

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	8	Contents Page	Table Heading		Whilst Table 1 has been updated to take into account completions and the recent permission at Banbury 6 it remains unclear why further land has not been allocated for development within Banbury. Banbury is a primary regional centre and should therefore be the main focus for growth within the district up to 2031.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	9	Contents Page	Table Heading		Whilst Table 1 has been updated to take into account completions and the recent permission at Banbury 6 it remains unclear why further land has not been allocated for development within Banbury. Banbury is a primary regional centre and should therefore be the main focus for growth within the district up to 2031.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	10	Contents Page	Table Heading		Whilst Table 1 has been updated to take into account completions and the recent permission at Banbury 6 it remains unclear why further land has not been allocated for development within Banbury. Banbury is a primary regional centre and should therefore be the main focus for growth within the district up to 2031.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	11	Contents Page	Table Heading		Whilst Table 1 has been updated to take into account completions and the recent permission at Banbury 6 it remains unclear why further land has not been allocated for development within Banbury. Banbury is a primary regional centre and should therefore be the main focus for growth within the district up to 2031.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	12	Executive Summary	Developing a Sustainable Local Economy		No specific comment made.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	13	Executive Summary	Developing a Sustainable Local Economy		No specific comment made.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	14	Executive Summary	Table 1 Proposed Strategic Employment Allocations - Heading		No specific comment made.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	15	Executive Summary	Table 1 Proposed Strategic Employment Allocations		No specific comment made.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	16	Executive Summary	Table 2 Proposed Strategic Town Centre Allocations		No specific comment made.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	17	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	18	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		The rate of housing delivery from the South East Plan has continued to be used which is likely to lead to an overestimate of the need.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	18	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities	The amount of housing proposed to be allocated to Banbury should be increased.	The Plan should not direct higher levels of housing to Bicester on grounds of under-delivery alone. An explanation for this is needed and why this departs from the reasoned and sustainable position of the former RSS. The amount of housing proposed to be allocated to Banbury should be increased.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	18	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		The Council has considered the indications provided by the 2008-based household projection for the district. An up to date SHMA is needed. The Council has not considered the likely impact of those planning decisions being made by its neighbours and by those other authorities in the wider housing market area. The annual housing requirement of 830 dwellings should be applied which is in line with the SHMA.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	18	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	18	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements (the SHMA). The Council will need to work with neighbouring authorities as well as producing a SHLAA to establish a realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability of land to meet the identified need for housing. There is no evidence to support the suggested windfall allowance. The production of SHMA and Duty to Cooperate are essential and must feed into the Plan. The Plan should identify Land at Warwick Road, Banbury as a housing allocation to provide for approximately 300 dwellings. The Housing Trajectory will need reviewing in particular the windfall allowance and the delivery rate at Canalside. Guidance and clarification needed on housing growth at rural villages.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	18	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		Concerned over the implications of a no net inward migration assumption and whether the Plan has robustly assessed the needs arising from other areas of Oxfordshire, and beyond, in a sufficient evidence-based manner. The concentration of development at the two principal settlements will be at the expense of wider needs and effectively results in a moratorium on development in the rest of the District. The Housing Trajectory shows that there will be no delivery from sites of 10 or more dwellings in rural areas from 2018/19. Object to Bicester being the main location for growth as it ignores wider opportunities for growth.
281	V N	Smith	Quantock House	18	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		Recent housing completions have failed to meet the South East Plan annual requirement of 670 dwellings per annum. The projected housing completions should start with the actual figures for the last three years to prove that it is unrealistic to suggest that there will be a significant increase in the rate of completions in the near future. The current housing market does not help the local authority to achieve the housing requirements set.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	19	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		The majority of proposed development in Banbury and Bicester raises concerns. The focus at the two main settlements will be at the expense of wider needs and may militate against effective delivery if Banbury and Bicester reach a saturation point. There is over reliance on the delivery at Banbury and Bicester therefore more housing should be allocated in the rural areas.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	19	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	19	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		Concerned over the implications of a no net inward migration assumption and whether the Plan has robustly assessed the needs arising from other areas of Oxfordshire, and beyond, in a sufficient evidence-based manner. The concentration of development at the two principal settlements will be at the expense of wider needs and effectively results in a moratorium on development in the rest of the District. The Housing Trajectory shows that there will be no delivery from sites of 10 or more dwellings in rural areas from 2018/19. Object to Bicester being the main location for growth as it ignores wider opportunities for growth.
6	Dominic	Woodfield	Bioscan (UK) Ltd	20	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		Removal of reference to Gavray Drive as a consented site is welcomed. This recognition reflects the current position of impasse with the promoters of that site, and it is worth stressing that this situation is not of Cherwell District Councils making but due to the applicant's continued reluctance to change their proposals to comply with local and national planning policy.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	20	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		The majority of development to Banbury and Bicester raises concerns. The focus at the two main settlements will be at the expense of wider needs and may militate against effective delivery if Banbury and Bicester reach a saturation point. There is over reliance on the delivery at Banbury and Bicester therefore more housing should be allocated in the rural areas.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	20	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	20	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities		Concerned over the implications of a no net inward migration assumption and whether the Plan has robustly assessed the needs arising from other areas of Oxfordshire, and beyond, in a sufficient evidence-based manner. The concentration of development at the two principal settlements will be at the expense of wider needs and effectively would result in a moratorium on development in the rest of the District. The Housing Trajectory shows that there will be no delivery from sites of 10 or more dwellings in rural areas from 2018/19. Object to Bicester being the main location for growth as it ignores wider opportunities for growth.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	21	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities - Table 3 - Headings		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	21	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities - Table 3 - Headings		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. Bicester's traffic congestion will continue to worsen due to the planned growth therefore growth should be focused at Banbury.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	22	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities - Table 3		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
223	David	French	Deddington Development Watch	22	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities - Table 3	The overall housing requirement of 16,750 dwellings should be deleted and replaced by a figure derived from an up to date and relevant evidence base as regards district housing need. Housing trajectory to be revised.	The Council has continued to use the housing requirements set in the South East Plan which raises concerns. The overall housing requirement of 16,750 dwellings should be deleted. A new SHMA is needed.
224	David	French		22	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities - Table 3	The overall housing requirement of 16,750 dwellings should be deleted and replaced by a figure derived from an up to date and relevant evidence base as regards district housing need. Housing trajectory to be revised.	The Council has continued to use the housing requirements set in the South East Plan which raises concerns. It is not justified by up to date and relevant evidence base as regards district housing need, both market and affordable, over this extended period.
258	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon	22	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities - Table 3		On the basis the Council are proposing to redistribute Banbury's housing allocations to Bicester it would seem sensible to reduce the number of dwellings at Bicester 12 from 400 dwellings to 325 dwellings and allocating 75 dwellings to Skimmerdish Lane. Land to south of Skimmerdish Lane should be allocated for up to 75 houses. The site does not constitute green space or public open space.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	22	Executive Summary	Building Sustainable Communities - Table 3		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. Bicester's traffic congestion will continue to worsen due to the planned growth therefore growth should be focused at Banbury.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	23	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: Bicester and Banbury		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
258	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon	23	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: Bicester and Banbury		On the basis the Council are proposing to redistribute Banbury's housing allocations to Bicester it would seem sensible to reduce the number of dwellings at Bicester 12 from 400 dwellings to 325 dwellings and allocating 75 dwellings to Skimmerdish Lane. Land to south of Skimmerdish Lane should be allocated for up to 75 houses. The site does not constitute green space or public open space.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	24	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: Bicester and Banbury		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
258	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon	24	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: Bicester and Banbury		On the basis the Council are proposing to redistribute Banbury's housing allocations to Bicester it would seem sensible to reduce the number of dwellings at Bicester 12 from 400 dwellings to 325 dwellings and allocating 75 dwellings to Skimmerdish Lane. Land to south of Skimmerdish Lane should be allocated for up to 75 houses. The site does not constitute green space or public open space.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	25	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: Bicester and Banbury		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
258	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon	25	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: Bicester and Banbury		On the basis the Council are proposing to redistribute Banbury's housing allocations to Bicester it would seem sensible to reduce the number of dwellings at Bicester 12 from 400 dwellings to 325 dwellings and allocating 75 dwellings to Skimmerdish Lane. Land to south of Skimmerdish Lane should be allocated for up to 75 houses. The site does not constitute green space or public open space.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	26	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: Bicester and Banbury		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
258	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon	26	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: Bicester and Banbury		On the basis the Council are proposing to redistribute Banbury's housing allocations to Bicester it would seem sensible to reduce the number of dwellings at Bicester 12 from 400 dwellings to 325 dwellings and allocating 75 dwellings to Skimmerdish Lane. Land to south of Skimmerdish Lane should be allocated for up to 75 houses. The site does not constitute green space or public open space.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	27	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031 - Heading		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
258	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon	27	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031 - Heading		On the basis the Council are proposing to redistribute Banbury's housing allocations to Bicester it would seem sensible to reduce the number of dwellings at Bicester 12 from 400 dwellings to 325 dwellings and allocating 75 dwellings to Skimmerdish Lane. Land to south of Skimmerdish Lane should be allocated for up to 75 houses. The site does not constitute green space or public open space.
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031		The figures for NW Bicester (Eco-Town) - 1,793 dwellings to 2031, 3,207 dwellings after 2031. How was this calculated? Only the exemplar development has received planning permission. When will the Bicester Masterplan be published? A further 1,399 dwellings to be built on Eco-Town over 18 years questioned.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031		Object to the strategic allocations at Banbury 2 East and West Southam Road and Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields. Table 4 and the Plan will need to be amended if these sites are taken out.
183	Alan	Jones		28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031	The site name for Banbury 2 should be Hardwick Farm, Southam Road.	Object to the strategic allocations at Banbury 2 East and West Southam Road and Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields. Table 4 and the Plan will need to be amended if these sites are taken out.
184	Karen	Jones		28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031	The site name for Banbury 2 should be Hardwick Farm, Southam Road.	Object to the strategic allocations at Banbury 2 East and West Southam Road and Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields. Table 4 and the Plan will need to be amended if these sites are taken out.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
185	Sarah	Hamilton-Foyn	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031		Supports the proposed wording change
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
210	Angela	Reeve	Doelotte Real Estate / CEMEX UK Limited	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031		The CEMEX site should be included as part of the Banbury 1 site.
211	David	Keene	David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates Ltd (Gavray Drive)	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031		Land at Gavray Drive is no longer a strategic housing allocation and has been removed from the Proposals Map and Housing Trajectory. The High Court quashed renewal of outline permission on account of a technical breach of the EIA regulations. The application will need to be redetermined by the Council. There is a valid planning consent therefore the site should remain as a strategic housing allocation. A new policy is needed if this is followed.
212	David	Keene	David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates Ltd	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031	There should be a site specific policy for Wykham Park Farm similar to other strategic allocations. A suggested policy has been provided.	The Plan should include Wykham Park Farm as a strategic housing allocation which is supported by the evidence base. There is over reliance on Canalside to meet a larger proportion of housing growth in Banbury. The Council has considered that Salt Way should be defined as a settlement boundary. Salt Way is not considered to be of exceptional landscape character, its physical characteristics being typical of many greenways in the vicinity. Outline planning application for 1000 homes to be considered by the Council. The development could commence in 2014/15 and should be referenced in the housing trajectory and Proposals Map. There should be a site specific policy for Wykham Park Farm for a mixed use development. Housing delivery rate at Canalside is questioned and there is no evidence to support this allocation. Canalside should be considered as a "Housing Reserve Area" and not to be included in the housing trajectory.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031		Clarification needed on the reduction of 200 dwellings in Banbury. There is no evidence to support this. Land West of Warwick Road, Banbury could help accommodate the 200 dwellings. Object to the allocation of Banbury 2 as it contradicts the evidence base.
241	Kathryn	Ventham	Barton Wilmore / Taylor Wimpey South West	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031	Include land to the south of Skimmingdish Lane as an allocation for approximately 60 dwellings within Table 4 of the Local Plan.	Allocations in Banbury and Bicester should be increased. Opportunity on land to the south of Skimmerdish Lane to the south of the RAF Bicester and North East Bicester Business Park. The site could deliver circa 60 dwellings. The Plan should include this site as an allocation, but also consider smaller sites which will help with the housing land supply.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
241	Kathryn	Ventham	Barton Wilmore / Taylor Wimpey South West	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031	Include land to the west of Warwick Road as an allocation for approximately 300 dwellings within Table 4 of the Local Plan.	Allocations in Banbury and Bicester should be increased. Opportunity on land to the west of Warwick Road, to the north of North Oxfordshire Academy. The site is adjacent to Banbury 5. The site could deliver circa 300 dwellings. The Plan should include the site as an allocation but also consider smaller sites which will help with the housing land supply.
258	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Taylor Wimpey and Persimmon	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031		On that basis the Council are proposing to redistribute Banbury's housing allocations to Bicester it would seem sensible to reduce the number of dwellings at Bicester 12 from 400 dwellings to 325 dwellings and allocating 75 dwellings to Skimmerdish Lane. Land to south of Skimmerdish Lane should be allocated for up to 75 houses. The site does not constitute green space or public open space.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	28	Executive Summary	Table 4 Proposed Strategic Housing Allocations in Bicester and Banbury 2011-2031		Concerns raised over Banbury 1. The site currently comprises over 40 separate freehold ownerships and many more leasehold interests. The only way to redevelop the site is by complex compulsory purchase which will take many years to implement. There could be viability issues. The Plan does not allocate additional land for employment use within Banbury therefore existing businesses at the site will find it difficult to remain within the town. There is no substantial evidence to show how issues could be addressed or how the site could be secured.
40	Richard	Broadbent		29	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas		It would be more appropriate to incorporate small sites and 'windfalls' and set a target for sites of 'up to 10 homes'.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	29	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas		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 up to 2031. 'Local' housing need is not defined nor are any criteria specified. It is not demonstrated, by reference to a robust evidence base that the revised allocation is responsive to aggregate anticipated actual year on year local housing need in the 23 rural villages. CRAITLUS states that workers from Group 1 and 2 villages travel 14 miles to work whilst residents in Deddington travel 37.5 miles to work (2001 Census). An up to date housing needs assessment needed.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	29	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		29	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas	There should be a compensating statement to indicate that these are minimum targets, such that, once the Kidlington Masterplan or the Local Neighbourhoods DPD identifies actual local need in the Kidlington area.	Growth in rural areas and Kidlington are restricted to the numbers included in the Plan. It is not reasonable to suggest that needs originating in Kidlington should be met in Bicester or further afield.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
224	David	French		29	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.
227	Grahame	Handley		29	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	30	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas		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 up to 2031. 'Local' housing need is not defined nor are any criteria specified. It is not demonstrated, by reference to a robust evidence base that the revised allocation is responsive to aggregate anticipated actual year on year local housing need in the 23 rural villages. CRAITLUS states that workers from Group 1 and 2 villages travel 14 miles to work whilst residents in Deddington travel 37.5 miles to work (2001 Census). An up to date housing needs assessment needed.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	30	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
224	David	French		30	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
227	Grahame	Handley		30	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas		A revised village grouping reflecting current planning permissions is more realistic.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas		Table 5 does not specify a maximum size for rural developments. 'Local' housing need in the context of the rural villages is unlikely to warrant major or large-scale development in an individual village. The policy encourages development on greenfield sites in the countryside instead of protecting the natural environment. Impact on the subsequently identified local housing need between adoption and 2031. It would risk the imposition of disproportionately large developments on individual villages. It would encourage dormitory developments. Suggest including a maximum number of new dwellings for sites in villages.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas		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 up to 2031. 'Local' housing need is not defined nor are any criteria specified. It is not demonstrated, by reference to a robust evidence base that the revised allocation is responsive to aggregate anticipated actual year on year local housing need in the 23 rural villages. CRAITLUS states that workers from Group 1 and 2 villages travel 14 miles to work whilst residents in Deddington travel 37.5 miles to work (2001 Census). An up to date housing needs assessment needed.
127	Valerie	Russell	Bodicote Parish Council	31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas / Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas		Supports the proposed table change

