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013

The representation form and guide are also available at the Deposit Locations (see below).

Alternatively completed forms can be returned by:

Post: Strategic Planning and the Economy
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxon
OX15 4AA

Email Planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Fax: 01295 221856

All comments received during the consultation will be made available for public inspection.

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

- i) the submission of the Local Plan for independent examination under section 20 of the Act,
- ii) the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Local Plan under section 20 of the Act, and
- iii) the adoption of the Local Plan

Where and when to inspect the document:

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission (2012), amended Proposals Map (2013), updated Sustainability Appraisal and other supporting documents can be viewed and downloaded through the Council website at:

www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan and its supporting documents are also available to inspect at the Deposit Locations listed below. Copies of the representation form and guide can also be obtained at these Deposit Locations.

Cherwell District Council Offices, Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA
8.45am - 5.15pm Monday -Friday

Banbury Library, Marlborough Road, Banbury, OX16 5DB
Monday 9am – 1pm, Tuesday 9am-7pm, Wednesday 9am – 8pm, Thurs and Friday 9am – 7pm, Saturday 9am – 4.30pm, closed Sunday

Neithrop Library, Community Centre, Woodgreen Avenue, Banbury OX16 0AT
Monday 10am – 7pm, Tuesday Closed, Wednesday 2pm – 5pm, Thursday 10am – 1pm, Friday 10am- 5pm, Saturday 9.30am – 1pm, closed Sunday

Bicester Town Council, The Garth, Launton Road, Bicester, OX26 6PS
Monday – Thursday 9am – 5pm, Friday 9am – 4pm

Bicester Library, Old Place Yard, Bicester OX26 6AU
Monday 9.30am – 7pm, Tuesday 9.30-5pm, Wednesday and Thursday 9.30am – 7pm, Friday 9.30am – 5pm, Saturday 9am-4.30pm, closed Sunday

Kidlington Library, Ron Groves House, 23 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 2BP
Monday 9.30am – 5pm, Tuesday 9.30am – 7pm, Wednesday 9.30am – 1pm, Thursday 9.30am – 5pm, Friday 9.30am – 7pm, Saturday 9.00am – 4.30pm, closed Sunday

Adderbury Library, Church House, High Street, Adderbury, OX17 3LS
Tuesday: 10 am –12 noon & 3 – 7pm, Thursday: 2pm – 5pm & 6 – 7pm, Friday: 10am – 12 noon & 2 pm – 5pm, Saturday: 9.30 am –1pm, closed Monday & Sunday

Deddington Library, The Old Court House, Horse Fair, Deddington, Oxon. OX15 0SH
Monday 2pm - 5pm, 5.30pm - 7pm, Tuesday Closed Wednesday 9.30am - 1pm, Thursday 2pm - 5pm, 5.30pm - 7pm Friday Closed Saturday 9.30am - 1pm, closed Sunday

Hook Norton Library, High Street, Hook Norton, Banbury, Oxon, OX15 5NH
Monday 2pm - 5pm, 6pm - 7pm, Tuesday Closed, Wednesday 2pm - 5pm, Thursday Closed, Friday 2pm - 5pm, 6pm - 7pm, Saturday 9.30am - 12.30pm, closed Sunday

Copies will be available on the North, Central and West Mobile Library Services. For details of locations and times of the mobile library visit www.oxfordshire.gov.uk or phone 01865 810240

Banbury LinkPoint, 43 Castle Quay, Banbury, Oxfordshire, OX15 5UW

8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

Bicester LinkPoint, 38 Market Square, Bicester, Oxfordshire, OX26 6AL

8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

Kidlington LinkPoint, Exeter Hall, Oxford Road, Kidlington, Oxon, OX5 1AB

8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

THE TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING (LOCAL PLANNING) (ENGLAND) REGULATIONS 2012

REGULATION 19 CONSULTATION

NOTICE OF PUBLICATION OF CHANGES TO THE CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN PROPOSED SUBMISSION, PROPOSALS MAPS, AND SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL OF LOCAL PLAN

EXTENSION TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Cherwell District Council is consulting on Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission, amended Proposals Maps and an updated Sustainability Appraisal. The documents are being published for consultation from Thursday 28th March 2013 to **Thursday 23rd May 2013** prior to submission to the Secretary for State of Communities and Local Government.

The Local Plan will, upon adoption, set the broad planning framework for meeting the future needs of Cherwell, and replace the Cherwell Local Plan 1996. The Plan will:

- Develop a sustainable local economy
- Ensure sustainable development
- Build sustainable communities

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission (2013), the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission (2012), updated Sustainability Appraisal and supporting documents will be available online at www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013 from Thursday 28th March 2013. They will also be made available at the locations below.

All comments must be received by **5pm Thursday 23rd May 2013**.