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas		Adderbury should not be in the group identified as there is a lack of services provided in the village.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas		Agrees, in view of the amount of development that has recently taken place in Bloxham, that a proportion of these dwellings may be feasible to be considered in the drawing up of a Neighbourhood Development Plan for Bloxham. However, it considers that any future developments need to be agreed following sound site appraisals.
197	Dominic	Lawson	Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning Ltd / Gracewell Healthcare	31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas		Object to the reduction in the housing allowance for large villages due to the increase in the envisaged housing supply on the major allocations in Banbury and Bicester. The Plan should allocate more homes to rural areas to allow flexibility and not over relying on delivery rates at Banbury and Bicester.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
224	David	French		31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas	Paragraph C.235 should be amended as follows: Insert "and should generally not exceed 20 dwellings" at the end of the 3rd sentence.	A maximum size for rural developments has not been set. A maximum of 20 dwellings per site would be more appropriate with a view to ensuring a proportionate distribution of housing growth amongst the rural villages. Paragraph C.235 to be amended.
224	David	French		31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
227	Grahame	Handley		31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	31	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas - Table 5 Distribution of Housing in the Rural Areas		The categorisation of Bloxham is questioned. Bloxham is one of the District's most sustainable villages. Housing allocations in rural villages is not based on a robust assessment of actual housing need required in the rural areas.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	32	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas		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 up to 2031. 'Local' housing need is not defined nor are any criteria specified. It is not demonstrated, by reference to a robust evidence base that the revised allocation is responsive to aggregate anticipated actual year on year local housing need in the 23 rural villages. CRAITLUS states that workers from Group 1 and 2 villages travel 14 miles to work whilst residents in Deddington travel 37.5 miles to work (2001 Census). An up to date housing needs assessment needed.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	32	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
224	David	French		32	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
227	Grahame	Handley		32	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	33	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas		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 up to 2031. 'Local' housing need is not defined nor are any criteria specified. It is not demonstrated, by reference to a robust evidence base that the revised allocation is responsive to aggregate anticipated actual year on year local housing need in the 23 rural villages. CRAITLUS states that workers from Group 1 and 2 villages travel 14 miles to work whilst residents in Deddington travel 37.5 miles to work (2001 Census). An up to date housing needs assessment needed.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	33	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
224	David	French		33	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.
227	Grahame	Handley		33	Executive Summary	Locations for Community Growth: The Villages and Rural Areas	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	34	Executive Summary	Affordable Housing		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
230	Patricia	Redpath	Kidlington Parish Council	34	Executive Summary	Affordable Housing	Match the qualifying threshold for Kidlington with that of the rural areas.	The housing allocation for rural areas is not based on an up to date assessment of local housing needs and that the current numbers will be inadequate to meet them. The Kidlington Masterplan should be the opportunity for resetting a new Kidlington housing target based on a new review of local needs. The small scale local review of the Green Belt review should consider associated housing needs. 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. The generation of new jobs will create wholly unmet local housing need. The threshold for affordable housing should be reduced from 10 to 3 in Table 6.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	35	Executive Summary	Affordable Housing		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
230	Patricia	Redpath	Kidlington Parish Council	35	Executive Summary	Affordable Housing	Match the qualifying threshold for Kidlington with that of the rural areas.	The housing allocation for rural areas is not based on an up to date assessment of local housing needs and that the current numbers will be inadequate to meet them. The Kidlington Masterplan should be the opportunity for resetting a new Kidlington housing target based on a new review of local needs. The small scale local review of the Green Belt review should consider associated housing needs. 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. The generation of new jobs will create wholly unmet local housing need. The threshold for affordable housing should be reduced from 10 to 3 in Table 6.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	36	Executive Summary	Ensuring Delivery		The provision for increased infrastructure such as schools has not been adequately covered.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	36	Executive Summary	Ensuring Delivery		Changes to the housing allocations noted. Concerned over the allocations at Banbury.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	36	Executive Summary	Ensuring Delivery		Supports the proposed removal of text. Amend the sentence as "The Local Plan includes provision for a range of key infrastructure such as schools, strategic highway improvements and 'green' infrastructure".
284	J	Burrett		36	Executive Summary	Ensuring Delivery		The proposed relief road at South East Bicester will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running"; the amount of land which would be taken up with a dual carriageway road to join the A41 just north of Wendlebury. Detail of mitigation measures is unknown.
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	38	Introduction	1.6		The suggested change is overly restrictive. It is suggested that the policy should make clear that adverse environmental impacts can be the subject of mitigation in order to allow development to proceed. The policy should also make clear that growth should avoid unacceptable adverse environmental impacts. Fails the provisions of the NPPF by not demonstrating a five year housing land supply.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	38	Introduction	1.6		'Sprawl' will be avoided providing that development has been properly planned for and is located within a sustainable location, in accordance with the principles set out within the NPPF.
186	Sarah	Turner		39	Introduction	1.13	Reinstate previous wording for 2nd bullet point.	Previous wording of the 2nd bullet point was clearer and more appropriate.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	39	Introduction	1.13		Supports the proposed wording change
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	42	Introduction	1.21		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements (the SHMA). The Council will need to work with neighbouring authorities as well as producing a SHLAA to establish a realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability of land to meet the identified need for housing. There is no evidence to support the suggested windfall allowance. The production of SHMA and Duty to Cooperate are essential and must feed into the Plan. The Plan should identify Land at Warwick Road, Banbury as a housing allocation to provide for approximately 300 dwellings. The Housing Trajectory will need reviewing in particular the windfall allowance and the delivery rate at Canalside. Guidance and clarification needed on housing growth at rural villages.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	43	Introduction	1.22		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements (the SHMA). The Council will need to work with neighbouring authorities as well as producing a SHLAA to establish a realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability of land to meet the identified need for housing. There is no evidence to support the suggested windfall allowance. The production of SHMA and Duty to Cooperate are essential and must feed into the Plan. The Plan should identify Land at Warwick Road, Banbury as a housing allocation to provide for approximately 300 dwellings. The Housing Trajectory will need reviewing in particular the windfall allowance and the delivery rate at Canalside. Guidance and clarification needed on housing growth at rural villages.
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	44	Introduction	1.23		The Local Plan has been prepared to respond to regional and sub-regional objectives and be completed and implemented to deliver the growth envisaged in the South East Plan. This significantly underplays the district's housing requirements therefore not meeting the full objectively assessed housing needs. Absence of revisiting housing figures indicates a failure in the Councils duty to cooperate given that neighbouring authorities are bringing forward plans and re-considering their approach to housing need and delivery. The Interim Household Projections (2011) shows an increase housing requirement for the district from 670 dwellings per annum to 688 per annum.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	44	Introduction	1.23		The rate of housing delivery from the South East Plan has continued to be used which is likely to lead to an overprovision of housing which will not be reflected in what the market will deliver.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	44	Introduction	1.23		Supports the proposed wording change
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	44	Introduction	1.23		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements (the SHMA). The Council will need to work with neighbouring authorities as well as producing a SHLAA to establish a realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability of land to meet the identified need for housing. There is no evidence to support the suggested windfall allowance. The production of SHMA and Duty to Cooperate are essential and must feed into the Plan. The Plan should identify Land at Warwick Road, Banbury as a housing allocation to provide for approximately 300 dwellings. The Housing Trajectory will need reviewing in particular the windfall allowance and the delivery rate at Canalside. Guidance and clarification needed on housing growth in rural villages.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	45	Introduction	1.31		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements (the SHMA). The Council will need to work with neighbouring authorities as well as producing a SHLAA to establish a realistic assumptions about the availability and suitability of land to meet the identified need for housing. There is no evidence to support the suggested windfall allowance. The production of SHMA and Duty to Cooperate are essential and must feed into the Plan. The Plan should identify Land at Warwick Road, Banbury as a housing allocation to provide for approximately 300 dwellings. The Housing Trajectory will need reviewing in particular the windfall allowance and the delivery rate at Canalside. Guidance and clarification needed on housing growth at rural villages.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	46	Introduction	1.39		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements (the SHMA). The Council will need to work with neighbouring authorities as well as producing a SHLAA to establish a realistic assumptions about the availability and suitability of land to meet the identified need for housing. There is no evidence to support the suggested windfall allowance. The production of SHMA and Duty to Cooperate are essential and must feed into the Plan. The Plan should identify Land at Warwick Road, Banbury as a housing allocation to provide for approximately 300 dwellings. The Housing Trajectory will need reviewing in particular the windfall allowance and the delivery rate at Canalside. Guidance and clarification needed on housing growth in rural villages.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	47	Introduction	1.49		The level of growth anticipated appears not to be substantiated both for the effects of economic activity certainly in the short term and the level of migration and population growth.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		49	Introduction	1.52	Reference should be made on Kidlington Masterplan. Clarify throughout the Plan the role of the Kidlington Masterplan and the Local Neighbourhoods DPD.	The Kidlington Masterplan has not been referenced. The Masterplan has been presented as essential in delivering necessary change for Kidlington to the Parish Council however this has been downgraded by the Plan. The role of the Kidlington Masterplan and the Local Neighbourhoods DPD is unclear.
127	Valerie	Russell	Bodicote Parish Council	50	Introduction	1.53		Supports the proposed wording change. Green Buffer zones, particularly to the south of Banbury and around Bodicote are vital for the future.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	50	Introduction	1.53		It is evidence that the allocation of land south of Banbury will not lead to 'coalescence with villages'. Specifically it will not lead to the coalescent with Bloxham.
47	Martin	Small	English Heritage	52	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.9		Supports the proposed wording change
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	52	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.9		Supports the proposed wording change
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	53	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.11		Supports the proposed wording change
199	Peter	Atkin	Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd	53	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.11	Growth across the rest of the District will be at a lesser level but will be sufficient to meet community and business needs to enhance and maintain the viability of local communities.	The majority of development in the two major towns in the District is supported. There must be recognition that there is a continuing need for new development in rural areas and that development in these areas should be encouraged. The evidence base has identified key housing issues in rural areas.
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	53	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.11		Support the recognition that Kidlington should be targeted for economic development, featuring alongside Banbury and Bicester. Kidlington should be grouped with Banbury and Bicester rather than the rural areas. Object to the 3rd bullet point and would like the wording reinstated from the Proposed Changes. A balance of houses and jobs in Kidlington is preferred. The Plan should not mention housing growth in Kidlington which could be addressed in the Local Neighbourhoods DPD.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		53	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.11	Reinstate the wording "will only be supported where it meets local needs" and delete "there will be no significant housing growth at Kidlington".	The last bullet point removes the possibility of taking on board evidence from a currently missing local assessment of housing need, and undermines of the key purposes of the proposed Local Neighbourhoods DPD and the Kidlington Masterplan which are supposed to assess local housing need. It is too restrictive.
230	Patricia	Redpath	Kidlington Parish Council	53	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.11	Reverse changes and deletions made to the last bullet point.	The last bullet point seems to reduce prospects for housing development by saying there will be no significant housing growth in Kidlington, and deleting "will only be supported where it meets local needs". Reverse changes and deletions made to the last bullet point.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	53	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.11		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. Bicester's traffic congestion will continue to worsen due to the planned growth therefore growth should be focused at Banbury.
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	53	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.11		Support the recognition that Kidlington should be targeted for economic development, featuring alongside Banbury and Bicester. Kidlington should be grouped with Banbury and Bicester rather than the rural areas. Object to the 3rd bullet point and would like the wording reinstated from the Proposed Changes. A balance of houses and jobs in Kidlington is preferred. The Plan should not mention housing growth in Kidlington which could be addressed in the Local Neighbourhoods DPD.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	55	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.14	Reword the paragraph to make clear that this specifically supports the expansion of existing sustainable rural employment sites as well as the development of entirely new ones. Wording read as "New small scale rural employment proposals and the expansion of existing rural employment sites within rural areas will be supported if they meet the following criteria".	The Plan fails to address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester. No target identified for the amount of employment development to the rural areas. The Plan does not distribute new development around the District toward the most sustainable locations (other than to Banbury and Bicester).
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	55	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.14	Reword the paragraph to make clear that this specifically supports the expansion of existing sustainable rural employment sites as well as the development of entirely new ones. Wording read as "New small scale rural employment proposals and the expansion of existing rural employment sites within rural areas will be supported if they meet the following criteria". Add a new bullet point to provide for agricultural diversification proposals. "Where agricultural diversification schemes are proposed these will be supported particularly in sustainable rural locations".	The paragraph and Policy SLE 1 fails to address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester. No target identified for the amount of employment development to the rural areas. The Plan does not distribute new development around the District toward the most sustainable locations (other than to Banbury and Bicester).
213	Laura	Wilkinson	D2 Planning Ltd / Blue Cedar Homes	56	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.21		Supports the proposed wording change however it is necessary that the identified need is translated into specific policies to ensure that the required housing is provided to meet the changing needs and demands. The provision of specialist accommodation for the elderly should be specified by a quantum or target to meet the growing needs of the elderly.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	58	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.25	The Plan needs to be prepared having regard to the Sir John Harman Report.	Concerns on the viability of the proposal included in the Plan. Local Plan allocations should not be subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the Plan's viability. Reference made to Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	58	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	A.25		Supports the proposed wording change
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	59	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	Our Strategic Objectives for Ensuring Sustainable Development		SO13: Would the objective be applied to the Eco-Town exemplar phase? The outline plans suggest not, given the provision for car parking.
127	Valerie	Russell	Bodicote Parish Council	59	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	Our Strategic Objectives for Ensuring Sustainable Development		The paragraph conflicts with the proposed relocation of Banbury United FC to BAN12 as this will increase the use of the private car.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	59	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	Our Strategic Objectives for Ensuring Sustainable Development		The policy fails to ensure effective delivery of services to vulnerable and impaired mobility groups. Adequate access to appropriate local services should be a condition of any further development.
186	Sarah	Turner		59	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	Our Strategic Objectives for Ensuring Sustainable Development		Support the proposed wording change
109	David	Coates	Kingerlee Homes	60	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Paragraph A.28	The Council needs to provide clear evidence of the outcomes of having cooperated with adjoining authorities. If none can be provided then the Plan should be withdrawn.	There is no reference to or evidence of the Council having complied with the Duty to Cooperate. Simply stating the requirement without providing any evidence of having done so and, as a consequence, commenting on the outcomes does not satisfy the duty. This change appears to have been added as an afterthought. The Council needs to provide clear evidence of the outcomes of having cooperated with adjoining authorities. If none can be provided then the Plan should be withdrawn.
149	Tom	Ashley	Turnberry Planning / Merton College	60	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Paragraph A.28		The scale of housing need in Oxford should be considered. The proposed wording does not comply with the Duty to Cooperate as it does not explicitly recognise the issue of acute housing need in Oxford City, or give a commitment to actively working towards a cross boundary solution. Suggest adding "Constructively engage in an inter-authority process to identify strategic housing sites in the Oxford Housing Market Area to accommodate the acute unmet housing needs in Oxford City".
178	Michael	Crofton Briggs	Oxford City Council	60	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Paragraph A.28		Supports the proposed wording change, however would like the paragraph expanded to incorporate any wording agreed by Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership before the submission of the Local Plan.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	60	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Paragraph A.28		The new Duty to Cooperate paragraph is an afterthought and it appears that consideration of actual and potential cross border challenges have not informed the development of the Local Plan. The Council should consider neighbouring authorities housing requirements and identify the potential impacts they may have on the District. An up to date SHMA is needed.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
212	David	Keene	David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates Ltd	60	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Paragraph A.28	A more up to date SHMA is required.	There is little evidence to demonstrate how Duty to Cooperate has informed the plan making. The Council has continued to use the housing requirements set in the South East Plan. A more up to date SHMA is required and consideration is needed on the impacts from the neighbouring authorities.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	60	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Paragraph A.28		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements (the SHMA). The Council will need to work with neighbouring authorities as well as producing a SHLAA to establish realistic assumptions about the availability and suitability of land to meet the identified need for housing. There is no evidence to support the suggested windfall allowance. The production of SHMA and Duty to Cooperate are essential and must feed into the Plan. The Plan should identify Land at Warwick Road, Banbury as a housing allocation to provide for approximately 300 dwellings. The Housing Trajectory will need reviewing in particular the windfall allowance and the delivery rate at Canalside. Guidance and clarification needed on housing growth in rural villages.
252	Oliver	Taylor	Framptons Planning / Mintondale Developments Ltd	60	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Paragraph A.28		A joint SHMA with Stratford on Avon Council or South Northamptonshire Council has not been prepared. The statutory Duty to Cooperate has not been discharged by the Council.
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Policy		The Policy should be extended to make clear that at all times, 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. To address the housing shortfall, the Plan could allocate a greater number of smaller sites both around the sustainable main centres such as Bicester, but also in sustainable rural locations such as Adderbury. This will make the plan inherently flexible and able to adapt to rapid change.
129	Tim	Hibbert		61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	Policy PSD1: Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development		There is a clear bias towards the urban centres of Banbury and Bicester to the detriment of rural communities like Wendlebury. There is no study or evidence to show the impact of Bicester's expansion on Wendlebury.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Policy		Presumption in favour of sustainable development embodies the planning requirement to provide easy access to local services.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Policy		Supports the proposed wording change. Authorities are required to assess the likely cumulative impact on development in their area of all existing and proposed local and national standards.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
186	Sarah	Turner		61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Policy	Reword the policy to read "The Council will always work proactively with applicants jointly to find solutions which secure development that improves the economic, social and environmental conditions in the area". Complete the final paragraph.	Policy PSD1 appears to be a very sweeping statement, which could leave the Council unable to defend against inappropriate proposals. The final paragraph is incomplete.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Policy		Policy PSD1 is supported however the Policy should be worded to make it absolutely clear that the definition of "out of date" matches that within the NPPF.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Policy		Supports the proposed wording change
210	Angela	Reeve	Doelotte Real Estate / CEMEX UK Limited	61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Policy		Supports the proposed wording change
252	Oliver	Taylor	Framptons Planning / Mintondale Developments Ltd	61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Policy		Supports the proposed wording change
268	Anne	Hibbert		61	Strategy for Development in Cherwell	New Policy		There is a clear bias towards the urban centres of Banbury and Bicester to the detriment of rural communities like Wendlebury. There is no evidence to show the impact of Bicester's expansion on Wendlebury.
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	62	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.7		Investment in high-tech industries at Langford Lane is supported.
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	62	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.7		Investment in high-tech industries at Langford Lane is supported.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	64	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.13		Whilst Table 1 has been updated to take into account completions and the recent permission at Banbury 6 it remains unclear why further land has not been allocated for development within Banbury. Banbury is a primary regional centre and should therefore be the main focus for growth within the district up to 2031.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
134	Hannah	Smith	Indigo Planning / Albion Land Ltd	68	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.21		Bicester 11 should include other uses such as B1, B2 and or B8 and not be restricted to only B1 uses.
210	Angela	Reeve	Doeloitte Real Estate / CEMEX UK Limited	70	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.30		Supports the proposed wording change
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	72	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.34	Include a fourth criterion: "Improvement and appropriate expansion and redevelopment of existing employment sites and reuse of existing buildings and brownfield sites (reflecting their historic or cultural significance where appropriate)".	The Plan fails to 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. The Plan does not provide for new rural employment development and the management of the development of existing rural employment sites and fails to recognise the contribution that the expansion of existing sustainable rural employment sites could have in delivering sustainable development.
134	Hannah	Smith	Indigo Planning / Albion Land Ltd	74	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.40		Bicester 11 needs to be more flexible and should include other uses such as B1, B2 and or B8 and not be restricted to only B1 uses.
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	75	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.41		It will be good to make reference on consideration of local residents views. E.g. The proposed Albion Land development on the Middleton Stoney/Howes Lane.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	76	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.44	Delete paragraph B.44	The Plan fails to address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester. No target identified for the amount of employment development for rural areas. The Plan does not distribute new development around the District toward the most sustainable locations (other than to Banbury and Bicester).
210	Angela	Reeve	Doeloitte Real Estate / CEMEX UK Limited	78	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 1: Employment Development		The inclusion of the marketing requirement should be reconsidered.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
218	R	Jones	John Phillips Planning Consultancy / Dr R Jones	78	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 1: Employment Development		The Policy should be more flexible to include the recognition that employment sites on the periphery of the settlement can be developed without harm to surrounding land, and would require little in the way of additional infrastructure.
225	Alex	Arrol	Savills / Kennet Properties Ltd/Thames Water Group	78	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 1: Employment Development		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. Employment land is identified in the individual strategic allocations however there is no reference on how this impacts on the overall need. The Plan has only allocated one employment site in Banbury which is not sufficient.
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning	78	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 1: Employment Development	The proposed changes to A.14 should be deleted.	The Policy would not be effective in encouraging sustainable development in Cherwell. The criteria are inclusive rather than exclusive. Inconsistent with paragraph B.21. The proposed changes to A.14 should be deleted.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group	78	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 1: Employment Development		The vision for employment is difficult to achieve. If proposals do not meet the needs of the market, then development will not occur. Further analysis and explanation required.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	78	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 1: Employment Development	Add a new bullet point to provide for agricultural diversification proposals. "Where agricultural diversification schemes are proposed these will be supported particularly in sustainable rural locations".	The Plan fails to address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester. No target identified for the amount of employment development to the rural areas. The Plan does not distribute new development around the District toward the most sustainable locations (other than to Banbury and Bicester).
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	78	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 1: Employment Development	Reword the paragraph to make clear that this specifically supports the expansion of existing sustainable rural employment sites as well as the development of entirely new ones. Wording read as "New small scale rural employment proposals and the expansion of existing rural employment sites within rural areas will be supported if they meet the following criteria". Add a new bullet point to provide for agricultural diversification proposals. "Where agricultural diversification schemes are proposed these will be supported particularly in sustainable rural locations".	The paragraph and Policy SLE 1 fails to address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester. No target identified for the amount of employment development for the rural areas. The Plan does not distribute new development around the District toward the most sustainable locations (other than to Banbury and Bicester).