How to make your representations

Please make your representation on the representations form and refer to the accompanying Guide to Making Representations before completing the form. The representation form can be completed online or downloaded from the website at:

www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013

The representation form and guide are also available at the Deposit Locations (see below).

Alternatively completed forms can be returned by:

Post: Strategic Planning and the Economy
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxon
OX15 4AA

Email Planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Fax: 01295 221856

All comments received during the consultation will be made available for public inspection.

Representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of any of the following:

- i) the submission of the Local Plan for independent examination under section 20 of the Act,
- ii) the publication of the recommendations of the person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Local Plan under section 20 of the Act, and
- iii) the adoption of the Local Plan

Where and when to inspect the document:

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission (2012), amended Proposals Map (2013), updated Sustainability Appraisal and other supporting documents can be viewed and downloaded through the Council website at:

www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan and its supporting documents are also available to inspect at the Deposit Locations listed below. Copies of the representation form and guide can also be obtained at these Deposit Locations.

Cherwell District Council Offices, Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA

8.45am - 5.15pm Monday -Friday

Banbury Library, Marlborough Road, Banbury, OX16 5DB

Monday 9am – 1pm, Tuesday 9am-7pm, Wednesday 9am – 8pm, Thurs and Friday 9am – 7pm, Saturday 9am – 4.30pm, closed Sunday

Neithrop Library, Community Centre, Woodgreen Avenue, Banbury OX16 0AT

Monday 10am – 7pm, Tuesday Closed, Wednesday 2pm – 5pm, Thursday 10am – 1pm, Friday 10am- 5pm, Saturday 9.30am – 1pm, closed Sunday

Bicester Town Council, The Garth, Launton Road, Bicester, OX26 6PS

Monday – Thursday 9am – 5pm, Friday 9am – 4pm

Bicester Library, Old Place Yard, Bicester OX26 6AU

Monday 9.30am – 7pm, Tuesday 9.30-5pm, Wednesday and Thursday 9.30am – 7pm, Friday 9.30am – 5pm, Saturday 9am-4.30pm, closed Sunday

Kidlington Library, Ron Groves House, 23 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 2BP

Monday 9.30am – 5pm, Tuesday 9.30am – 7pm, Wednesday 9.30am – 1pm, Thursday 9.30am – 5pm, Friday 9.30am – 7pm, Saturday 9.00am – 4.30pm, closed Sunday

Adderbury Library, Church House, High Street, Adderbury, OX17 3LS

Tuesday: 10 am –12 noon & 3 – 7pm, Thursday: 2pm – 5pm & 6 – 7pm, Friday: 10am – 12 noon & 2 pm – 5pm, Saturday: 9.30 am –1pm, closed Monday & Sunday

Deddington Library, The Old Court House, Horse Fair, Deddington, Oxon. OX15 0SH

Monday 2pm - 5pm, 5.30pm - 7pm, Tuesday Closed Wednesday 9.30am - 1pm, Thursday 2pm - 5pm, 5.30pm - 7pm Friday Closed Saturday 9.30am - 1pm, closed Sunday

Hook Norton Library, High Street, Hook Norton, Banbury, Oxon, OX15 5NH

Monday 2pm - 5pm, 6pm - 7pm, Tuesday Closed, Wednesday 2pm - 5pm, Thursday Closed, Friday 2pm - 5pm, 6pm - 7pm, Saturday 9.30am - 12.30pm, closed Sunday

Copies will be available on the North, Central and West Mobile Library Services. For details of locations and times of the mobile library visit www.oxfordshire.gov.uk or phone 01865 810240

Banbury LinkPoint, 43 Castle Quay, Banbury, Oxfordshire, OX15 5UW

8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

Bicester LinkPoint, 38 Market Square, Bicester, Oxfordshire, OX26 6AL

8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

Kidlington LinkPoint, Exeter Hall, Oxford Road, Kidlington, Oxon, OX5 1AB

8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

Appendix C
Notification Letter

[Blank Page]

Strategic Planning & the Economy

Adrian Colwell – Head of Strategic Planning & the Economy



DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH OXFORDSHIRE

NAME
ADDRESS LINE 1
ADDRESS LINE 2
TOWN
COUNTY
POST CODE (must be on own line)

*Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxfordshire
OX15 4AA*

www.cherwell.gov.uk

Please ask for: Maria Garcia Dopazo

Direct Dial: 01295 227970

Email: Planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Our Ref: R19_2

28th March 2013

Dear

Focused consultation on Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission

The Council is consulting on Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission, amended Proposals Maps and an updated Sustainability Appraisal. The documents are being published for consultation **from Thursday 28th March 2013 to Thursday 9th May 2013** prior to submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

The Local Plan will, upon adoption, set the broad planning framework for meeting the future needs of Cherwell, and replace the Cherwell Local Plan 1996. The Plan will:

- Develop a sustainable local economy
- Ensure sustainable development
- Build sustainable communities

On 29th August 2012, the Council published for consultation the Local Plan and Proposals Maps which it was proposed to submit to the Secretary of State of Communities and Local Government (The Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission Document 2012). The Plan was consulted upon for 6 weeks alongside the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan.