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
245	Damien	Holdstock	Turley Associates / I M Properties Ltd	78	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 1: Employment Development	The Plan should address the identified need set out against the high growth scenario which was stated in the Employment Land Review Update. This will ensure that there is a greater choice of sites for the market, and avoid overreliance on only a handful of sites which may be unduly delayed, or may not be capable of providing the form of development attractive to the market. The Plan should allocate further sites based on an up to date review of available sites, the existing employment land position and the proposed form of development achievable and supported for those employment sites already identified in the Plan.	The Plan does not allocate sufficient land for B2 and B8 employment uses. 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. Concerned that the sites allocated for B2 and B8 uses have not considered the form of development which can be achieved, and will be supported on these sites. The employment strategy does not reflect the likely loss of employment land through the LXB Banbury Gateway and Kraft scheme. Requirement for B2 and B8 uses is unknown. The Plan should address the identified need set out against the high growth scenario which was stated in the Employment Land Review Update. The Plan should allocate further employment sites.
251	Nick	Alston	GVA / Oxford Aviation Services Ltd	78	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 1: Employment Development		The Policy is silent on the redevelopment/regeneration of existing employment sites for employment uses. e.g. Oxford Airport. Include the following text in the policy "The redevelopment and intensification of existing employment sites for employment and complementary uses is supported in principle". Rework the policy to read "Other types of employment and complementary other uses will be considered in conjunction with the preferred uses if it makes it viable". The last paragraph should read "Where any employment sites in the district remain undeveloped or un/under-occupied and there is no reasonable prospect of the site being used for that purpose other uses will be considered, including housing.
228	Kiran	Ubbi	Turley Associates / Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd	79	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy			Inconsistencies exist with respect to retail policy. A number of reference to the Bicester Masterplan. The Plan should not prejudge the outcomes of the planned town centre boundary review which it does at present. Reference to the growth of Bicester town centre "...towards the improved Bicester Town Railway Station and on through to an expanded Bicester Village..." should be deleted.
257	David	Smith	Turley Associates / Scottish Widows Investment Partnership	79	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.51	The Policy should be revised to make clear that any short term negative capacity identified in the CBRE Retail Study, should not as as an impediment to proposed beneficial town centre development or investment.	Significant concern is expressed that as drafted (and with its clear reliance on the CBRE Retail Study findings), the Plan could act as a disincentive to short-medium term development that will clearly support the wider aspiration to consolidate, protect and enhance established centres. There is an obvious tension between the policies within the Plan and the Retail Study evidence base. Sites to accommodate growth in Banbury town centre are supported. The Policy should be revised to make clear that any short term negative capacity identified in the CBRE Retail Study, should not be an impediment to proposed beneficial town centre development or investment.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
228	Kiran	Ubbi	Turley Associates / Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd	80	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy			Inconsistencies exist with respect to retail policy. A number of reference to the Bicester Masterplan. The Plan should not prejudge the outcomes of the planned town centre boundary review which it does at present. Reference to the growth of Bicester town centre "...towards the improved Bicester Town Railway Station and on through to an expanded Bicester Village..." should be deleted.
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning	80	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.53	The paragraph should be deleted or rephrased to reiterate the sequential approach discussed elsewhere within the Plan.	The paragraph is inconsistent with other parts of the Plan which supports in-centre retail/office development in the first instance. It is inappropriate to imply a blanket restriction on any out of centre development of this nature. The paragraph should be deleted or rephrased to reiterate the sequential approach discussed elsewhere within the Plan.
281	V N	Smith	Quantock House	80	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.53		The Council is seeking to redevelop "Bolton Road" but is not rejecting 'out of town' proposals which will further reduce the need for town centre shops. This does not accord with this paragraph which does not support out of town office or retail development.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	84	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.57		Supports the proposed wording change
82	Joanna	Male	Gregory Gray Associates / Garden Centre Group	85	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres		The policy needs to be revised to encourage proposals for sustainable development on existing retail parks, subject to the provisions outlined in the NPPF. Alternatively a new policy which would guide new development on identified retail parks, aimed at protecting the vitality and viability of the town centres whilst encouraging the sustainable development of existing enterprises. Possibility of another new policy that would address the issue of new development associated with specialist retail uses that cannot be accommodated within town centres. Consider the inclusion of Bicester Avenue Garden Centre within the adjacent employment allocations. Suggest looking at the site's potential to provide food or non-food retail development, a leisure or tourism scheme.
178	Michael	Crofton Briggs	Oxford City Council	85	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres		Supports the proposed wording change
228	Kiran	Ubbi	Turley Associates / Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd	85	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres		The last paragraph provides no guidance or insight as to the quantified need resulting from the strategic housing allocations. 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 over the plan period.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
228	Kiran	Ubbi	Turley Associates / Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd	85	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy			Inconsistencies exist with respect to retail policy. A number of reference to the Bicester Masterplan. The Plan should not prejudge the outcomes of the planned town centre boundary review which it does at present. Reference to the growth of Bicester town centre "...towards the improved Bicester Town Railway Station and on through to an expanded Bicester Village..." should be deleted.
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning	85	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres	Amend paragraph to read "The Council will require a 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".	The Policy is poorly drafted. The paragraph in respect of transport should read "Be or can be made to accessible.....". Reference to the Retail Study should be deleted as this is not necessary and is repetitive. The thresholds for retail impact assessment should be re-worded in order to provide greater clarity. Amend paragraph to read "The Council will require a 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".
257	David	Smith	Turley Associates / Scottish Widows Investment Partnership	85	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres	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.	There is serious concern for the sites already identified for growth. Concerned over the ability of district centres to accommodate the scale of changes envisaged in CBRE's long term forecasts, potentially lending credibility to further out of centre retailing proposals. Additional out of centre retailing must be resisted. Retail evidence base should be reviewed every 5 years.
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	87	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.69		No mention of any proposals for a northern relief road since Howes Lane/Lords Lane are palpably unsuitable as a northern 'ring' road. Vendee Drive is a single carriageway road and not a dual carriageway as might be expected with more vehicles and HGVs due to new housing and employment.
60	Alison	Clements		87	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.69	Revise the Plan and maps to take into account the existence of Ambrosden and highlight the Grade II listed buildings. Review the Green Buffer boundaries to check whether they are sufficient. Consider re-aligning the options so that they do not pass through Wretchwick Farm.	Maps from the Movement Study ignore the existence of Ambrosden which gives a false impression of the Plan's population impact. Residential properties cannot be included within Green Buffers. Residential properties at Wretchwick Farm are Grade II listed buildings however no reference has been made to this. Do not support the proposed options 2c and 3 which will pass through Wretchwick Farm however support option 2b as it will cause less impact and contain Bicester's urban sprawl. Impacts on the residential properties should be minimised if Options 2c or 3 gets decided.
64	Doug	Irvine		87	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.69	Revise the Plan and maps to take into account the existence of Ambrosden and highlight the Grade II listed buildings. Review the Green Buffer boundaries to check whether they are sufficient. Consider re-aligning the options so that they do not pass through Wretchwick Farm.	Maps from the Movement Study ignore the existence of Ambrosden which gives a false impression of the Plan's population impact. Residential properties cannot be included within Green Buffers. Residential properties at Wretchwick Farm are Grade II listed buildings however no reference has been made on this. Do not support the proposed options 2c and 3 which will pass through Wretchwick Farm however support option 2b as it will cause less impact and contain Bicester's urban sprawl. Impacts on the residential properties should be minimised if Options 2c or 3 gets decided.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	87	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.69		The paragraph should also include the possible route at North West Bicester. No mention of the potential impact on Wendlebury of the proposed relief road.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	87	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.69		Objects to the proposed wording change
243	Sarah	Chambers		87	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.69		3 routes were identified in the Bicester Movement Study therefore the Plan should make reference to all 3 routes. No mention of the potential impact on Wendlebury of the proposed relief road.
255	Brett	Chambers		87	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.69		The paragraph should also include the possible route at North West Bicester. No mention of the potential impact on Wendlebury of the proposed relief road.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	87	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.69		The paragraph should not be specific. Refer to either "new relief road for Bicester" or "This will include the SW Bicester Perimeter Road....and highway capacity improvements on peripheral routes in Bicester....". "highway capacity improvements to the Windsor Street/Upper Cherwell Street corridor".
301	Gerald	Baldwin		87	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.72		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.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	88	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.72		Inclusion of the Movement Studies is supported. Amend text as "The Movement Studies propose sustainable movement and access strategies to deliver growth".
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	89	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.73		Strategic cycle lanes does not accurately reflect the proposals in the Movement Studies. Amend text as "Consideration will be given to the implementation of walking and cycling improvements which connect to employment areas, the town centre and key services and that link urban routes with the rights of way network".

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
230	Patricia	Redpath	Kidlington Parish Council	90	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.74	The words "within its existing boundaries" should be added.	This does not qualify the degree of growth potential at London Oxford Airport within its existing boundaries. The Council risks all development on the existing site and expansion beyond difficult to resist. This could draw in unwelcome and unsustainable levels of car-borne traffic, and unwelcome aircraft noise beyond the types of short runway aircraft able to use the existing runways. The words "within its existing boundaries" should be added.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	90	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	B.74		Amend the name of the airport to London Oxford Airport.
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	91	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections		No mention of a northern relief road.
70	Charles	Routh	Natural England	91	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections		Reference on species surveys is not sufficient. More evidence needed on the site allocations.
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	91	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections		It appears that the only option is South East relief road as it does not include the other possible routes.
243	Sarah	Chambers		91	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections		3 routes were identified in the Bicester Movement Study therefore the Plan should make reference to all 3 routes.
255	Brett	Chambers		91	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections		It appears that the only option is South East relief road as it does not include the other possible routes.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	91	Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy	Policy SLE 4: Improved Transport and Connections		Delete "Bicester South East relief road" as it is sufficient with "Transport improvements at Banbury and Bicester". Alternatively specific wording could include "highway capacity improvements to the Windsor Street/Upper Cherwell Street corridor in Banbury".

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
101	Simon	Turner	Launton Parish Council	94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86	Reinstate the words "green buffers" to read as "We aim to avoid development in inappropriate locations and coalescence with neighbouring settlements. Therefore, where appropriate, green buffers are being identified at the edges of the town (see 'Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth')".	Error in the proposed deletion of text. The sentence should read as "Therefore, where appropriate, green buffers are being identified...."
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86		The Bicester Green Buffer report by LDA directly conflicts with the draft Bicester Masterplan. This relates to Green Buffer 1 at Caversfield. The introduction of Green Buffers is wholly flawed. There is no need for Green Buffers as the policies in the Plan make clear that there should be development restraint and that development should not extend beyond the proposed allocations. Caversfield is physically joined to Bicester and has visual functional and social relationship with the urban area of Bicester. Therefore Caversfield is different to other surrounding villages such as Launton and Chesterton. Coalescence has already occurred and the Plan promotes further coalescence with Bicester 1 and 8 allocations. The narrowest point of the Green Buffer between Caversfield and Bicester is 250m wide which undermines its purpose compared to other Green Buffer boundaries. The Green Buffer at Caversfield should be removed.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86		The use of the word "aim" is too loose for a policy. The word "ensure" would suggest policy intent.
186	Sarah	Turner		94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86	Paragraph should be re-worded.	The paragraph needs re-wording with "We aim to avoid development in inappropriate locations and coalescence with neighbouring settlements. Therefore, where appropriate, Green Buffers are being identified at the edges of the two towns (see 'Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth')".
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86		Green Buffers do not protect the areas intended to be protected as the proposed wording allows the local authority to amend and change the boundaries to allow development.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86	Paragraph to be deleted.	The principles of this paragraph are adequately and appropriately addressed later in the Plan (B.285) therefore this paragraph should be deleted.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning	94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86	Amend the paragraph to read "We aim to avoid development in inappropriate locations and coalescence with neighbouring settlements. Therefore where appropriate green boundaries to growth have been established".	Critical words removed from the paragraph. There are clearly words missing and lacks clarity over the two towns to which it refers. Amend the paragraph to read "We aim to avoid development in inappropriate locations and coalescence with neighbouring settlements. Therefore where appropriate green boundaries to growth have been established".
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86	Green Buffers around Banbury and Bicester have not been objectively assessed. 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. Land to the south of Bodicote is suitable for development however it has been included within the Green Buffer. The site should be removed from the Green Buffer.	The Plan impose a blanket presumption against any development on the edge of Banbury (including Bodicote) and bicester without having considered in detail the relative merits of those sites and the opportunities they bring. Decision to impose Green Buffers is not justified. Policy ESD 15 is not supported by the NPPF. Land to the south of Bodicote should be removed from the Green Buffer.
243	Sarah	Chambers		94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86		The Green Buffers do not protect the areas intended to be protected as the proposed wording allows the local authority to amend and change the boundaries to allow development.
255	Brett	Chambers		94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86		Green Buffers do not protect the areas intended to be protected as the proposed wording allows the local authority to amend and change the boundaries to allow development.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	94	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.86		The 2nd sentence makes very little sense.
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	95	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.89		The Local Plan has been prepared to respond to regional and sub-regional objectives and be completed and implemented to deliver the growth envisaged in the South East Plan. This significantly underplays the district's housing requirements therefore not meeting the full objectively assessed housing needs. Absence of revisiting housing figures indicates a failure in the Council's duty to cooperate given that neighbouring authorities are bringing forward plans and re-considering their approach to housing need and delivery. The Interim Household Projections (2011) shows an increase housing requirement for the district from 670 dwellings per annum to 688 per annum.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	95	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.89		The rate of housing delivery from the South East Plan has continued to be used which is likely to lead to an overestimate of the need. A more sensitive local appraisal should be carried out after adoption of the Local Plan.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	95	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.89		Supports the proposed wording change
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	95	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.89		The Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply therefore current housing policies are out of date. The Council should consider revising the housing strategy to reflect the current economic climate.
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes	95	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.89	A new SHMA is required.	Support the principle of the paragraph however is concerned about the strong reference to the South East Plan following the revocation by the Government. In absence of an up to date SHMA, the housing numbers are not sufficiently robust and up to date therefore a new SHMA is required. Duty to Cooperate with regards to meeting housing needs across Oxfordshire is questioned.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	96	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.90		The Council has no regard to the NPPF as the South East Plan has been used.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	96	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.90		The Plan fails to address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester. It seeks to focus development on the urban areas at the expense of the rural areas, rather than considering the merits of a more dispersed development strategy. Consider amending the first bullet to read as "Development is focused on the most sustainable settlements in the District". Consider amending the second bullet to read as "Where large scale development is proposed for the District towns and villages, principles of 'Garden Cities' will be applied". If bullet 3 is retained the wording should read as "Most new development in the rural areas will be focused on the urban areas and the most sustainable larger villages. Rural areas are generally less sustainable than urban areas: there may generally be a greater need to travel to employment, schools, shops and other services, and few public transport opportunities may be available than would be found in the main towns in the District. All new development proposals for housing in the District will be expected to be accompanied by a detailed site sustainability appraisal. It is considered that development could only be sustainably accommodated in Cherwell's rural areas if the overall level of development were to be reduced".
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	97	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.91	Rural areas can make an important contribution to housing supply and this should be reflected in the Plan, and that this shortfall should be addressed conclusively and early in the plan period.	The Council cannot demonstrate a five year housing land supply therefore current housing policies are out of date. The Council should consider revising the housing strategy to reflect the current economic climate.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
76	Holly	Rhoades	Planning Potential Ltd / Gleeson Developments Ltd	98	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.92	Consider identifying and allocating Land south of Broughton Road, Banbury for housing. It is a suitable housing site which is available now, in a suitable location for development, is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered within five years and is viable. Site plan enclosed.	The LP does not identify or allocate sufficient specific housing sites to release land to meet the NPPF 5 year plus 5% buffer. The 2012 AMR shows a consistent under delivery of housing since 2007. The Council's allocated housing sites have failed to come forward therefore a 20% buffer should be applied to the identified housing sites. The LP should identify housing land beyond the housing target to build in a contingency for sites that do not come forward in order to facilitate annual delivery. The capacity of allocated housing sites particularly in Banbury has been revised down therefore there will be an under delivery against the Plan requirement. The allocations to the rest of the District does not meet the NPPF requirement of identifying specific housing sites that are deliverable in the next 5 years. There is overreliance on windfall sites in the Plan to meet the housing requirement and question the windfall allowance. The Housing Trajectory within the Plan shows that the Council has not identified housing sites to meet the annual target of 670 dwellings until 2014/15 due to the large strategic allocation sites not coming forward.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	98	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.92		The paragraph should make reference on windfall sites and that they are sites of a scale less than 10 dwellings. The following wording which is in line with Change no.104 should also be added. Windfall allowances refers specifically to "small previously development sites in urban areas and in villages as described in Policy Villages 1 and 2".
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	98	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.93		The Bicester Green Buffer report by LDA directly conflicts with the draft Bicester Masterplan. This relates to Green Buffer 1 at Caversfield. The introduction of Green Buffers is wholly flawed. There is no need for Green Buffers as the policies in the Plan make clear that there should be development restraint and that development should not extend beyond the proposed allocations. Caversfield is physically joined to Bicester and has visual functional and social relationship with the urban area of Bicester. Therefore Caversfield is different to other surrounding villages such as Launton and Chesterton. Coalescence has already occurred and the Plan promotes further coalescence with Bicester 1 and 8 allocations. The narrowest point of the Green Buffer between Caversfield and Bicester is 250m wide which undermines its purpose compared to other Green Buffer boundaries. The Green Buffer at Caversfield should be removed.
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	98	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.92	A reduced reliance on windfall development in the rural areas with greater emphasis on the positive allocations to meet local housing needs. More certainty over the policy intention with allocations to the villages and their purpose. An expression of how the provision of housing in the villages and rural areas is intended to achieve the housing objectives of the Plan.	There appears to be a disconnect between the objectives and local purpose of providing housing in the villages and rural areas and the method and justification for their distribution. Windfall allowance is too heavily relied on.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	98	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.92	Delete the last proposed sentence and Policy ESD 15.	Object to the last proposed sentence and the inclusion of Green Buffers as a whole and more specifically to the inclusion of land to the south of Bodicote within Green Buffer 5.
19	Suzanne	Bangert	Terence O'Rourke / The Ashworth Family	99	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.93		The Plan aims to increase the supply of homes and improve access to building however Policy Villages 1 effectively prohibits all new development within the Category 'C' villages except conversions. The Plan has not been prepared in accordance with paragraphs 54 and 55 of the NPPF. The paragraphs provide a presumption against isolated dwellings in the countryside but positively support housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities and where housing is promoted in response to local communities.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	99	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.93		Supports the proposed wording change
213	Laura	Wilkinson	D2 Planning Ltd / Blue Cedar Homes	99	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.93		Supports the proposed wording change however it is necessary that the identified need is translated into specific policies to ensure that the required housing is provided to meet the changing needs and demands. The provision of specialist accommodation for the elderly should be specified by a quantum or target to meet the growing needs of the elderly.
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	99	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.93	Clarity needed as to how the housing allocations are expected to achieve the well intentioned housing objectives for the villages. A reduced reliance on windfall development in the rural areas with greater emphasis on the positive allocations. More certainty over the policy intention with allocations to the villages and their purpose.	The distribution of the allocated sites in villages means that there will be very few options for providing market housing, affordable housing or elderly accommodation within those numbers.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
76	Holly	Rhoades	Planning Potential Ltd / Gleeson Developments Ltd	100	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.94	Consider identifying and allocating Land south of Broughton Road, Banbury for housing. It is a suitable housing site which is available now, in a suitable location for development, is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered within five years and is viable. Site plan enclosed.	The LP does not identify/allocate sufficient specific housing sites to release land to meet the NPPF 5 year supply plus 5% buffer. The 2012 AMR shows a consistent under delivery of housing since 2007. The allocated housing sites failed to come forward therefore a 20% buffer should be applied to identified housing sites. The Plan should identify housing land beyond the housing target to build in a contingency for sites that do not come forward to facilitate annual delivery. The capacity of allocated housing sites particularly in Banbury has been revised down therefore there will be an under delivery against the Plan requirement. Allocations to the rest of the District do not meet the NPPF requirement of identifying specific housing sites that are deliverable in the next 5 years. There is overreliance on windfall sites to meet the housing requirement and question the windfall allowance. The Housing Trajectory shows that the Council has not identified housing sites to meet the annual target of 670 dwellings to 2014/15 due to large strategic allocation sites not coming forward until then.
76	Holly	Rhoades	Planning Potential Ltd / Gleeson Developments Ltd	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	Consider identifying and allocating Land south of Broughton Road, Banbury for housing. It is a suitable housing site which is available now, in a suitable location for development, is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered within five years and is viable. Site plan enclosed.	The LP does not identify/allocate sufficient specific housing sites to release land to meet the NPPF 5 year supply plus 5% buffer. The 2012 AMR shows a consistent under delivery of housing since 2007. The allocated housing sites failed to come forward therefore a 20% buffer should be applied to identified housing sites. The Plan should identify housing land beyond the housing target to build in a contingency for sites that do not come forward to facilitate annual delivery. The capacity of allocated housing sites particularly in Banbury has been revised down therefore there will be an under delivery against the Plan requirement. Allocations to the rest of the District do not meet the NPPF requirement of identifying specific housing sites that are deliverable in the next 5 years. There is overreliance on windfall sites to meet the housing requirement and question the windfall allowance. The Housing Trajectory shows that the Council has not identified housing sites to meet the annual target of 670 dwellings to 2014/15 due to large strategic allocation sites not coming forward until then.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	Changes to the table within Policy BSC 1. Changes include increasing the numbers in the Allocations row which adjust the total of new homes from 16,750 to 20,650 dwellings.	Changes to the table within Policy BSC 1. Changes include increasing the numbers in the Allocations row which adjust the total of new homes from 16,750 to 20,650 dwellings.
95	Bruce	Tremayne	CPRE Oxfordshire	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The increase to the housing requirement (16,750 dwellings) due to the plan period being extended for a further 5 years is unnecessarily over ambitious, and there are concerns over infrastructure.
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The Local Plan has been prepared to respond to regional and sub-regional objectives and be completed and implemented to deliver the growth envisaged in the South East Plan. This significantly underplays the district's housing requirements therefore not meeting the full objectively assessed housing needs. Absence of revisiting housing figures indicates a failure in the Councils duty to cooperate given that neighbouring authorities are bringing

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The figures are from the South East Plan which will lead to an over assessment of the housing need.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	The amount of housing proposed to be allocated to Banbury should be increased.	The proposed distribution departs from that in the former RSS. Bicester despite having a significantly smaller estimate of fall-in will accommodate more housing than Banbury. A windfall allowance has been included for Banbury however there can be no certainty over these therefore should not be relied on.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The Council has continued to use the housing requirements set in the South East Plan. There has been an under delivery of housing completions since 2006. It is highly likely that the proposed target of 670 dwellings per annum is a substantial underestimate of future housing requirements in Cherwell. The Council do not have a clear understanding of the full, objectively assessed housing requirements for both affordable and market housing. A more up to date SHMA is required and until this is produced the Local Plan should not proceed any further. The housing growth is focused in the main settlements of Banbury and Bicester however there is a risk of over relying on deliver in these areas. There needs to be flexibility and contingencies in place.
197	Dominic	Lawson	Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning Ltd / Gracewell Healthcare	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		Supports the proposed change to boost rural communities and generate employment that supports villages with good services.
199	Peter	Atkin	Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	The housing figure for Bicester should be reduced by at least 10% and allocated to Rest of District.	The additional homes to be provided is supported. The housing provision for the rural areas should be protected from any future reviews. The current allocations in rural areas already represents a significant undersupply when compared with demand, therefore more housing should be allocated in rural areas. Concerned over the deliverability of some of the strategic housing allocations, in particular North West Bicester. There is an over-reliance on large strategic allocations and there should be a flexible and robust approach that allows for the development of smaller sites in larger settlements in rural areas. The housing figure for Bicester should be reduced by at least 10% and allocated to rest of District.
213	Laura	Wilkinson	D2 Planning Ltd / Blue Cedar Homes	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The overall housing requirement is supported. There are no positive references to the provision of specialist market housing for the elderly. 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 policy should be redrafted to encourage the provision of specific housing requirements to be provided where a local need exists and not primarily focussed within those villages identified as the main focus for housing development.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
223	David	French	Deddington Development Watch	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	The overall housing requirement of 16,750 dwellings should be deleted and replaced by a figure derived from an up to date and relevant evidence base as regards district housing need. Housing trajectory to be revised.	The Council has continued to use the housing requirements set in the South East Plan which raises concerns. The overall housing requirement of 16,750 dwellings should be deleted. A new SHMA is needed.
227	Grahame	Handley		103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	The overall housing requirement of 16,750 dwellings should be deleted and replaced by a figure derived from an up to date and relevant evidence base as regards district housing need. Housing trajectory to be revised.	The Council has continued to use the housing requirements set in the South East Plan which raises concerns. It is not justified by up to date and relevant evidence base as regards district housing need, both market and affordable, over this extended period.
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	As a minimum 800 dwellings per annum should be provided for by Policy BSC1 (minimum of 20,000 dwellings).	Support in principle the proposed district wide housing distribution and to focus the housing growth in the main settlements of Banbury and Bicester. However the overall housing figure for the district is too low and will not meet housing need. The latest household projections indicate a significant increase in household formations that were anticipated. The 2012 Annual Monitoring Report shows an under delivery of new homes. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates a significant total housing need including unmet need for affordable housing. Significant additional housing should be provided to address the requirements to house an increasing population.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements. The Council is under-estimating current housing needs especially when the rate of delivery at NW Bicester could be increased beyond the current 1,793 rate (up to 2031), as proposed to meet needs.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	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. Rural allocations should be increased to the levels set in the Proposed Submission. As a result housing allocated to strategic sites around Banbury and Bicester and windfall allowance should be reduced.	The Plan fails to provide a clear justified and effective way to meet the Districts housing needs across the plan period, and fails to provide an effective strategy for resolving the District's on-going housing land supply problems. The majority of development will be directed to the urban areas which is not justified by the NPPF. 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. Rural allocations should be increased to the levels set in the Proposed Submission. As a result housing allocated to strategic sites around Banbury and Bicester and windfall allowance should be reduced.
241	Kathryn	Venthams	Barton Willmore / Taylor Wimpey South West	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	The housing requirement should be increased to 24,199 dwellings (968 dwellings per annum) over the Plan period.	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 housing requirement should be increased to 24,199 dwellings (968 dwellings per annum) over the Plan period.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The Plan does not provide sufficient flexibility to ensure the successful delivery of the housing strategy. The Plan should take account of market signals when identifying land for development and should be responsive to local circumstances and plan for housing development to reflect local needs.
252	Oliver	Taylor	Framptons Planning / Mintondale Developments Ltd	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The housing growth is focused in the main settlements of Banbury and Bicester however there is a risk of over relying on delivery in these areas.
253	Kathryn	Ventham	Barton Willmore / Archstone Land and Persimmon Homes	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution	The housing requirement should be increased to 24,199 dwellings (968 dwellings per annum) over the Plan period.	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 housing requirement should be increased to 24,199 dwellings (968 dwellings per annum) over the Plan period.
279	Peter	Burrows	Adderbury Conservation Action Group	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The revocation of the South East Plan and its housing assessment that Cherwell have adopted will probably lead to an overestimate of the strategic housing need.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	103	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		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. Bicester's traffic congestion will continue to worsen due to the planned growth therefore growth should be focused at Banbury.
171	Colin	Cockshaw	Bicester against Eco-Con)	104	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.98	Delete Policy Bicester 1.	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%. If Policy Bicester 1 was removed this would substantially improve the proportion of brownfield land allocated for development in Bicester.
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	104	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.98	As a minimum 800 dwellings per annum should be provided for by Policy BSC1 (minimum of 20,000 dwellings).	Support in principle the proposed district wide housing distribution and to focus the housing growth in the main settlements of Banbury and Bicester. However the overall housing figure for the district is too low and will not meet housing need. The latest household projections indicate a significant increase in household formations that were anticipated. The 2012 Annual Monitoring Report shows an under delivery of new homes. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates a significant total housing need including unmet need for affordable housing. Significant additional housing should be provided to address the requirements to house an increasing population.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	104	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.98	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. Rural allocations should be increased to the levels set in the Proposed Submission. As a result housing allocated to strategic sites around Banbury and Bicester and windfall allowance should be reduced.	The Plan fails to provide a clear justified and effective way to meet the Districts housing needs across the plan period, and fails to provide an effective strategy for resolving the Districts on-going housing land supply problems. The majority of development will be directed to the urban areas which is not justified by the NPPF. 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. Rural allocations should be increased to the levels set in the Proposed Submission. As a result housing allocated to strategic sites around Banbury and Bicester and windfall allowance should be reduced.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	104	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.98		The Plan does not provide sufficient flexibility to ensure the successful delivery of the housing strategy. The Plan should take account of market signals when identifying land for development and should be responsive to local circumstances and plan for housing development to reflect local needs.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	105	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.99		Supports the proposed wording change
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	105	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.99		The minimum density of 30 dwellings per hectare raises concern as it is difficult to provide family housing and housing for the elderly where stringent higher minimum densities are prescribed by policy. It is also challenging for developers who will also need to meet Highways requirements such as refuse. The Local Plan allocations will not meet the required housing in the district therefore additional housing allocations should be provided to meet the full objectively assessed housing needs.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	105	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.99	Reference to minimum density requirements should be removed as this is contrary to the NPPF. Greater emphasis on the effective use of land to individual circumstances should be reinstated into the Plan.	The density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare is too prescriptive. The capability to assess sites on individual circumstances needs to be added to the policy text in order to provide the most appropriate development for individual sites, rather than set a minimum requirement.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		105	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.99	Include the wording "In appropriate locations, the density will be expected to be higher".	There is no guidance as to what would be expected in urban locations, and makes it harder for the Council to object to developments that are of a density suited to rural areas, but not well-connected urban centre areas.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	105	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.99	As a minimum 800 dwellings per annum should be provided for by Policy BSC1 (minimum of 20,000 dwellings).	Support in principle the proposed district wide housing distribution and to focus the housing growth in the main settlements of Banbury and Bicester. However the overall housing figure for the district is too low and will not meet housing need. The latest household projections indicate a significant increase in household formations that were anticipated. The 2012 Annual Monitoring Report shows an under delivery of new homes. The Strategic Housing Market Assessment indicates a significant total housing need including unmet need for affordable housing. Significant additional housing should be provided to address the requirements to house an increasing population.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	105	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.99		The Plan does not provide sufficient flexibility to ensure the successful delivery of the housing strategy. The Plan should take account of market signals when identifying land for development and should be responsive to local circumstances and plan for housing development to reflect local needs.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	106	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Delivery		Supports the proposed wording change however the application of the policy should be subject to the individual circumstances for any particular site.
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd	106	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Delivery	The capability to assess sites on individual circumstances needs to be added to the policy text in order to provide the most appropriate development for individual sites, rather than set a minimum requirement.	The density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare is too prescriptive. The capability to assess sites on individual circumstances needs to be added to the policy text in order to provide the most appropriate development for individual sites, rather than set a minimum requirement.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	106	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Delivery		Development of new homes should be allocated to brownfield sites and sites that do not cause strain to existing infrastructure. The density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare is not supported. The density should be controlled by the location of the site. In a rural setting, the Parish Council would advocate a density of (at most) 25 dwellings per hectare to allow for adequate garden space for families. The maintenance of the rural aspect is paramount.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	106	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Delivery		The target of 45% of new homes to be developed on previously developed land appears too ambitious and could potentially have an adverse impact on housing delivery. The density requirement of 30 dwellings per hectare is unnecessary and inappropriate. Scheme density should be considered on a site by site bases to reflect the character and form of the surrounding settlement along with any specific site constraints.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	106	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land - Brownfield Land and Housing Delivery		The Plan does not provide sufficient flexibility to ensure the successful delivery of the housing strategy. The Plan should take account of market signals when identifying land for development and should be responsive to local circumstances and plan for housing development to reflect local needs.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	107	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.102		It is unclear if the identified need for affordable housing considers the significant backlog of need. Affordable housing requirements should be based on robust viability evidence to ensure they do not place too onerous a requirement on development rendering schemes unviable.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	114	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing	The policy did not embrace the changes suggested in the representation submitted to the Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation in August 2012.	The policy did not embrace the changes suggested in the representation submitted to the Proposed Submission Local Plan consultation in August 2012.
109	David	Coates	Kingerlee Homes	114	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing	References to 'gross' in the policy should be replaced with 'net'.	The policy on the provision of affordable housing should use a net figure when referring to the threshold and capacity.
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd	114	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing		Economic circumstances of development will change over the Plan period and there will be a need to address this on any individual development. 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. Policy needs supporting text which identifies that promoters of development can provide 'open book' financial analysis where they consider there are viability issues.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	114	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing	Specific affordable housing percentages should not be included in the policy. A more flexible approach is needed.	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 Plan does not consider the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans". Local Plan allocations should not be subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the Plan's viability to be developed viably.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	114	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing		The requirement of financial contribution is supported. The rational in the assumption that a site could accommodate 3 or more dwellings, in a rural setting is questionable. Applications should be viewed on an individual site basis taking account of location, traffic capacity and safety and resulting impacts on the existing infrastructure.
199	Peter	Atkin	Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd	114	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing	A more flexible approach should be applied which is consistent with the NPPF.	The need to provide affordable housing is generally supported however the affordable housing requirement for rural areas is objected. The Policy could threaten the viability of a site. Individual sites circumstances should always be fully taken into account where viability becomes an issue. The inclusion of flexibility via an economic viability assessment in cases where a developer is concerned that a scheme would be unviable is therefore supported and welcomed.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
213	Laura	Wilkinson	D2 Planning Ltd / Blue Cedar Homes	114	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing		The provision of affordable housing is generally supported however this policy is overly onerous in terms of the affordable housing requirement. The requirement would result in large family dwellings in order to subsidise the 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 and the policy should acknowledge that where a proposed development addresses a specific local need, this would be an appropriate situation which could seek an alternative to on-site provision.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		114	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing	The threshold for Kidlington should be reduced to 3.	The affordable housing threshold for Kidlington should be reduced to 3 due to the high land values.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group	114	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing		Supports the policy for the provision of affordable housing. The flexibility to adjust quantum and tenure to reflect site circumstances (site location and scheme characteristics as well as viability) is essential.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	118	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix		Supports the table to be removed from the policy and the proposed wording change. However disagree with the third paragraph which refers to a minimum requirement of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings on strategic sites. Provision of such homes at particular locations should be the subject to negotiations and involve the specialist providers of such homes. Consider adding "It is anticipated that, where appropriate, the strategic housing sites will include a number of self-contained extra care dwellings, the amount and location for which will be agreed between providers and the applicants".
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	118	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.126		It is unclear what constitutes a strategic housing site and why a figure of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings has been chosen. Clarification needed.
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd	118	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix		Supports the deletion of Table 4 and the proposed wording change. The minimum requirement of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings should significantly contribute towards the on site affordable housing requirement.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	118	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix	Plans needs to be realistic, and should ensure that the impact of the policies when read as whole should be such that the plan is deliverable. Unclear how weight will be attributed to the Council's evidence and developer's evidence. Local Plan allocations should not be subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the Plan's viability.	Object to the requirement for strategic sites to provide a minimum of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings as part of the overall mix in addition to affordable housing. No assessment of the implications on the viability of development is provided to support the requirement nor has the policy requirement made any reference to the overall viability of schemes.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	118	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix		Supports the proposed wording change
199	Peter	Atkin	Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd	118	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix		Supports the proposed wording change.
213	Laura	Wilkinson	D2 Planning Ltd / Blue Cedar Homes	118	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix		The provision of a mix of housing is generally supported however this policy is overly onerous in terms of the requirement for self-contained extra care dwellings. The mixture of dwelling types and sizes does not take into account circumstances where it may not be appropriate to seek a mix of housing. The policy should be redrafted to exclude development schemes where a proposed development addresses a specific local need. The policy should encourage the provision of specific housing requirements to be provided where a local need exists and not primarily focussed within those villages identified as the main focus for housing development. The requirement for self-contained extra care dwellings should be deleted. Extra care dwellings should be exempted from providing affordable housing.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group	118	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix		Criticisms of the policy where the Council now only wishes to prescribe residential mix in terms of 1 bed units at strategic sites.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	118	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix		The Policy does not need to require a minimum requirement for extra care housing but instead should delegate the numbers to agreement with the LPA. The Policy specifically includes extra care dwellings however this is too restrictive as other types of accommodation may be required later in the plan period. Amend policy to read "Strategic housing sites will be expected to provide contained extra care dwellings or other forms of supported living accommodation as part of the overall mix (with the precise numbers to be agreed between the local planning authority, developers and operators). Elsewhere, opportunities for the provision of extra care accommodation will be encouraged in suitable locations close to services and facilities. All proposals for extra care housing will be expected to provide affordable housing in accordance with Policy BSC 3: Affordable Housing. subject to viability".
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	121	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.142		There is very little evidence in the Plan of effective assessment of school provision within rural areas.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	121	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.142		A number of wards that are experiencing community and social issues have been identified in the Local Plan and it is envisaged that the Plan will help to address these issues with the planned developments. This approach should be extended to other wards within Banbury over the life of the Plan. Oxfordshire County Council owns and occupies a range of property assets within Banbury but there are other publicly owned property assets in the town. These assets could help secure a new way of delivering services to the local community and make best use of the County Council's property portfolio.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	124	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 7: Meeting Education Needs		A number of wards that are experiencing community and social issues have been identified in the Local Plan and it is envisaged that the Plan will help to address these issues with the planned developments. This approach should be extended to other wards within Banbury over the life of the Plan. Oxfordshire County Council owns and occupies a range of property assets within Banbury but there are other publicly owned property assets in the town. These assets could help secure a new way of delivering services to the local community and make best use of the County Council's property portfolio.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	125	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.150		A number of wards that are experiencing community and social issues have been identified in the Local Plan and it is envisaged that the Plan will help to address these issues with the planned developments. This approach should be extended to other wards within Banbury over the life of the Plan. Oxfordshire County Council owns and occupies a range of property assets within Banbury but there are other publicly owned property assets in the town. These assets could help secure a new way of delivering services to the local community and make best use of the County Council's property portfolio.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	127	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 9: Public Services and Utilities		A number of wards that are experiencing community and social issues have been identified in the Local Plan and it is envisaged that the Plan will help to address these issues with the planned developments. This approach should be extended to other wards within Banbury over the life of the Plan. Oxfordshire County Council owns and occupies a range of property assets within Banbury but there are other publicly owned property assets in the town. These assets could help secure a new way of delivering services to the local community and make best use of the County Council's property portfolio.
39	Sue	Mackrell	Bicester Town Council	129	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities		162	The SW Sports Village at Kingsmere will address the known shortfall in outdoor sports and recreation provision to 2008/09. Bicester has grown since and consequently the deficiency in recreational open space remains unaddressed. The plan does not address the accelerating need for recreational open space and green space through the Plan period.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	129	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.162		The Plan should not make reference to absent work such as the Banbury Masterplan.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	130	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Table 8: Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Provision	Plans needs to be realistic, and should ensure that the impact of the policies when read as whole should be such that the plan is deliverable. Unclear how weight will be attributed to the Council's evidence and developer's evidence. 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 Council's evidence base is not considered up to date.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	130	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Table 8: Local Standards of Provision - Outdoor Provision		Supports the proposed wording change. 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.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	131	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.181	Plans needs to be realistic, and should ensure that the impact of the policies when read as whole should be such that the plan is deliverable. Unclear how weight will be attributed to the Council's evidence and developer's evidence. Local Plan allocations should not be subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the Plan's viability.	Fail to have proper regard to the impact on the viability of development in securing the climate change objectives. Specific reference should be made to the need to ensure that such requirements do not have an adverse impact of the viability of development proposals.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	131	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.181		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted once evidence have been prepared and considered.
40	Richard	Broadbent		132	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.183		Remove the reference to the larger villages as the most sustainable locations for growth.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	132	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.183		Not all the villages in Policies Villages 1 and 2 have a range of services that reduce the need to travel by car.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	132	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.183	Plans needs to be realistic, and should ensure that the impact of the policies when read as whole should be such that the plan is deliverable. Unclear how weight will be attributed to the Council's evidence and developer's evidence. Local Plan allocations should not be subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the Plan's viability to be developed viably.	Fail to have proper regard to the impact on the viability of development in securing the climate change objectives. Specific reference should be made to the need to ensure that such requirements do not have an adverse impact of the viability of development proposals.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	132	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.183		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted on once evidence have been prepared and considered.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	132	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.183		Supports the proposed wording change

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	133	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change	Plans needs to be realistic, and should ensure that the impact of the policies when read as whole should be such that the plan is deliverable. Unclear how weight will be attributed to the Council's evidence and developer's evidence. Local Plan allocations should not be subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the Plan's viability to be developed viably.	Fail to have proper regard to the impact on the viability of development in securing the climate change objectives. Specific reference should be made to the need to ensure that such requirements do not have an adverse impact of the viability of development proposals.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	133	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change		Supports the proposed wording change. It is essential that the evidence of establishing sustainable locations is robust and regularly reviewed. It is vital that safety is paramount when considering transport to schools.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	133	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted on once evidence have been prepared and considered.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group	133	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change		The policy makes reference to reduced dependence on private car, which does not adequately consider the continued emergence of electric vehicles. The Policy is inflexible, and implies all elements would be required. The Policy should set out options to consider only.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	133	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change	The Plan should consider increasing the housing allocations in the rural areas as larger villages have an important role to play in delivering the objectives of the policy.	The Plan does not consider allocating more development to the rural areas and the sustainability benefits. The policy is supported. The Plan need to allocate more housing and employment development in the rural areas, and particularly in the larger villages. Larger villages have an important role to play in delivering the objectives of the policy.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	134	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.185	Policy ESD 2: Energy Hierarchy 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.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	134	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.185		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted once evidence have been prepared and considered.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	134	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.185	The requirement for developers to submit a Energy Statement should be deleted.	The requirement for developers to submit a Energy Statement is unnecessary as this is not a planning matter therefore this should be deleted. This represents an additional financial burden on development. Carbon emissions reductions to be achieved through allowable solutions is premature as the Government has not yet determined what will constitute an 'allowable solution'.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	135	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 2: Energy Hierarchy	Policy ESD 2: Energy Hierarchy 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.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	135	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 2: Energy Hierarchy		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted once evidence have been prepared and considered.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	135	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 2: Energy Hierarchy		The Plan should not specify how the national carbon reduction targets or any local target that exceeds the Building Regulations are achieved. This is a not a planning matter therefore should be deleted. An explanation is needed which addresses the legal issues. The policy is unnecessary as the Government's target is for all homes to be built to zero carbon standards by April 2016.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	136	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.189	Policy ESD 2: Energy Hierarchy 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.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	136	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.189		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted once evidence have been prepared and considered.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	136	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.189		Supports the proposed wording change
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction		Construction standards required for new homes should be at least in line with the prevailing Building Regulations. The policy of the Coalition Government is to achieve zero carbon homes by 2016. Policy ESD 3 is proposed to be amended to help with the trajectory towards zero carbon homes however its shelf life will in fact be limited by the time that Plan gets adopted.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction		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). The policy should make clear that achieving specific code level targets is appropriate where a scheme remains viable and thus deliverable in accordance with the NPPF. Methods of construction and sustainability should be addressed through the Building Regulations and not the planning system.
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction		No evidence shown for the requirement of all new homes to meet Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes and the acceleration of the higher levels of carbon compliance than national building regulations on Strategic Development sites. No mandatory requirement for Level 4 and the policy is too prescriptive and potentially impracticable. The additional costs associated may affect the proposed supply and delivery of new homes.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction		Delivery of sites will be put at risk due to the financial burden placed upon them. Consideration of viability is a key factor. The Plan does not consider the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans". The Council's evidence base fails to properly consider the cost implications of building to Code Level 5. Policy ESD 3 has been prepared in isolation and fails to consider the cumulative impact of other financial burdens imposed by policies in the Local Plan.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted once evidence have been prepared and considered.
199	Peter	Atkin	Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction	The policy should simply refer applicants to existing standards rather than prescribe unreasonable criteria above national standards.	Concerned that the policy seeks to apply Code Level standards which will already be the subject of national regulation through the Building Control and other regulatory regimes. The Plan could seek to 'encourage' higher environmental performance by reducing financial obligations on a development scheme in other regards to balance out effects on project viability.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction	The viability modelling will need reviewing.	The policy is not supported by evidence base. 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. To achieve this as well as meeting the affordable housing requirement will have an impact on a site's viability. The cost of policies should be assessed by the Council to ensure that development is viable. The viability modelling will need reviewing.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction	The Policy needs to be reworded to reflect national policy, thereby ensuring it does not compromise the viability of a development. The Policy also needs to acknowledge that alternative assessment methodologies and more bespoke sustainability appraisals of the development can be used to demonstrate compliance with the aims of the policy. The Policy should promote cost effective development in order to deliver affordable housing.	The standards are over and above current national Building Regulations requirements. The Policy needs to recognise that sustainable construction methods should be applied where viable and practical. The proposed standards will act as a disincentive to development and have a knock on effect on development delivery rates. 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. The Policy should distinguish between the requirements at outline/detailed application stage and promote cost effective development in order to deliver affordable housing.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction		Policy Bicester 1 predetermines dwellings should achieve Level 5 Sustainable Homes which does not accord with the PPS1 Supplement which require dwellings to meet Level 4 standards. References to "embodied energy within buildings" in Policy ESD 3 are ambiguous, and further clarity is required.
261	Ellen	O'Grady	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	137	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 3: Sustainable Construction		Clarification is needed on the references to "standards" and "immediate effect" within the first sentence. The supporting text makes reference to flexibility which should also be included within the Policy itself. The blanket approach for Code Level 4 is not justified or consistent with National Policy. Policy should be amended as "All new homes will be encouraged to meet Code Level 4 of the Code for Sustainable Homes, unless exceeded by national standards". Parts of the policy conflict with paragraph 95 of the NPPF. Local requirements should align with the Government's national zero carbon timetable for buildings and there is no justification for exceeding this national standard. The Policy makes no reference to off-site 'allowable solutions'
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	138	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.194	The proposed policy needs to be flexible to deal with changing circumstances and needs to better reflect viability and deliverability.	Object to combined heat and power at district level. The Council cannot stipulate the manner by which developers achieve the carbon emission reduction targets. The policy is overly prescriptive. Policy ESD 4 fails to have proper regard to viability and the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans".
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	138	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.194		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted once evidence have been prepared and considered.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	139	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 4: Decentralised Energy Systems	The proposed policy needs to be flexible to deal with changing circumstances and needs to better reflect viability and deliverability.	Object to combined heat and power at district level. The Council cannot stipulate the manner by which developers achieve the carbon emission reduction targets. The policy is overly prescriptive. Policy ESD 4 fails to have proper regard to viability and the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans".