A number of changes are proposed to the Local Plan arising from a combination of responses received to the consultation on the Plan (August – October 2012), and evidence documents completed since the Plan was consulted upon.

Cherwell District Council is now consulting on a table of focused changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission, amended Proposals Maps and an updated Sustainability Appraisal.

The representations received during the August – October 2012 consultation on the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission can be found in full and in summary form at www.cherwell.gov.uk/publicationscheme

All these representations have been taken into account when preparing the Changes to the Local Plan and will all be sent in full to the Planning Inspector following the submission of the Local Plan for consideration. Therefore, comments are now invited on the proposed focused changes.

Consultation Arrangements

The consultation arrangements for the **Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission** are set out in the enclosed 'Statement of Representations Procedure' and there are also guidance notes available. Representations must be received by **5pm on Thursday 9th May 2013**.

Following this consultation the Council is required to consider the responses received and the need for any amendments and then submit the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for public examination together with copies of the representations made. The purpose of the examination is to consider whether the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound. Therefore any representations received on the Local Plan must address these concerns and for this reason we would strongly recommend that you use the enclosed representation form.

Further information is set out within the guidance notes.

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission and supporting documents are available online to view and comment on at www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013.

Copies will also be available in all Deposit Locations set out within the enclosed 'statement of representations procedure'. Comments can either be made online or returned by the following:

Post: Strategic Planning and the Economy
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxon
OX15 4AA

Email: Planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Fax: 01295 221856

All comments received will be made available for public inspection

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many Thanks,

Maria Garcia Dopazo

Strategic Planning & the Economy

Adrian Colwell – Head of Strategic Planning & the Economy



DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH OXFORDSHIRE

NAME
ADDRESS LINE 1
ADDRESS LINE 2
TOWN
COUNTY
POST CODE (must be on own line)

*Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxfordshire
OX15 4AA*

www.cherwell.gov.uk

Please ask for: Maria Garcia Dopazo

Direct Dial: 01295 227970

Email: Planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Our Ref: R19_2

9th April 2013

Dear

EXTENSION TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION

Focused consultation on Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission

The Council is consulting on Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission, amended Proposals Maps and an updated Sustainability Appraisal. The documents are being published for consultation **from Thursday 28th March 2013 to Thursday 23rd May 2013** prior to submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

The Local Plan will, upon adoption, set the broad planning framework for meeting the future needs of Cherwell, and replace the Cherwell Local Plan 1996. The Plan will:

- Develop a sustainable local economy
- Ensure sustainable development
- Build sustainable communities

On 29th August 2012, the Council published for consultation the Local Plan and Proposals Maps which it was proposed to submit to the Secretary of State of Communities and Local Government (The Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission Document 2012). The Plan was consulted upon for 6 weeks alongside the Sustainability Appraisal of the Local Plan.

A number of changes are proposed to the Local Plan arising from a combination of responses received to the consultation on the Plan (August – October 2012), and evidence documents completed since the Plan was consulted upon.

Cherwell District Council is now consulting on a table of focused changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission, amended Proposals Maps and an updated Sustainability Appraisal.

The representations received during the August – October 2012 consultation on the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission can be found in full and in summary form at www.cherwell.gov.uk/publicationscheme

All these representations have been taken into account when preparing the Changes to the Local Plan and will all be sent in full to the Planning Inspector following the submission of the Local Plan for consideration. Therefore, comments are now invited on the proposed focused changes.

Consultation Arrangements

The consultation arrangements for the **Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission** are set out in the 'Statement of Representations Procedure' and there are also guidance notes available. Representations must be received by **5pm on Thursday 23rd May 2013**.

Following this consultation the Council is required to consider the responses received and the need for any amendments and then submit the Local Plan to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for public examination together with copies of the representations made. The purpose of the examination is to consider whether the Local Plan is legally compliant and sound. Therefore any representations received on the Local Plan must address these concerns and for this reason we would strongly recommend that you use the enclosed representation form.

Further information is set out within the guidance notes.

The Changes to the Cherwell Local Plan Proposed Submission and supporting documents are available online to view and comment on at www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplan2013.

Copies will also be available in all Deposit Locations set out within the enclosed 'statement of representations procedure'. Comments can either be made online or returned by the following:

Post: Strategic Planning and the Economy
Cherwell District Council
Bodicote House
Bodicote
Banbury
Oxon
OX15 4AA

Email: Planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk

Fax: 01295 221856

All comments received will be made available for public inspection

If you have any questions please do not hesitate to contact me.

Many Thanks,

Maria Garcia Dopazo

Appendix D

Summary of Representations to the Proposed Changes to the
Proposed Submission Local Plan

[Blank Page]