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	139	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 4: Decentralised Energy Systems		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted once evidence have been prepared and considered.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	139	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 4: Decentralised Energy Systems		Carbon emission reduction targets should be a matter for developers to determine and not stipulated by the Council. The Council's viability assessment has not demonstrated that it can sustain the policy including the requirement that all development achieves Code 5.
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	139	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 4: Decentralised Energy Systems	Policy ESD 4 and ESD 5 should be combined. The final sentence of ESD 4 should be amended as "Where feasibility assessments demonstrate that decentralised energy systems are deliverable and viable, such systems will be encouraged as part of the development". The feasibility study should cover all Low Zero Carbon and Renewable energy solutions in order to ensure the most suitable technology is considered. Justification needed on the thresholds used.	The systems identified may not be the most effective when other effective solutions are available however they will be excluded due to the policy wording. The Policy wording itself is inconsistent as words "encouraged" and "required" are used within the policy. Justification needed on the thresholds used. Policy ESD 4 and ESD 5 should be combined. The Policy should distinguish between the requirements at outline/detailed application stage.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	140	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.195		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted on once evidence have been prepared and considered.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	141	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.197		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted once evidence have been prepared and considered.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	142	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.199		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted on once evidence have been prepared and considered.
47	Martin	Small	English Heritage	143	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy		Supports the proposed wording change

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	143	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy		Supports the proposed wording change.
183	Alan	Jones		143	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy		Support the proposed wording change
184	Karen	Jones		143	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy		Support the proposed wording change
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	143	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy	The policy needs to be more flexible and recognise that viability is a key factor.	Object to the policy. Places onerous burdens upon the development. Local Plan needs to be realistic, and should ensure that the impact of the policies when read as whole should be such that the plan is deliverable. The Plan does not consider the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans". Local Plan allocations should not be subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the Plan's viability to be developed viably.
186	Sarah	Turner		143	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy		Support the proposed wording change. The 3rd bullet point should end with "and their settings".
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	143	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy		Supports the proposed wording. All new developments should aim for zero carbon impact on their location. Sites allocated to deliver renewable energy must demonstrate the benefit to the local community.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	143	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy		Policies ESD 1 - 5 have been written without any evidence base as it is still being prepared. The policies should be re-consulted once evidence have been prepared and considered.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	143	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy	Policy ESD 4 and ESD 5 should be combined. The final sentence of ESD 4 should be amended as "Where feasibility assessments demonstrate that decentralised energy systems are deliverable and viable, such systems will be encouraged as part of the development". Justification needed on the thresholds used.	There is no national requirement to provide on-site renewable energy systems, whether a feasibility report identifies that they are deliverable or not. The Policy does not set out the Council's expectations for exceeding the national Building Regulations or set out a benchmark from which the reduction should be calculated. The aims of the Policy conflicts with Policy ESD 4 and does not encourage the most appropriate Low and Zero Carbon technologies to be selected for the site. The requirements are already reflected in the proposed methodologies detailed in Policy ESD 3. Justification needed on the thresholds used.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group	143	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 5: Renewable Energy		The policy should make reference to viability.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	145	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management		Supports the proposed wording change. Clarification is needed on the removal of existing culverts. Flood Risk Assessments should explore all potential sources of flood risk and water contamination to water sources further from the immediate flood risk zone.
95	Bruce	Tremayne	CPRE Oxfordshire	148	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 7: 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. Concerned if the existing sewage works can really cope with the new developments.
186	Sarah	Turner		149	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.218	Amend the sentence to read "Some development can remediate contaminated land which may be having an adverse impact on controlled water and human health".	Wording is unclear and makes it sound as if the remediation has an adverse impact. Amend the sentence to read "Some development can remediate contaminated land which may be having an adverse impact on controlled water and human health".
70	Charles	Routh	Natural England	154	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment	The policy could be made clearer by reading "If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then development will not be permitted".	The policy could be made clearer by reading "If significant harm resulting from a development cannot be avoided (through locating on an alternative site with less harmful impacts), adequately mitigated, or, as a last resort, compensated for, then development will not be permitted".
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	154	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 10: Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment	The policy needs to be more flexible and recognise that viability is a key factor.	Object to Policy ESD 10.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	155	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.240	The policy needs to be more flexible and recognise that viability is a key factor.	Object to Policy ESD 10.
1	Malcolm	Watt	Cotswolds Conservation Board	156	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.241		Supports the proposed wording change
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	156	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.241	The policy needs to be more flexible and recognise that viability is a key factor.	Object to Policy ESD 10.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	156	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.241		Supports the proposed wording change
2	Malcolm	Watt	Cotswolds Conservation Board	157	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.244		Supports the proposed wording change
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	157	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.244	The policy needs to be more flexible and recognise that viability is a key factor.	Object to Policy ESD 10.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	158	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 12: Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty		Supports the proposed wording change
70	Charles	Routh	Natural England	159	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.245		Supports the proposed wording change
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	159	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.245		The Policy and supporting text needs to acknowledge that some landscapes will be more sensitive than others, and that where specific development proposals come forward, a specific appraisal of the landscape character and effects of development in that location will need to be undertaken.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	160	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.248	Delete the proposed wording	The landscape assessment was prepared after the allocation of housing sites and the proposed Green Buffer policy and allocations therefore it is not evidence base supporting the policies within the Plan.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	160	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.248		The Policy and supporting text needs to acknowledge that some landscapes will be more sensitive than others, and that where specific development proposals come forward, a specific appraisal of the landscape character and effects of development in that location will need to be undertaken.
47	Martin	Small	English Heritage	161	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.249	The proposed removal of text in the 4th bullet point should be retained.	The proposed removal of text in the 4th bullet point should be retained. The Grade II* Registered Park at Wroxton Abbey and the borrowed vistas up the Cherwell Valley from Brougham should be recognised as landscape features of value.
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	161	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.249		"The open and agricultural setting and identity of the outlying villages surround Bicester" will be threatened by the proposed South East relief road.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	161	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.249	Include the wording "These will be given weight appropriate to their international/national/local importance, consistent with NPPF Paras 14, 113 and 128-141" after '...local communities'.	Salt Way is not a 'key landform and landscape feature' of the District.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	161	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.249		Objects to the removal of reference to the Grade II* Wroxton Abbey Park and the borrowed vistas up the Cherwell Valley from Rousham. Reference to Sor Brook and Graven Hill is supported.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	161	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.249		The Policy and supporting text needs to acknowledge that some landscapes will be more sensitive than others, and that where specific development proposals come forward, a specific appraisal of the landscape character and effects of development in that location will need to be undertaken.
243	Sarah	Chambers		161	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.249		The 1st bullet point will be directly threatened by the proposed South East relief road.
255	Brett	Chambers		161	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.249		"The open and agricultural setting and identity of the outlying villages surrounding Bicester" will be threatened by the proposed South East relief road.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
299	Peter	Brown	Drayton Parish Council	161	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.249		Supports the proposed wording change
51	Lucy	Murfett	South Oxfordshire District Council	162	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.255	Delete the 3rd sentence. Delete the 4th sentence. Add "The Treasury Solicitor conceded a legal challenge to this as insufficient sustainability appraisal had been undertaken of possible alternative locations for meeting the wider housing needs of the City. Any provision of development on that scale would need to have been preceded by joint work and sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternative options involving the City and all of its adjoining authorities. Oxford Core Strategy states that 'some needs that cannot be met within the City may be met elsewhere within the Central Oxfordshire sub-region'. If (following the planned updating of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for Oxfordshire) joint work were to be initiated to address how the study findings should be evaluated and met, the Council would fulfil its statutory 'duty to co-operate' in partnership with all the other necessary participating authorities".	The paragraph does not correctly report the outcome of the legal challenge, nor does it make reference to the forthcoming joint Oxfordshire SHMA update. The Plan needs to be kept open for this work similar to the adopted South Oxfordshire Core Strategy 2012. The housing figures in the Vale of White Horse District Council's final Local Plan will be informed by the SHMA and other evidence base work and not the South East Plan.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
68	Anna	Lee	Vale of White Horse District Council	162	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.255	Delete the 3rd sentence. Delete the 4th sentence. Add "The Treasury Solicitor conceded a legal challenge to this as insufficient sustainability appraisal had been undertaken of possible alternative locations for meeting the wider housing needs of the City. Any provision of development on that scale would need to have been preceded by joint work and sustainability appraisal of reasonable alternative options involving the City and all of its adjoining authorities. Oxford Core Strategy states that 'some needs that cannot be met within the City may be met elsewhere within the Central Oxfordshire sub-region'. If (following the planned updating of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for Oxfordshire) joint work were to be initiated to address how the study findings should be evaluated and met, the Council would fulfil its statutory 'duty to co-operate' in partnership with all the other necessary participating authorities".	The suggested change will ensure that the Plan recognises the potential need to work with other authorities to address the findings of the SHMA, hence ensuring that the Plan is positively prepared.
178	Michael	Crofton Briggs	Oxford City Council	162	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.255		Supports the removal of text within the paragraph. The housing need identified through the South East Plan process has not as yet been satisfied through the policies of the District Councils in the Central Oxfordshire Sub-region. Any wording agreed by Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership should be incorporated into the next Cherwell Local Plan before submission to the Secretary of State.
250	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Mr Markham	162	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.255		The Plan fails to provide an adequate level of housing provision which results in the housing needs of the District not being met. There is a designated conservation area in Charlton-on-Otmoor, which seeks to protect the character of the village. There is no 'open character' to the village due to the dense built environment. Realigning the Green Belt to exclude Charlton-on-Otmoor's built village envelope would not detract from the openness of the Green Belt. The village envelope should be considered as a permanent physical barrier to development. Charlton-on-Otmoor should be released from the Green Belt to enable the Plan to meet the objectively assessed development needs of the District.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		163	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.256	Redraft the wording as "to meet this need and possible housing need identified through the Neighbourhoods DPD".	There is no linkage between the likely findings of the Local Neighbourhoods DPD in respect of housing need in Kidlington and the identified employment needs in the Kidlington area.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
230	Patricia	Redpath	Kidlington Parish Council	163	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.256	Amend sentence to read "Kidlington's local housing needs will be examined in more detail through the preparation of the Local Neighbourhoods DPD, and as a result of this the housing allocation may be increased".	Supports the proposed wording change but it ignores the proposed addition of "associated housing needs generated". Amend sentence to read "Kidlington's local housing needs will be examined in more detail through the preparation of the Local Neighbourhoods DPD, and as a result of this the housing allocation may be increased".
19	Suzanne	Bangert	Terence O'Rourke / The Ashworth Family	164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt		There is no flexibility for smaller local communities to accommodate local development needs or address settlement issues through development, where that development is supported by the local community.
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD14: Oxford Green Belt		Acknowledged that some changes have been made which seek to apply a more positive approach to the review of the Green Belt at Kidlington and that the draft Proposals Map has been amended. No other fundamental changes made to respond to the original representation.
38	Nik	Lyzba	The John Phillips Planning Consultancy / The Oxford Charity	164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD14: Oxford Green Belt		Land west of Water Eaton Lane, Gosford would provide a sustainable location for new development being close to existing services and facilities. Release of this land would not undermine the purposes of the Green Belt and development on the site would not result in a coalescence of settlements and would protect the vulnerable Kidlington gap given the existing permanent development that surrounds it.
84	Ian	Scargill	Oxford Green Belt Network	164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt		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.
95	Bruce	Tremayne	CPRE Oxfordshire	164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt		The small scale local review of the Green Belt boundary in Kidlington and Begbroke needs a clearer reference as the two areas are quite distinct. Suggest labelling the sites as Kidlington 1a and 1b to avoid collating the two separate areas.
108	Alan	Lodwick		164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt	Clarification needed on "exceptional circumstances" which needs to be strictly defined.	The Plan should state that 'exceptional circumstances' will be very strictly interpreted having regard to the permanent nature of Green Belt. One test, amongst others, could be that any revision would not lead to pressure for further Green Belt review elsewhere.
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt		The 3rd paragraph should start with "Small scale local reviews....". Object to the inclusion of "and Begbroke Science Park" and this reference should be deleted. Begbroke Science Park has very different Green Belt characteristics to the land at Oxford Technology Park and has no obvious long term defensible boundary. Other issues regarding Begbroke Science Park include: No Landscape and Green Belt Assessment, No needs case set out. The Plan could keep the annotation but number it "Begbroke 1" in order to identify that this is a different Green Belt review, responding to different issues. No evidence to support the proposed Green Belt review.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
250	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Mr Markham	164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt		The Council should provide for a review of the Green Belt boundaries in order to identify potential development opportunities. 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. The Green Belt is of national significance and it must therefore follow that is a strategic priority. Villages should be included in the Green Belt only if they contribute significantly to the openness of the Green Belt.
251	Nick	Alston	GVA / Oxford Aviation Services Ltd	164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt		Clarity is needed on how major development sites in the Green Belt are dealt with in policy terms. E.g. Refer to the NPPF, Delivery DPD or adding relevant criteria to the policy. The first sentence of the last paragraph should be deleted. Include "Further reviews of the Green Belt boundary will only be undertaken where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated at the end.
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	164	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt		The 3rd paragraph should start with "Small scale local reviews.....". Object to the inclusion of "and Begbroke Science Park" and this reference should be deleted. Begbroke Science Park has very different Green Belt characteristics to the land at Oxford Technology Park and has no obvious long term defensible boundary. Other issues regarding Begbroke Science Park include: No Landscape and Green Belt Assessment, No needs case set out. The Plan could keep the annotation but number it "Begbroke 1" in order to identify that this is a different Green Belt review, responding to different issues. No evidence to support the proposed Green Belt review.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	165	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258		Green Boundaries/Buffers policy should be deleted since it gives rise to the establishment of "quasi" Green Belt areas, and 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. If Policy ESD 15 remains, the wording will need to be amended to reflect paragraph B.260. Proposed wording for Policy ESD 15 ".....will be maintained over the plan period to 2031 or until land within the Green Buffer is required to meet sustainable development needs that cannot be met elsewhere in order to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing land. Proposals for the future growth of Banbury and Bicester beyond 2031, will be included in a review of the Local Plan. The review will reconsider the role, function and extent of the Green Buffer around these towns, as necessary to meet some or all of those needs".
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	165	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
183	Alan	Jones		165	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.
184	Karen	Jones		165	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	165	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258		Development at Banbury and Bicester should address the relationship with the open countryside. Consideration should be given.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	165	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258		Supports the proposed wording change
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	165	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted.	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted because it establishes "quasi" Green Belt areas, and duplicates the objectives of Policy ESD 13. Establishing a quasi Green Belt would overly constrict development. There is a risk that development may leapfrog the Green Buffers on appeal. This could militate against the achievement of the Council's objectives at Banbury and Bicester. Green Buffers would be unnecessary and ineffective.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	165	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258		Supports the proposed wording change
299	Peter	Brown	Drayton Parish Council	165	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258		The proposed wording change has weakened the policy by referring to a green edge instead of clear green boundaries. The separation between Banbury and Drayton Village needs to be maintained.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	165	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.258		The Green Buffers show extensive areas of land that are not between the settlement and surrounding villages, nor related to proposed new development. They effectively form 'Greenbelt' around the main settlements preventing sustainable growth. It is clearly evident that the green boundaries shown within the Banbury and Bicester Masterplans have been introduced so as to 'retrofit' the evidence base to the development strategy. The Council should base policy on up to date and relevant evidence base. There is no need for Policy ESD 15. It is considered development at South West of Banbury can be sensitively laid out and designed to maintain Banbury's distinctive identity and setting.. The last bullet point of the policy should be deleted and amended to "for each of the proposed new strategic development areas consideration will need to be given to the landscape setting and the edge to Banbury".
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		Green Boundaries/Buffers policy should be deleted since it gives rise to the establishment of "quasi" Green Belt areas, and 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. If Policy ESD 15 remains, the wording will need to be amended to reflect paragraph B.260. Proposed wording for Policy ESD 15 ".....will be maintained over the plan period to 2031 or until land within the Green Buffer is required to meet sustainable development needs that cannot be met elsewhere in order to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing land. Proposals for the future growth of Banbury and Bicester beyond 2031, will be included in a review of the Local Plan. The review will reconsider the role, function and extent of the Green Buffer around these towns, as necessary to meet some or all of those needs".
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		The Bicester Green Buffer report by LDA directly conflicts with the draft Bicester Masterplan. This relates to Green Buffer 1 at Caversfield. The introduction of Green Buffers is wholly flawed. There is no need for Green Buffers as the policies in the Plan make clear that there should be development restraint and that development should not extend beyond the proposed allocations. Caversfield is physically joined to Bicester and has visual functional and social relationship with the urban area of Bicester. Therefore Caversfield is different to other surrounding villages such as Launton and Chesterton. Coalescence has already occurred and the Plan promotes further coalescence with Bicester 1 and 8 allocations. The narrowest point of the Green Buffer between Caversfield and Bicester is 250m wide which undermines its purpose compared to other Green Buffer boundaries. The Green Buffer at Caversfield should be removed.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable, but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggests allocating Drayton and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		Purpose of Green Buffers is supported, however clarification is needed when referring to Para 157 of the NPPF. This policy will be subject to legal challenge from developers and land owners.
183	Alan	Jones		166	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable, but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggests allocating Drayton and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbuy 2 policy.
184	Karen	Jones		166	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbuy 2 policy.
186	Sarah	Turner		166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259	Amend the bullet point to read "Prevent coalescence and protect the gaps between the existing/planned edge of the towns and surrounding settlements to keep them free from built environment that would harm the character of the surrounding settlements".	The 3rd bullet point is unclear. Amend the bullet point to read "Prevent coalescence and protect the gaps between the existing/planned edge of the towns and surrounding settlements to keep them free from built environment that would harm the character of the surrounding settlements".
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		The proposed South East relief road will bring the built environment to the edge of the village and destroy the environment that the Green Buffer has been proposed to protect.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259	Delete the paragraph	There has been an extension of the proposed Green Buffers however the landscape assessment was prepared after the proposed Green Buffer policy and allocations, therefore the evidence base does not support the policies and allocations.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted.	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted because it establishes "quasi" Green Belt areas, and duplicates the objectives of Policy ESD 13. Establishing a quasi Green Belt would overly constrict development. There is a risk that development may leapfrog the Green Buffers on appeal. This could militate against the achievement of the Council's objectives at Banbury and Bicester. Green Buffers would be unnecessary and ineffective.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		Supports the proposed wording change
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		The identification of the Green Buffer as shown on the Proposals Map is supported.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259	Remove Land West of Warwick Road, Banbury from the Green Buffer and allocate the site for housing development.	Land West of Warwick Road, Banbury should not be included within the Green Buffer according to the evidence base for the Green Buffer designations.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259	Land to the south of Bodicote should be removed from the Green Buffer or have the Green Buffer policy deleted from the Plan.	The Green Buffers do not enable the Council to plan positively. Green Buffers are considered to be an example of negative and over restrictive planning that will prevent development coming forward in the most sustainable locations. Concerned that the Green Buffers Reports were carried out after the decision to include Green Buffers was taken and was first consulted upon. Land to the south of Bodicote should be removed from the Green Buffer. The Green Buffer policy should be deleted.
243	Sarah	Chambers		166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		The proposed South East relief road will bring the built environment to the edge of the village and destroy the environment that the Green Buffer has been proposed to protect.
255	Brett	Chambers		166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		The proposed South East relief road will bring the built environment to the edge of the village and destroy the environment that the Green Buffer has been proposed to protect.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	166	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.259		The Green Buffers show extensive areas of land that are not between the settlement and surrounding villages, nor related to proposed new development. They effectively form 'Greenbelt' around the main settlements preventing sustainable growth. It is clearly evident that the green boundaries shown within the Banbury and Bicester Masterplans have been introduced so as to 'retrofit' the evidence base to the development strategy. The Council should base policy on up to date and relevant evidence base. There is no need for Policy ESD 15. It is considered development at South West of Banbury can be sensitively laid out and designed to maintain Banbury's distinctive identity and setting.. The last bullet point of the policy should be deleted and amended to "for each of the proposed new strategic development areas consideration will need to be given to the landscape setting and the edge to Banbury".

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
76	Holly	Rhoades	Planning Potential Ltd / Gleeson Developments Ltd	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260	Consider reducing the Green Buffers away from the existing edge of settlements which will maintain the gaps between settlements and the landscape identity and setting.	The Green Buffers are overly restrictive and will prevent sustainable development. There is a high identified housing need as well as a housing shortfall. Sites in sustainable locations adjacent to existing settlements will need to be developed. The Plan does not offer sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change due to the increased tightly drawn Green Buffers. The strategic housing allocations are not sufficient to meet the annual housing requirement, or the shortfall. Not all housing could be contained within the settlement boundaries set by the Green Buffers.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260	Wording within paragraph B.260 is contrary to the policy wording in Policy ESD 15. Suggest removing the text in brackets ("including associated green infrastructure")	Wording within paragraph B.260 is contrary to the policy wording in Policy ESD 15. Suggest removing the text in brackets ("including associated green infrastructure")
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		Green Boundaries/Buffers policy should be deleted since it gives rise to the establishment of "quasi" Green Belt areas, and 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. If Policy ESD 15 remains, the wording will need to be amended to reflect paragraph B.260. Proposed wording for Policy ESD 15 ".....will be maintained over the plan period to 2031 or until land within the Green Buffer is required to meet sustainable development needs that cannot be met elsewhere in order to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing land. Proposals for the future growth of Banbury and Bicester beyond 2031, will be included in a review of the Local Plan. The review will reconsider the role, function and extent of the Green Buffer around these towns, as necessary to meet some or all of those needs".
101	Simon	Turner	Launton Parish Council	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260	The Green Buffer around Launton should be extended to cover 200 - 300m the other sides of the railway lines to the NW and SW of the village in addition to the area already shown.	The major reduction in extent of the Green Buffer protecting Launton from Bicester renders the buffer completely ineffective as developers will be building closer to Launton. The change conflicts with notes about risk of coalescence in the Sustainability Appraisal Report, Green Buffer report and Officer's response to the Options for Growth 2009 consultation. The current separation between the village and Bicester is less than 200m which the Bicester Green Buffer report describes as "very limited gap" implying that such a small separation is undesirable and should not be reduced further. The SA report Annex B ruled out as an alternative housing allocation due to the risk of coalescence with Launton village. This risk was also identified in the Officer's response to the Options for Growth 2009 consultation. The risk has been ignored in the Bicester Green Buffer report. The Green Buffer around Launton should be extended to cover 200 - 300m on the other sides of the railway lines to the NW and SW of the village in addition to the area already shown.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		The Bicester Green Buffer report by LDA directly conflicts with the draft Bicester Masterplan. This relates to Green Buffer 1 at Caversfield. The introduction of Green Buffers is wholly flawed. There is no need for Green Buffers as the policies in the Plan make clear that there should be development restraint and that development should not extend beyond the proposed allocations. Caversfield is physically joined to Bicester and has visual functional and social relationship with the urban area of Bicester. Therefore Caversfield is different to other surrounding villages such as Launton and Chesterton. Coalescence has already occurred and the Plan promotes further coalescence with Bicester 1 and 8 allocations. The narrowest point of the Green Buffer between Caversfield and Bicester is 250m wide which undermines its purpose compared to other Green Buffer boundaries. The Green Buffer at Caversfield should be removed.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.
183	Alan	Jones		167	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.
184	Karen	Jones		167	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
186	Sarah	Turner		167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260	Green Buffer to be extended beyond the two railway lines to give a significant buffer around Launton comparable to that around the other villages in the vicinity of Bicester, whilst retaining (or improving) the buffer between the edges of the village and the railway lines. The Green Buffer should also be extended to the south of the village to prevent the village growing outwards towards the railway line.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. The Green Buffer is too small and will be ineffective. The edge of Launton is within 200m of the existing edge of Bicester. The Green Buffer boundary should be extended beyond the two railway lines to give a significant buffer around Launton comparable to that around the other villages in the vicinity of Bicester, whilst retaining (or improving) the buffer between the edges of the village and the railway lines. The Green Buffer should also be extended to the south of the village to prevent the village growing outwards towards the railway line. The railway lines themselves would not provide sufficient demarcation if development were to come right up to the lines from the other side.
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		The proposed relief roads options 2c and 3 both cross the proposed Green Buffer for Wendlebury.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260	Delete the paragraph	The requirement for and extent of the Green Buffers is disputed. Object in principle to the inclusion of Salt Way as being of such historic value as to constrain sustainable development. The Bicester and Banbury Green Buffer reports post-date the Green Buffer policy.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted.	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted because it establishes "quasi" Green Belt areas, and duplicates the objectives of Policy ESD 13. Establishing a quasi Green Belt would overly constrict development. There is a risk that development may leapfrog the Green Buffers on appeal. This could militate against the achievement of the Council's objectives at Banbury and Bicester. Green Buffers would be unnecessary and ineffective.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		Supports the proposed wording change
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		The identification of the Green Buffer as shown on the Proposals Map is supported.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260	Remove Land West of Warwick Road, Banbury from the Green Buffer and allocate the site for housing development.	Land West of Warwick Road, Banbury should not be included within the Green Buffer according to the evidence base for the Green Buffer designations.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260	Evidence needed to support the Green Buffer policy.	Welcomes the review qualification to Policy ESD 15 which allows for the revision of a Green Buffer in the event that a site on the edge of a village were to come forward for development. Evidence needed to support the Green Buffer policy.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
243	Sarah	Chambers		167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		The proposed relief roads options 2c and 3 both cross the proposed Green Buffer for Wendlebury.
255	Brett	Chambers		167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		The proposed relief roads options 2c and 3 both cross the proposed Green Buffer for Wendlebury.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		Where there is a need for important infrastructure the District Council would consider the merits, balancing the principles of the Green Buffer policy with the importance of the infrastructure being proposed.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	167	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.260		The Green Buffers show extensive areas of land that are not between the settlement and surrounding villages, nor related to proposed new development. They effectively form 'Greenbelt' around the main settlements preventing sustainable growth. It is clearly evident that the green boundaries shown within the Banbury and Bicester Masterplans have been introduced so as to 'retrofit' the evidence base to the development strategy. The Council should base policy on up to date and relevant evidence base. There is no need for Policy ESD 15. It is considered development at South West of Banbury can be sensitively laid out and designed to maintain Banbury's distinctive identity and setting.. The last bullet point of the policy should be deleted and amended to "for each of the proposed new strategic development areas consideration will need to be given to the landscape setting and the edge to Banbury".
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	168	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261		Supports the proposed wording change
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	168	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261		Green Boundaries/Buffers policy should be deleted since it gives rise to the establishment of "quasi" Green Belt areas, and 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. If Policy ESD 15 remains, the wording will need to be amended to reflect paragraph B.260. Proposed wording for Policy ESD 15 ".....will be maintained over the plan period to 2031 or until land within the Green Buffer is required to meet sustainable development needs that cannot be met elsewhere in order to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing land. Proposals for the future growth of Banbury and Bicester beyond 2031, will be included in a review of the Local Plan. The review will reconsider the role, function and extent of the Green Buffer around these towns, as necessary to meet some or all of those needs".

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	168	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.
183	Alan	Jones		168	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.
184	Karen	Jones		168	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbury 2 policy.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	168	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261	Delete the paragraph. If the paragraph remains consider the wording "Land within the buffers will contribute to green infrastructure, including retained agricultural land, open space and woodland".	The Bicester and Banbury Green Buffer reports post-date the Green Buffer policy. This paragraph is inconsistent with Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	168	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted.	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted because it establishes "quasi" Green Belt areas, and duplicates the objectives of Policy ESD 13. Establishing a quasi Green Belt would overly constrict development. There is a risk that development may leapfrog the Green Buffers on appeal. This could militate against the achievement of the Council's objectives at Banbury and Bicester. Green Buffers would be unnecessary and ineffective.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	168	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261		Supports the proposed wording change
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	168	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261		The identification of the Green Buffer as shown on the Proposals Map is supported.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	168	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261		The Policy should be reworded to be more positive towards the creation of community woodland where this is appropriate in landscape and ecological terms. Include the following wording "Green Buffers will take the form of community woodland where the opportunity exists and when woodland planting is appropriate in landscape and ecological terms". The Green Buffers should be retained in perpetuity and management mechanisms put in place.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	168	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.261		The Green Buffers show extensive areas of land that are not between the settlement and surrounding villages, nor related to proposed new development. They effectively form 'Greenbelt' around the main settlements preventing sustainable growth. It is clearly evident that the green boundaries shown within the Banbury and Bisector Master plans have been introduced so as to 'retrofit' the evidence base to the development strategy. The Council should base policy on up to date and relevant evidence base. There is no need for Policy END 15. It is considered development at South West of Banbury can be sensitively laid out and designed to maintain Banbury's distinctive identity and setting.. The last bullet point of the policy should be deleted and amended to "for each of the proposed new strategic development areas consideration will need to be given to the landscape setting and the edge to Banbury".
76	Holly	Rhoades	Planning Potential Ltd / Gleeson Developments Ltd	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth	Consider reducing the Green Buffers away from the existing edge of settlements which will maintain the gaps between settlements and the landscape identity and setting.	The Green Buffers are overly restrictive and will prevent sustainable development. There is a high identified housing need as well as a housing shortfall. Sites in sustainable locations adjacent to existing settlements will need to be developed. The Plan does not offer sufficient flexibility to adapt to rapid change due to the increased tightly drawn Green Buffers. The strategic housing allocations are not sufficient to meet the housing requirement annually or the shortfall. Not all housing could be contained within the settlement boundaries set by the Green Buffers.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Green Boundaries/Buffers policy should be deleted since it gives rise to the establishment of "quasi" Green Belt areas, and duplicates the objectives of Policy END 13, which are designed to protect and enhance the character and appearance of the landscape around the urban fringe. If Policy ESD 15 remains, the wording will need to be amended to reflect paragraph B.260. Proposed wording for Policy ESD 15 ".....will be maintained over the plan period to 2031 or until land within the Green Buffer is required to meet sustainable development needs that cannot be met elsewhere in order to maintain a five year supply of deliverable housing land. Proposals for the future growth of Banbury and Bicester beyond 2031, will be included in a review of the Local Plan. The review will reconsider the role, function and extent of the Green Buffer around these towns, as necessary to meet some or all of those needs".
95	Bruce	Tremayne	CPRE Oxfordshire	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Supports the proposed wording but question why the Green Buffers have not been extended to include land west of Bicester 1, south of Bicester 2, east of Bicester 12 and south east Bicester 11.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		The Bicester Green Buffer report by LDA directly conflicts with the draft Bicester Masterplan. This relates to Green Buffer 1 at Caversfield. The introduction of Green Buffers is wholly flawed. There is no need for Green Buffers as the policies in the Plan make clear that there should be development restraint and that development should not extend beyond the proposed allocations. Caversfield is physically joined to Bicester and has visual functional and social relationship with the urban area of Bicester. Therefore Caversfield is different to other surrounding villages such as Launton and Chesterton. Coalescence has already occurred and the Plan promotes further coalescence with Bicester 1 and 8 allocations. The narrowest point of the Green Buffer between Caversfield and Bicester is 250m wide which undermines its purpose compared to other Green Buffer boundaries. The Green Buffer at Caversfield should be removed.
129	Tim	Hibbert		169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Support the policy however the boundaries will need be adopted so that it prevents any form of development taking place in them.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbuy 2 policy.
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		The purpose of the Green Buffer is supported however it should not be afforded the degree of permanence that constrains development options at the town in the longer term.
183	Alan	Jones		169	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbuy 2 policy.
184	Karen	Jones		169	Theme Three Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Support the principle of the Green Buffers under Policy ESD15. The Green Buffer boundary will need to be tightly drawn around the final housing allocations north of Banbury. Drayton is relatively sustainable but not considered in the Local Plan. Suggest making Drayton as an allocation and removing it from the Green Buffer. Banbury 2 should be included in the proposed Green Buffer. There is discrepancy between the Banbury Proposals Map and the revised Banbuy 2 policy.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
186	Sarah	Turner		169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth	The final sentence should be amended to "Development proposals within the Green Buffers will only be permitted under exceptional circumstances, and if they would not conflict with these objectives".	The removal of the text about the Green Buffers being "kept free from built development" and the addition of the last sentence weakens the concept of the Green Buffers making them ineffective.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth	Delete the paragraph	The Bicester and Banbury Green Buffer reports post-date the Green Buffer policy. The five objectives could be achieved with Para B.258 and Policy ESD 16.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted.	The Green Buffer policy should be deleted because it establishes "quasi" Green Belt areas, and duplicates the objectives of Policy ESD 13. Establishing a quasi Green Belt would overly constrict development. There is a risk that development may leapfrog the Green Buffers on appeal. This could militate against the achievement of the Council's objectives at Banbury and Bicester. Green Buffers would be unnecessary and ineffective.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Supports the proposed wording change
212	David	Keene	David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates Ltd	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth	The policy should be deleted however if the policy remains it should only be applied in cases where the local authority is able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The policy should also refer to a requirement to review the green boundaries for growth in the event of any plan review.	This policy raises concerns in particular for Banbury as the Green Buffer designation now extend further beyond the current edge of built development, potentially eliminating a much larger land area from considerations for further housing growth. The policy should be deleted however if the policy remains it should only be applied in cases where the local authority is able to demonstrate a five year housing land supply. The policy should also refer to a requirement to review the green boundaries for growth in the event of any plan review.
218	R	Jones	John Phillips Planning Consultancy / Dr R Jones	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		The site to the South West of Bicester which is positioned between the A41 and the Wendlebury Road. Object to the site being designated as a Green Buffer. The site does not present danger of the coalescence of Bicester and Wendlebury therefore the site should be removed from the Green Buffer.
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth	"Protection of important views" should be deleted.	The principle of the Green Buffers as shown on the Proposals Map is supported. Explanation needed on the protection of important views. It is unclear how designating land as Green Buffer will protect important views. This is not considered to be a legitimate planning purpose of such a designation.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		The identification of the Green Buffer as shown on the Proposals Map is supported.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth	Land to the south of Bodicote should be removed from the Green Buffer or have the Green Buffer policy deleted from the Plan. Evidence needed to support the Green Buffer policy.	The Policy and supporting text needs to acknowledge that some landscapes will be more sensitive than others, and that where specific development proposals come forward, a specific appraisal of the landscape character and effects of development in that location will need to be undertaken. Land to the south of Bodicote should be removed from the Green Buffer as this serves no purpose in the delivery of the five objectives. The Green Buffer policy should be deleted. Evidence needed to support the Green Buffer policy.
268	Anne	Hibbert		169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Supports the proposed wording change however the Green Buffer zones will need to be adopted in order for them to be effective.
279	Peter	Burrows	Adderbury Conservation Action Group	169	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Concerned over the distance between Bankside development / Bankside Phase 2 and Adderbury. The proposed Green Buffer zone between the two areas should be maintained.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	170	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 16: The Character of the built Environment		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	171	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.262		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	172	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.263		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
47	Martin	Small	English Heritage	173	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.264		Supports the proposed wording change however would the text to be revised as "We will maintain a local register of Buildings at Risk and use Article 4 Directions to maintain the character of our towns and villages".

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	173	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.264	The second sentence to be amended as ".....Conservation Areas and other heritage assets (including both designated and undesignated assets) form part of the historic fabric of the District and will be protected to an extent appropriate to their importance and value, consistent with NPPF Paras 14 and 128-141".	The paragraph appear to give equal weight to designated historical assets of all types and to 'other' and 'undesignated' assets which is inconsistent with the NPPF. The policy has no distinction to the significance of impacts on assets of local/national/international importance.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	173	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.264		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	174	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.265		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
42	Ian	Carmichael	Thames Valley Police	175	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 16: The Character of the built Environment		Supports the policy. If a policy on community safety etc is not created then Policy ESD 16 will need rewording. Suggestion - "New development proposals must". Change "Be compatible with up to date....." to "achieve Secured by Design accreditation".
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd	175	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 16: The Character of the built Environment		The inclusion of a requirement for the preparation of a Design Code on Strategic Sites should not prejudice or extend the determination of any currently submitted applications on Strategic Sites where wholly appropriate and sufficient information has been submitted by the applicants. It should be a requirement for any future phased development constructed post adoption.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	175	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 16: The Character of the built Environment		The policy needs to recognise that design objectives have to be practical and deliverable in the context of the NPPF.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	175	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 16: The Character of the built Environment		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	175	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 16: The Character of the built Environment	The policy needs amending.	No definition or explanation for a 'strategic site'. The level of detailed design expectation, particularly in relation to Design Codes will still need to be determined as appropriate pending whether it is an outline or reserved matters/full application.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	176	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.270		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	177	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.272		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	178	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.273		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
84	Ian	Scargill	Oxford Green Belt Network	179	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.274		Supports the proposed wording change
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	179	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.274		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
177	Jane	Hennell	The Canal and Rivers Trust	180	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 17: The Oxford Canal		Supports the proposed wording change however there is one minor concern relating the facilities needed to service the canal and those who seek to enjoy it. The policy meets needs of some users however 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 needs to be recognised or widen the remit of the proposed policy in the Development Management DPD to cover all facilities. The policy needs to be flexible.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	180	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 17: The Oxford Canal		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	180	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 17: The Oxford Canal		Concerned that the policy does not include reference to the need to protect and enhance biodiversity. The Policy should be amended to ensure that harm to the biodiversity value of the Oxford Canal is avoided.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
21	Troth	Wells	The British Horse Society	181	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.275		Equestrianism plays an important role in culture, health, leisure, sport and general improvement to the quality of life, including for disabled people (such as riding for the disabled) and people with mental health issues. Many people partially disabled find that horse riding is a convenient way to get around and to get exercise. Reference made to a study titled 'The health benefits of horse riding in the UK'. Reference also made to West Berks Local Plan Policy CS 12 Equestrian/racehorse industry.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	181	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.275		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	181	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.275		Policy on Green Infrastructure is supported however it should include reference to woodlands, as they are an important part of Green Infrastructure. The District currently has a shortage of accessible green space, including deficiencies in woodland.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	182	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.280		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	183	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.281		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	184	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	B.282		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	185	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 18: Green Infrastructure		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".
225	Alex	Arrol	Savills / Kennet Properties Ltd/Thames Water Group	185	Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 18: Green Infrastructure		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. It is unclear how Green Infrastructure is annotated on the Banbury Key Proposals Map.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	186	C Policies for Cherwell's Places	C.2		Supports the proposed wording
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	186	C Policies for Cherwell's Places:	C.235		Supports the proposed wording change except "use of Article 4 Directions..." Change "our villages" to "our historic villages and towns".

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	186	C Policies for Cherwell's Places	C.2	Land to the south of Bodicote should be removed from the Green Buffer or have the Green Buffer policy deleted from the Plan. Evidence needed to support the Green Buffer policy.	The Plan fails to address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester. The Plan seeks to focus development on the urban areas at the expense of the rural areas, rather than considering the merits of a more dispersed development strategy.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	187	C Policies for Cherwell's Places	C.6		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.
6	Dominic	Woodfield	Bioscan (UK) Ltd	188	C Policies for Cherwell's Places	Introduction		Removal of reference to Gavray Drive as a consented site is welcomed. This recognition reflects the current position of impasse with the promoters of that site, and it is worth stressing that this situation is not of Cherwell District Councils making but due to the applicant's continued reluctance to change their proposals to comply with local and national planning policy.
178	Michael	Crofton Briggs	Oxford City Council	190	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.12		Supports the proposed wording change
50	Andy	Kirkham	Aylesbury Vale District Council	191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Insert a new sentence - "The potential link road will be progressed with engagement with Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council".	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.
90	Jayne	Blake		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. Route 3 cannot be carried forward: It sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester; the route impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone; the route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester SAM; it will increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering/leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
110	J H E	Thomas		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. Route 3 cannot be carried forward: It sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester; the route impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone; the route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester SAM; it will increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering/leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
111	Christine	Tulloch		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. Route 3 cannot be carried forward: It sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester; the route impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone; the route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester SAM; it will increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering/leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
112	Michell	Busby		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. Route 3 cannot be carried forward: It sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester; the route impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone; the route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester SAM; it will increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering/leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
113	P J	Busby		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. Route 3 cannot be carried forward: It sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester; the route impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone; the route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester SAM; it will increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering/leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
115	Kerry	Wilce		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	The Bicester Movement Study is a third party report commissioned by Oxfordshire County Council that has not been open to consultation or challenge prior to its inclusion as evidence as part of the Local Plan submission. The study makes no reference to any mitigation for Wendlebury in any of its options or recommendations despite what is referenced in C.15. Sufficient land has already been purchased from the owners of Elm Tree Farm for a dual carriageway to be built across the railway for the access road which clearly prejudices any consultation and leaves the process open to judicial challenge. There will be significant impact on Wendlebury caused by Option 3 where no appropriate mitigation could be overcome. A better solution will be to create a ring road from near Graven Hill to meet up with the A41 at the new roundabout to the south of Bicester Avenue.
116	Pamela	Wilce		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	The Bicester Movement Study is a third party report commissioned by Oxfordshire County Council that has not been open to consultation or challenge prior to its inclusion as evidence as part of the Local Plan submission. The study makes no reference to any mitigation for Wendlebury in any of its options or recommendations despite what is referenced in C.15. Sufficient land has already been purchased from the owners of Elm Tree Farm for a dual carriageway to be built across the railway for the access road which clearly prejudices any consultation and leaves the process open to judicial challenge. There will be significant impact on Wendlebury caused by Option 3 where no appropriate mitigation could be overcome. A better solution will be to create a ring road from near Graven Hill to meet up with the A41 at the new roundabout to the south of Bicester Avenue.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
117	Julian	Cordy		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. Route 3 cannot be carried forward: It sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester; the route impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone; the route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester SAM; it will increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering/leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
119	Robert	Armstrong		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. Route 3 cannot be carried forward: It sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester; the route impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone; the route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester SAM; it will increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering/leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; these routes have been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective showing a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
126	Charles	Wrench		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and missed from most of the maps. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. Route 3 sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester; it impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone; it does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; It is a longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester SAM; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering/leaving Wendlebury difficult; Wendlebury will be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as a new boundary will have been created; these routes have been looked at from a Bicester Town perspective, with total disregard for the communities outside of Bicester. No mention on the impact on water levels in the surrounding area; Wendlebury has a history of flooding.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
128	Charlotte	Carry		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and missed from most of the maps. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. Route 3 sits outside the proposed development area of Bicester; it impacts upon the proposed Green Buffer zone; it does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; It is a longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester SAM; it will increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering/leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as a new boundary will have been created; these routes have been looked at from a Bicester Town perspective with disregard for the communities outside of Bicester. It will be unsafe to ride to school for parents or children. There will be an increased risk of flooding. Option 1b should be reconsidered.
130	Stephen	Thompson		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Firmer proposal of the routes and justification needed. Reconsider option 1b.	No consultation was held with residents of Wendlebury whilst other communities were consulted. Wendlebury has not been referenced on maps. No clear strategy for the proposed options. Options 2c and 3 will be too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument. It will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road.
131	Anni	Thompson		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Firmer proposal of the routes and justification needed. Reconsider option 1b.	No consultation was held with residents of Wendlebury whilst other communities were consulted. Wendlebury has not been referenced on maps. No clear strategy for the proposed options. Options 2c and 3 will be too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument. It will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
137	A W	Banks		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
138	S	Hudson		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. There will be an increase risk of flooding in the area.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
139	Jean	Bebbington		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
140	C F	Hollis		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; it will greatly increase the noise and air pollution in 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; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. Consider Option 2c in conjunction with 1b.
141	J W M	Hollis		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; it will greatly increase the noise and air pollution in 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; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. Consider Option 2c in conjunction with 1b.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
142	N J	Dearlove		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
143	L	Dearlove		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
144	L	Stoner		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
146	David	Jones		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. Sufficient land has already been purchased from the owners of Elm Tree Farm for a dual carriage way to be built across the railway for this access road therefore it prejudices any consultation and leaves the process open to judicial challenge. No reference to any mitigation for Wendlebury.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
152	T	Hudson		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. There will be an increase risk of flooding in the area.
164	A S & G L	Adams		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. There will be an increase risk of flooding in the area.
170	Colin	Cockshaw		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	For the policy to be effective, the South East relief road needs to become adopted as a firm proposal by the relevant authorities. It should be then subject of a firm policy in the Local Plan which indicates how and when it will be implemented and should be incorporated into Map 5.2. Until this can be done, Bicester 2 and Bicester 12 would be premature and should be re-programmed to a later date.	The proposed South East Bicester relief road is only a possibility and no decisions has been made. The relief road has not been indicated on Map 5.2 however is shown in the Bicester Masterplan which is a draft SPD and is subject to amendments and revisions. For the policy to be effective, the South East relief road needs to become adopted as a firm proposal by the relevant authorities. It should be then subject of a firm policy in the Local Plan which indicates how and when it will be implemented and should be incorporated into Map 5.2. Until this can be done, Bicester 2 and Bicester 12 would be premature and should be re-programmed to a later date.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
176	Caroline	Abbot		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Route 1B should be reconsidered.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created.
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15		The paragraph should also include the possible route at North West Bicester.
200	Michael	Fuller		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
201	Joanne	Fuller		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
205	Karen	Lawrence		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
206	John	Lawrence		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
221	D	Watkins		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
229	Barbara	Smith		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes	191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15		Supports the proposed wording change. It has previously been demonstrated that Bicester 12 is capable of providing an initial release of housing and employment land without any improvements to the strategic road network.
243	Sarah	Chambers		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15		3 routes were identified in the Bicester Movement Study therefore the Plan should make reference to all 3 routes.
248	Keith	Skerrett		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
255	Brett	Chambers		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15		The paragraph should also include the possible route at North West Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15		The first bullet point should read "Delivering highway capacity improvements to peripheral routes to help improve sustainable movements in the rest of the town, service the long term growth aspirations, through traffic and to service key employment sites".
264	Andrew	Bignall		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
265	Laura	Bignell		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
266	Vivien	Armstrong		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. Routes 2c and 1b should be reconsidered.
267	A J	Tulloch		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. Routes 2c and 1b should be reconsidered.
268	Anne	Hibbert		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15		Explanation needed for the 3 identified routes in the Bicester Movement Study. A meeting should be held with the residents of Wendlebury. If an explanation cannot be provided then the Plan should be suspended or remove all references on the proposed relief roads. Option 3 is objected

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
269	L C H	Jones		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
270	M	Brazil		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
271	Oliver	Bouyssi		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
272	Kathy	Sharp		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
273	S	Twynham		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
274	R	Twynham		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
275	J	Twynham		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
276	Matthew & Sheila	Taylor		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. The requirement for the relief road is questionable as it does not appear to be of any use to vehicles from Banbury and Buckingham directions. The current travel flow from Aylesbury seem to adequately use the existing Bicester ring road towards Oxford. Valuable farmland and countryside will be lost due to the proposed relief road. It will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
277	Joel	Miller		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town
278	Sarah	Johnson-Perry		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
280	Jean	Rosbrough		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
282	Lisa	Bergin		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
283	David	McCauley		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
285	J	Beart		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. The requirement for the relief road is questionable as it does not appear to be of any use to vehicles from Banbury and Buckingham directions. The current travel flow from Aylesbury seem to adequately use the existing Bicester ring road towards Oxford. Valuable farmland and countryside will be lost due to the proposed relief road. It will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
286	E J	Harrop		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. The requirement for the relief road is questionable as it does not appear to be of any use to vehicles from Banbury and Buckingham directions. The current travel flow from Aylesbury seem to adequately use the existing Bicester ring road towards Oxford. Valuable farmland and countryside will be lost due to the proposed relief road. It will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester, and increase risk of flooding.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
287	T E	Harrop		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. The requirement for the relief road is questionable as it does not appear to be of any use to vehicles from Banbury and Buckingham directions. The current travel flow from Aylesbury seem to adequately use the existing Bicester ring road towards Oxford. Valuable farmland and countryside will be lost due to the proposed relief road. It will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester, and increase risk of flooding.
288	J	McColl		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and missed from most of the maps which have been part of the consultation. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. The requirement for the relief road is questionable as it does not appear to be of any use to vehicles from Banbury and Buckingham directions. The current travel flow from Aylesbury seem to adequately use the existing Bicester ring road towards Oxford. Valuable farmland and countryside will be lost due to the proposed relief road. It will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult.
289	Jennifer	Miller		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
290	A	Adams		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and missing completely from the majority of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
291	Tim and Holly	Howard		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and missing completely from the majority of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
292	J E	Witney		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and missing completely from the majority of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
294	R	Brown		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Route 3 cannot be carried forward for the following reasons: the route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury. Concerned over the proximity of the proposed roundabout that joins the A41 dual carriage way is directly in a small field behind residential properties.
295	R J	Witney		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and missing completely from the majority of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
296	Paula	Cordy		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. Other principles of the Plan have been disregarded when considering the proposed relief road at South East Bicester.
297	David, Janet, David and Alice	Robertson		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. Other principles of the Plan have been disregarded when considering the proposed relief road at South East Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
298	J	Campbell		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester. Other principles of the Plan have been disregarded when considering the proposed relief road at South East Bicester.
301	Gerald	Baldwin		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15		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.
304	Alan	Rumsey		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15		Object to Option 3. Route 3 cannot be carried forward for the following reasons: the route does not form a logical ring road around Bicester; it will greatly increase the traffic and noise in 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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
305	Vikki	Charles		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
306	S.B.	Charles		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
307	D	Chipperfield		191	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.15	Delete the reference to a possible strategic relief road to the south east and east of Bicester. This removes the need to include the Bicester Movement Study.	Wendlebury was excluded from the initial consultation and even missed from most of the maps that have been part of the process. There is no recommendation on a preferred route so people are commenting on the unknown. Poor communication throughout the process. 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; It is a much longer route than necessary; it is too close to the Alchester Scheduled Ancient Monument; it will greatly increase the noise in Wendlebury; it will cause a decline in the air quality in Wendlebury; there will be an inevitable increase in "rat running" through Wendlebury as traffic tries to avoid junction 9; it will make entering and leaving Wendlebury increasingly difficult; Wendlebury will effectively be boxed in by the M40, A41, railway and the new road; Increasing risk of development creeping towards Wendlebury, as effectively a new boundary will have been created; the whole consideration of these routes has been looked at from a solely Bicester Town perspective and has shown a total disregard for the inhabitants of communities outside of Bicester.
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	194	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.21		The location and route of the proposed relief road has not yet been decided therefore the paragraph should not make a specific reference to the South East option.
243	Sarah	Chambers		194	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.21		Reference to the relief road should refer to a relief road only as the location and route have not been determined.
255	Brett	Chambers		194	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.21		The location and route of the proposed relief road has not yet been decided therefore the paragraph should not make a specific reference to the South East option.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	194	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.21		The sentence should read "The provision of transport initiatives including highway capacity improvements to peripheral routes will secure substantial gains for the centre of the town by reducing the flow of traffic".
301	Gerald	Baldwin		194	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.21		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.
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	199	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.26		An ecological survey should be required to determine the impact of the proposed routes on Merton.
243	Sarah	Chambers		199	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.26		An ecological survey should be required to determine the impact of the proposed routes on Merton.
255	Brett	Chambers		199	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.26		An ecological survey should be required to determine the impact of the proposed routes on Merton.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
6	Dominic	Woodfield	Bioscan (UK) Ltd	200	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.33		Removal of reference to Gavray Drive as a consented site is welcomed. This recognition reflects the current position of impasse with the promoters of that site, and it is worth stressing that this situation is not of Cherwell District Councils making but due to the applicant's continued reluctance to change their proposals to comply with local and national planning policy.
171	Colin	Cockshaw	Bicester against Eco-Con)	201	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.33	Changes suggested in the previous representation (Oct 2012)	Previous representation (Oct 2012) not taken into consideration. Lack of progress on developments not addressed. Planning permission was granted in 2011 for the Exemplar 1st phase but no work has been started. Question the change in the Code for Sustainable Homes from Level 6 to Level 5.
171	Colin	Cockshaw	Bicester against Eco-Con)	205	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town	Changes suggested in the previous representation (Oct 2012)	Changes do not address specific issues with sufficient definition and clarity. E.g. the need to improve or bypass certain existing road junctions. 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 Masterplan.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group	205	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: 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. However the policy is too prescriptive and inflexible. Detailed matters should be addressed through the Masterplan process. The Masterplan is the correct vehicle for determining the nature and form of development. The rate of housing delivery for the site seems very conservative. Requirements are not justified and should be determined through the Masterplan process.
239	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Albion Land Limited	205	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town	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 proposed residential units should achieve Code for Sustainable Home 6 in order to be zero carbon. Consistency needed on requirements for non-residential and residential.	The Policy places too much emphasis on the dated guidance in the PPS1 Supplement and fails to address the requirements of securing and delivering economic growth. The Policy should be amended to enable greater flexibility and certainty. The Policy also fails to demonstrate how it has been derived at following an objective assessment of evidence base and market conditions. Concerned with the wording which states that planning permission will only be given following the Council's approval of a Masterplan. A masterplan at the beginning is not fully necessary for the whole development. The uses proposed are consistent with the concept masterplan for the eco town as outlined in the Bicester Masterplan. The proposed number and delivery rate of new jobs is questioned. Logistics and distribution sector would be suitable for the site and would generate high skills and advanced technological systems. These uses will deliver sustainable development and a type of employment that is in demand. Own evidence not considered. No evidence to support a restriction on use classes. Some wording are not precise and clarification is needed. Do not support the BREEAM requirement as it is not considered to be deliverable due to site specific factors. Wording could be revised to read as "non-residential dwellings to aspire to be BREEAM Excellent". The proposed residential units should achieve Code for Sustainable Home 6 in order to be zero carbon. Consistency needed on requirements for non-residential and residential.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
245	Damien	Holdstock	Turley Associates / I M Properties Ltd	205	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town	The Plan should address the identified need set out against the high growth scenario which was stated in the Employment Land Review Update. This will ensure that there is a greater choice of sites for the market, and avoid overreliance on only a handful of sites which may be unduly delayed, or may not be capable of providing the form of development attractive to the market. The Plan should allocate further sites based on an up to date review of available sites, the existing employment land position and the proposed form of development achievable and supported for those employment sites already identified in the Plan.	The proposed changes to the Policy result in an inherent lack of clarity over precisely how much employment land the Local Plan is allocating at the NW Bicester Eco-Town and for what uses. It is not clear how the proposed employment uses on the site will contribute to addressing the identified need for B2 and B8 employment uses in the District. The Draft Economic Analysis Study 2012 suggests that there is a need for B8 employment. There is insufficient land allocated for B2 and B8 employment uses. The Plan should address the identified need set out against the high growth scenario which was stated in the Employment Land Review Update. The Plan should allocate further employment sites.
171	Colin	Cockshaw	Bicester against Eco-Con)	206	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town	Changes suggested in the previous representation (Oct 2012)	Changes do not address specific issues with sufficient definition and clarity. E.g. the need to improve or bypass certain existing road junctions. 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 Masterplan.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	206	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town		The requirement for Building for Life Silver should be deleted as BFL is not a mandatory scoring system. It is guidance designed to assist the development industry. The cost for achieving Lifetime Homes has not been accounted for within the viability assessment. Clarification is needed on space standards.
75	Jack	Moeran	Environment Agency	207	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town	Replace "Ardley" with "Ardley Energy from Waste facility".	Supports the proposed wording however suggest one minor word change. Replace "Ardley" with "Ardley Energy from Waste facility".
171	Colin	Cockshaw	Bicester against Eco-Con)	207	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town	Changes suggested in the previous representation (Oct 2012)	Changes do not address specific issues with sufficient definition and clarity. E.g. the need to improve or bypass certain existing road junctions. 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 Masterplan.
225	Alex	Arrol	Savills / Kennet Properties Ltd/Thames Water Group	207	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town		The Environment Agency has published a guidance document on water cycle studies which should be referenced in the Policy.
239	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Albion Land Limited	207	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town	Clarification needed for the requirement of 40% of the site to be green open space. This could apply to the whole allocation or for individual sections of the allocation.	Clarification needed for the requirement of 40% of the site to be green open space. This could apply to the whole allocation or for individual sections of the allocation.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	207	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town		The sentence should be deleted as this is pre-emptive of the outcome of the Movement Study and the masterplan work for NW Bicester.
37	Andrew	Hickman	Middleton Stoney Parish Council	208	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town		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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	208	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town		The northern relief road is vital especially with new housing and employment. The A4095 is already over loaded and it is not acceptable for the increasingly HGVs to use the road to avoid congestions at the motorway junction and A34/A41 approach to Bicester. Could this be addressed?
171	Colin	Cockshaw	Bicester against Eco-Con)	208	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 1: North West Bicester Eco-Town	Changes suggested in the previous representation (Oct 2012)	Changes do not address specific issues with sufficient definition and clarity. E.g. the need to improve or bypass certain existing road junctions. 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
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	210	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.53		New sentence should be added to the end: "New road links on the site may be either site accesses only or form part of a strategic road, depending on the approved route for the relief road".
301	Gerald	Baldwin		210	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.53		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.
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	211	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.55		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.
243	Sarah	Chambers		211	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.55		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.
255	Brett	Chambers		211	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.55		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.
301	Gerald	Baldwin		211	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.55		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.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	215	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 2: Graven Hill		Supports the proposed wording change of the 16th bullet point. It is unclear as to why the 17th bullet point was deleted therefore an explanation is needed.
301	Gerald	Baldwin		215	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 2: Graven Hill		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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	216	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2		Supports the removal of reference on employment requirements.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	217	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2		The policy does not respond to the removal of the employment requirement. The proposed housing should increase from approximately 650 to approximately 700. The provision of extra care housing would enable the site to accommodate a greater number of residential units therefore approximately 700 would be more appropriate. The policy will need to ensure that the viability of the development is not put at risk due to the requirement for extra care provision and community self build. The requirement should contribute towards meeting affordable housing requirements.
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	218	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2		The proposed removal of "Two Form of Entry" - does this mean a green light for future expansion? Chesterton School could be marginalised if this were to happen. Suggest keeping the original wording.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	218	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2		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. Therefore the reference should be deleted.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	218	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2		The sentence is confusing. It should be clear that the Phase 2 school is as well as St Edburg's expansion - this makes it as if St Edburg's is the Phase 2 school.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	219	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2		The removal of the requirement for health provision is supported. Wording on access and movement needs amending as details are currently unknown. The delivery of works or a financial contribution would need to meet the planning obligation tests as set out in the CIL Regulations 2010. Object to the requirement for a community facility. Phase 2 should not be viewed as a stand-alone site but as the continuation of the larger SW Bicester development. A large community centre is provided at Phase 1 which is within close proximity and will be able to support the whole development. No evidence shown for a local centre to be provided at Phase 2.
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	220	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2		Supports and endorses the proposed wording change
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	220	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2		Object to the proposed wording on improved pedestrian and cycle access to the A41, bus routes and green infrastructure as there are no evidence to demonstrate that these are needed. Clarification needed on green infrastructure. Object to the requirement for a community woodland. The farm buildings at Whitelands Farm are not listed or subject to any statutory protection.
247	Chris	Goddard	GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) Ltd and the Browne Family Trust	223	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 4: Bicester Business Park		Supports the proposed wording change. The proposed removal of paragraph C.62 should be incorporated within Policy Bicester 4. The Tesco store will make the site more viable and attractive as a potential location for businesses.
75	Jack	Moeran	Environment Agency	225	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 4: Bicester Business Park		Supports the proposed wording however advise that there may still be some ambiguity around what developments at 'at risk of flooding' actually means in practice.
247	Chris	Goddard	GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) Ltd and the Browne Family Trust	225	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 4: Bicester Business Park		Supports the proposed wording change. The proposed removal of paragraph C.62 should be incorporated within Policy Bicester 4. The Tesco store will make the site more viable and attractive as a potential location for businesses.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
231	Sean	McGrath	Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities Ltd	226	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.63		Details for the extended town centre boundary has yet to be decided.
247	Chris	Goddard	GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) Ltd and the Browne Family Trust	226	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.63		Disappointed that the Plan does not intend to pursue the expansion of the Bicester town centre boundary as part of its support for the growth of the town centre and greater integration of Bicester Village and Bicester Town Railway Station into the town. This approach contradicts the aspirations of the Bicester Masterplan. The extension of the Bicester town centre boundary should include Bicester Village.
228	Kiran	Ubbi	Turley Associates / Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd	227	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.64		The Local Plan should be informed by the evidence base and not the Bicester Masterplan. The Masterplan should be founded on the principles contained in an adopted Local Plan prepared on a credible evidence base. The Masterplan should not be used to inform the Local Plan.
231	Sean	McGrath	Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities Ltd	227	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.64		Details for the extended town centre boundary has yet to be decided.
247	Chris	Goddard	GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) Ltd and the Browne Family Trust	227	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.64		The date for the implementation and scale of the extension is unknown. This will only serve to slow the growth of the town and hinder its potential to draw and retain greater levels of investment and expenditure, generate employment and meet the needs of the growing population of Bicester.
228	Kiran	Ubbi	Turley Associates / Sainsbury's Supermarket Ltd	228	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.65		The Bicester town centre boundary extension should not be decided by the Bicester Masterplan as this does not carry enough weight to fulfil the role to inform what would become statutorily adopted DPDs, including the Local Plan under consideration. Any town centre boundary extension should be approached with careful consideration and should be kept very tightly constrained to the boundaries of the existing centre.
247	Chris	Goddard	GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) Ltd and the Browne Family Trust	228	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.65		The increasing number of vacancies within the town centre is the primary reason for not considering the extension of the town centre boundary. Reference to the 2012 Retail Study Update and clarification on the vacancy rates is needed. The current Bicester town centre redevelopment indicates confidence of investors and willingness of retailers to locate in Bicester. Once the existing development is complete there will be no other imminent major development opportunities in the town centre. The need to expand the town centre to provide sufficient sites for development during the plan period is required now. The town centre extension proposed by the Proposed Submission Local Plan should be reinstated and extended to include Bicester Village.
247	Chris	Goddard	GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) Ltd and the Browne Family Trust	231	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.68		Object to the proposed sentence at the end of the paragraph which should be removed as it is unnecessary, potentially confusing, unduly restrictive and contrary to the provisions of the NPPF.
41	Roger	Wise		232	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.69		The proposed new town park at Pingle Fields/Bicester Sports Association will be unsafe for users due to the busy road (Pingle Drive). Pollution caused by motor vehicles is an issue. Significant importance has been placed on carbon free zones Bicester but yet the proposed park will be affected by high levels of pollution. No suggestions made for the replacement of playing pitches. The BSA trust fails, because of a lack of identifiable beneficiaries or of a charitable purpose. This questions to what legal entity the BSA are, surely their status should be qualified before any dialogue or development takes place.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
234	Gemma	Care	Barton Willmore / Bicester Sports Association	232	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.69	The paragraph should be reworded to read "Work on te Bicester Masterplan has identified the potential of land at Pingle Fields/Bicester Sports Association to contribute to the formation of a town park. The playing pitches at Pingle Fields/Bicester Sports Association land would need to be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location in or close to Bicester, in order to secure this, the site should be considered for redevelopment for appropriate town centre uses.	Supports Council's aspiration for additional playing fields and sports provision for Bicester, as well as the indication that identified deficiency can be met through the improvement to and quality of existing facilities. 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). There is inconsistency between the Local Plan and Bicester Masterplan, The Plan indicates that Pingle Fields will be converted into a town park whilst the Masterplan shows the site as part of the "Town Centre Action Area" and that the site is part of the "Civic and Cultural Quarter". The site should be designated for retail and/or residential use.
6	Dominic	Woodfield	Bioscan (UK) Ltd	239	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.83		Removal of reference to Gavray Drive as a consented site is welcomed. This recognition reflects the current position of impasse with the promoters of that site, and it is worth stressing that this situation is not of Cherwell District Councils making but due to the applicant's continued reluctance to change their proposals to comply with local and national planning policy.
6	Dominic	Woodfield	Bioscan (UK) Ltd	239	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.83		The planning permission is now quashed, but the site continues to be used in the informal manner, indeed the lower levels of such use and greater size of the area concerned means it is not only able to do so without detriment but also performs a valuable function for local residents that is worthy of recognition.
234	Gemma	Care	Barton Willmore / Bicester Sports Association	239	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.83	The last sentence should be amended to read "As the Bicester Plan proposes changing Pingle Fields and adjacent land into a new town park and as there is a recognised significant underprovision of sports pitches, there is a need to relocate the rugby club and other sports uses to a suitable alternative location in or close to the town comprising equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality".	Supports the proposed wording change however the text should be amended further to give some flexibility by stating that the rugby club and other sports uses should be located in or close to the town. The last sentence should be amended to read "As the Bicester Plan proposes changing Pingle Fields and adjacent land into a new town park and as there is a recognised significant under provision of sports pitches, there is a need to relocate the rugby club and other sports uses to a suitable alternative location in or close to the town comprising equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality".
10	Donald	Robinson	Royal Pioneer Corp Angling Association	241	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.85		C.85 is not supported as it is wrong and not feasible. The site name should be extended to include Elm Farm Quarry as the site consists of two parts. The statement "only low intensity recreational use of the site is likely to be appropriate" is vague, should consider adding "those limited numbers of organisations currently using the sites for a long period of time should remain the sole users". Turning Stratton Audley Quarry into a new country park is not supported as it will ruin the fishing clubs activities and the natural habitats in the area. The areas are not suitable for public access due to safety. In preparing the Plan Cherwell DC did not consider or discuss the matters with long standing tenants of the properties. The club has a 20 year fishing lease from Oxfordshire County Council.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
247	Chris	Goddard	GVA / Value Retail (Bicester Village) Ltd and the Browne Family Trust	245	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 10: Bicester Gateway		Supports the proposed wording change however the reference on high technology industries does not go far enough to protect other, sequentially preferable, sites identified for conventional B1 Business uses. Wording of Policy Bicester 10 should be more stringent in its assertion that the Bicester Gateway site should be for science and high tech industries only. Consider adding the following bullet point: "Commercial office uses will be resisted to safeguard the site for science and high tech knowledge industry employment use. Commercial office-led development will be focussed in sequentially preferable locations closer to Bicester town centre and Bicester Town railway station, such as the Bicester Business Park site (see Policy Bicester 4)".
75	Jack	Moeran	Environment Agency	246	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 10: Bicester Gateway		Supports the proposed wording however advise that there may still be some ambiguity around what developments at 'at risk of flooding' actually means in practice.
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	246	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 10: Bicester Gateway		Supports the proposed wording change
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	246	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 10: Bicester Gateway		Supports the proposed wording change
99	Bob	Ham	Bomber Command Heritage	247	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 11: North East Bicester Business Park	The North East Bicester Business Park should be relocated to a less damaging alternative site. The redevelopment of RAF Bicester will relieve pressure on Bicester 11.	Restricting the potential use to B1 uses will not remove the risk of detriment. The siting of any employment related development on site would fail to recognise or to preserve the vital significance of this unique 20th century heritage asset and its setting.
134	Hannah	Smith	Indigo Planning / Albion Land Ltd	247	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 11: North East Bicester Business Park		The policy nor the supporting text provides explanation on the nature of the impact or draw references to the evidence used for restricting the employment use to B1 uses. The policy needs to be more flexible. Potential impact of development on RAF Bicester should be made at the development management stage. The policy should include other uses such as B1, B2 and or B8. A revised site boundary needs to be included.
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes	253	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.101		Supports the proposed removal of the paragraph. It has previously been demonstrated that Bicester 12 is capable of providing an initial release of housing and employment land without any improvements to the strategic road network.
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes	254	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Strategic Development Bicester 12 - East Bicester - Heading	Reference to the development area should be amended to "approximately" to align with the areas included in the employment and housing sections of the policy.	Supports the proposed removal of text. Reference to the development area should be amended to "approximately" to align with the areas included in the employment and housing sections of the policy.
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes	255	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Strategic Development Bicester 12 - East Bicester		Supports the proposed removal of text.
211	David	Keene	David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates Ltd (Gavray Drive)	256	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 12 - East Bicester	South East Bicester and delivery rate should remain as set out in the Proposed Submission Local Plan. There is insufficient evidence to suggest the change.	An increase of new homes from 150 to 250 and the delivery rates have been brought forward by 15 years with the first of the 50 units to be delivered within 2014/15. No evidence base to suggest that 250 dwellings is appropriate or looked at alternative sites for accommodating growth in Bicester, and the proposed delivery rates. The SA does not consider the implications of this increase in housing number.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes	256	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 12 - East Bicester	The number of new homes should increase from 400 to approximately 800 dwellings.	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 order, to be determined by market factors. Reference to 'Jobs created' should be deleted. The site is capable of delivering a greater number of homes within the plan period. 400 new dwellings have been allocated on 22ha of land which appears to be too low. The site could accommodate approximately 800 dwellings during the plan period. Density calculated based on Graven Hill would result in 760 dwellings.
245	Damien	Holdstock	Turley Associates / I M Properties Ltd	256	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 12 - South East Bicester	The Plan should address the identified need set out against the high growth scenario which was stated in the Employment Land Review Update. This will ensure that there is a greater choice of sites for the market, and avoid overreliance on only a handful of sites which may be unduly delayed, or may not be capable of providing the form of development attractive to the market. The Plan should allocate further sites based on an up to date review of available sites, the existing employment land position and the proposed form of development achievable and supported for those employment sites already identified in the Plan.	The proposed changes to the Policy result in an inherent lack of clarity over precisely how much employment land the Local Plan is allocating at East Bicester and for what uses. It is not clear how the proposed employment uses on the site will contribute to addressing the identified need for B2 and B8 employment uses in the District. The Draft Economic Analysis Study 2012 suggests that there is a need for B8 employment. There is insufficient land allocated for B2 and B8 employment uses. The Plan should address the identified need set out against the high growth scenario which was stated in the Employment Land Review Update. The Plan should allocate further employment sites.
50	Andy	Kirkham	Aylesbury Vale District Council	258	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 12 - South East Bicester	Insert 'The Transport Assessment will include consultation in its production with Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council as adjoining planning and highway authorities.'	Transport Assessment for Sites 2 and 12 should be consulted with Aylesbury Vale District Council and Buckinghamshire County Council. The commitment to this needs to be set out in the Plan. There may be implications from the growth at these sites for traffic levels and capacity along the A41 that adjoining authorities need to have an input into.
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes	258	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	Policy Bicester 12 - South East Bicester		Reference to Policy ESD 16 is unnecessary. Bullet point 2 suggest that the height of buildings will be minimised to reduce their visual impact which will affect the viability of these buildings. Building heights could be controlled by Policy ESD 13. Remove reference to visual impact and relate the heights of buildings to occupier requirements. Reference to the requirement to implement the bus route should be deleted. Bullet point 16 should be deleted.
98	Julian	Woodward		261	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.104	Remove Banbury 3 from the Plan. Relative small extensions to zones 1 and 2 would compensate.	Concerned about the inclusion of the area on Bretch Hill (Banbury 3). 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. There will be increasing pressure for further development and the proposed Green Buffer in the area may not be effective. Bretch Hill may need some regeneration and improvement however this is not a sufficient reason to allocate West of Bretch Hill. Prime farmland will be lost.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	261	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.104	The wording should be amended as follows: "Banbury faces topographic constraints important to the setting of the town, including to the east (the M40 and River Cherwell Valley), the west (steep sided valley and villages) and the north (rising landform and villages), with a historic town boundary and open aspect to the south beyond the Salt Way. These are all natural (and manmade) barriers to growth that have shaped how the town has grown and is to grow in the future. As a result only a limited number of strategic development sites have been identified for new housing growth including Bankside, Canalside, West of Bretch Hill (to support an area of renewal to the east), North of Hanwell Fields and at Southam Road".	Topographic constraints in the north of Banbury has not been referenced. Sites north of Banbury have been identified by LDA to address housing supply issues and not due to availability. The wording should be amended accordingly.
183	Alan	Jones		261	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.104	The wording should be amended as follows: "Banbury faces significant topographic constraints important to the setting of the town, including to the east (the M40 and River Cherwell Valley), the west (steep sided valley and villages) and the north (rising landform and villages), with a historic town boundary and open aspect to the south beyond the Salt Way. These are all natural (and manmade) barriers to growth that have shaped how the town has grown and is to grow in the future. As a result only a limited number of strategic development sites have been identified for new housing growth including Bankside, Canalside, West of Bretch Hill (to support an area of renewal to the east), North of Hanwell Fields and at Southam Road".	Topographic constraints in the north of Banbury has not been referenced. Sites north of Banbury have been identified by LDA to address housing supply issues and not due to availability. The wording should be amended accordingly.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
184	Karen	Jones		261	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.104	The wording should be amended as follows: "Banbury faces significant topographic constraints important to the setting of the town, including to the east (the M40 and River Cherwell Valley), the west (steep sided valley and villages) and the north (rising landform and villages), with a historic town boundary and open aspect to the south beyond the Salt Way. These are all natural (and manmade) barriers to growth that have shaped how the town has grown and is to grow in the future. As a result only a limited number of strategic development sites have been identified for new housing growth including Bankside, Canalside, West of Bretch Hill (to support an area of renewal to the east), North of Hanwell Fields and at Southam Road".	Topographic constraints in the north of Banbury has not been referenced. Sites north of Banbury have been identified by LDA to address housing supply issues and not due to availability. The wording should be amended accordingly.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	261	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.104	Delete from "being important to the setting of the town".	Object to the weight originally given to Salt Way.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	261	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.104		Supports the proposed wording change
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	263	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.107		Supports the proposed wording change
210	Angela	Reeve	Doelotte Real Estate / CEMEX UK Limited	263	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.107		The last bullet point should be reflective of the wider policies within the Plan and which seeks to introduce flexibility to ensure the swift delivery of economic generating uses.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	265	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.109	Delete the third sentence. Amend the fourth sentence by replacing "many of these sites in Banbury" with "Whilst some sites are non-strategic...."	None of the landscapes on the periphery of Banbury are of such weight.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	267	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.116		Amend the wording "encourage change" to "welcome innovation".

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
104	Tim	Byrne	Jones Lang LaSalle / Oxford University Hospital NHS Trust	270	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.120	Sentence to be removed from the Plan. If the sentence remains then the Horton General Hospital should be appropriately referenced by its correct name.	The retention of healthcare provision at the Horton Hospital is secured through alternative mechanisms and it is not appropriate for it to be specifically referenced and included within this section of the Local Plan. If the sentence remains then the Horton General Hospital should be appropriately referenced by its correct name. Oxford University Hospitals Trust has developed a set of cooperate objectives to progress the delivery of the Trust's Strategic Objectives in 2012/13. The outcome will be to enhance the quality, efficiency and sustainability of services at the Horton General Hospital, including re-modelling of adult medical and surgical services and the provision of a flexible, robust core medical function that supports other speciality work. Th3e Horton Hospital has a sustainable location within the town of Banbury and in line with the NPPF the hospital has an important role in providing "accessible local services that reflect the community's needs".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	270	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.120		Supports the proposed wording change
25	David	Sullivan		272	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.122		The Plan should clearly identify schemes to reduce congestion including timescales to introduce these schemes before housing/industry is developed.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	272	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.122		Managing traffic congestion remains a key objective and should not be deleted.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP	272	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.122		C.122 overstates the importance of Salt Way. Crouch Hill is a more important asset than Salt Way however it has not been mentioned in the Policy. The protection of Salt Way is not therefore a 'key environmental challenge'. The last bullet point should be deleted.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	273	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.125		Objects to the increase of housing provision in Banbury. No further site allocations have been identified to accommodate the increased housing provision.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	275	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.131		Supports the proposed wording change
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	276	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Land to the South of Banbury should be considered as a reasonable alternative and policy allow for development in this location.	The site cannot be relied on due to the multiple ownerships at Canalside. The reduction of the delivery rate in the Housing Trajectory is still unrealistic.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	277	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Land to the South of Banbury should be considered as a reasonable alternative and policy allow for development in this location.	The site cannot be relied on due to the multiple ownerships at Canalside. The reduction of the delivery rate in the Housing Trajectory is still unrealistic.
231	Sean	McGrath	Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities Ltd	277	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	The Policy needs to make clear that financial assessments will play an important role in assessing the level of contributions from new development, particularly in relation to housing mix and tenure. It should also make clear that contributions will be reduced or not be sought where it would make the scheme unviable.	The requirement of affordable housing is inflexible and is likely to hinder residential development coming forward in the Canalside area. The policy does not take any account of viability.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	277	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		The reduction in the number of dwellings expected to be delivered at Canalside (1,050 to 950) will fail to deliver the requisite amount of completions during the plan period. Object to Banbury 2 as it contradicts the evidence base. Land at Warwick Road would be a more suitable site.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	278	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Land to the South of Banbury should be considered as a reasonable alternative and policy allow for development in this location.	The site cannot be relied on due to the multiple ownerships at Canalside. The reduction of the delivery rate in the Housing Trajectory is still unrealistic.
231	Sean	McGrath	Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities Ltd	278	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Delete the requirement for a new primary school.	The requirement for a new primary school is vague and should be deleted. The policy is too vague therefore it is not possible for applicants to know what will be expected from them.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	278	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		The reduction in the number of dwellings expected to be delivered at Canalside (1,050 to 950) will fail to deliver the requisite amount of completions during the plan period. Object to Banbury 2 as it contradicts the evidence base. Land at Warwick Road would be a more suitable site.
47	Martin	Small	English Heritage	279	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		Supports the proposed wording change. However it is not clear whether the Council sees a difference between "retention" and "integration". The two principles should be combined as "Retention and integration". Amend bullets to read "Retention and integration of the most valuable historic buildings/structures including the Old Town Hall and the Bridge over the Mill stream and buildings of local historic interest, which will enrich the environment and maintain the long-term character of the area".
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	279	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Land to the South of Banbury should be considered as a reasonable alternative and policy allow for development in this location.	The site cannot be relied on due to the multiple ownerships at Canalside. The reduction of the delivery rate in the Housing Trajectory is still unrealistic.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	279	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		The 25th bullet point "Retention of the most....." is inadequate. Retention of the Grade II listed buildings must be assured. Additional wording needed on the retention of the site's undesignated and locally designated heritage assets. Amend the bullet point to read "Retention of historic buildings, including Grade II-Listed Old Town Hall and Bridge over the river and locally listed buildings".
210	Angela	Reeve	Doelotte Real Estate / CEMEX UK Limited	279	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		The CEMEX site should be included as part of the Banbury 1 site.
217	Mark	Recchia	Banbury Town Council	279	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Amend bullet point to read as "Retention of historic buildings, including Grade II Listed Old Town Hall and Bridge over the river and locally listed buildings".	The proposed wording on valuable historic buildings/structures is not sufficient. It fails to give adequate policy backing to the retention of the site's undesignated and locally designated heritage assets, principally the locally listed historic buildings, all of which lie in the Oxford Canal Conservation Area.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
231	Sean	McGrath	Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities Ltd	279	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Delete the design requirement. Delete the requirement for an acoustic survey or state that this will be carried out by the council. Redraft the policy to make clear that continuation of the existing uses on the site should be acceptable. Clarification needed on the proposed bridges and their location. Alternatively delete the policy.	The vision of the site contradicts the development description. E.g. new offices (use class B1) will be developed in the Canalside site. The design requirement is subjective and unnecessary and should be deleted. The requirement for an acoustic survey should be deleted or state that this will be carried out by the council. Clarification needed on the number of proposed bridges and their approximate location. The policy is too vague. The vision for the site is not clarified in the policy. The site should not be allocated if the physical suitability is not known.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	279	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		The reduction in the number of dwellings expected to be delivered at Canalside (1,050 to 950) will fail to deliver the requisite amount of completions during the plan period. Object to Banbury 2 as it contradicts the evidence base. Land at Warwick Road would be a more suitable site.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	279	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		The word "boulevard" should be removed.
47	Martin	Small	English Heritage	280	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Remove the words "and buildings".	Consistency issue between Change no. 279 and 280. "nearly all.....buildings will be removed" or "Retention of the most valuable historic buildings/structures".
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	280	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Land to the South of Banbury should be considered as a reasonable alternative and policy allow for development in this location.	The site cannot be relied on due to the multiple ownerships at Canalside. The reduction of the delivery rate in the Housing Trajectory is still unrealistic.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	280	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		The 3rd paragraph is confusing, given the number of locally-listed historic industrial and other buildings within the Oxford Canal conservation Area, which need to be retained and reused in order to preserve the character, appearance and significance of the conservation area and wider site. The words "and buildings" should be removed. A new paragraph should be added "Because of all importance of Canalside's industrial heritage, archaeological surveys, assessments and mitigation of impacts will be needed in specific locations and buildings".
212	David	Keene	David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates Ltd	280	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	The site should be considered a "Housing Reserve Area" and the implications for bringing forward such a complex brownfield site should be made clear within the site specific policy Banbury 1.	The policy demonstrates the complexities of the site and the resources that will be required to bring it forward. There is an overreliance on Canalside to deliver a large proportion of Banbury's growth. The site should be considered a "Housing Reserve Area" and the implications for bringing forward such a complex brownfield site should be made clear within the site specific policy Banbury 1.
217	Mark	Recchia	Banbury Town Council	280	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	Remove the words "...and buildings" from the 3rd paragraph. Consider adding "Because of the importance of Canalside's industrial heritage, archaeological surveys, assessments and mitigation of impacts will be needed in specific locations and buildings".	The removal of 'nearly all existing land uses and buildings' raises concerns given the number of locally-listed historic industrial and other buildings within the Oxford Canal Conservation Area. These will need to be retained and reused to preserve the character, appearance and significance of the conservation area and wider site.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
231	Sean	McGrath	Indigo Planning Ltd / McKay Securities Ltd	280	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside	The policy should be deleted or amended to make clear that there is no impediment to any site coming forward. Alternatively delete this section.	The site contains a number of distinct sites whilst the Masterplan treats it as a single homogenous site which is incorrect. Welcome the proposed wording on open space provision. There are ownership issues and the policy is too vague. No reference made on proposals for decanting existing businesses, secure of donor sites and timescales. Supports the principle of regeneration however the policy has the potential to hinder the interim investment in the businesses on site.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	280	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		The reduction in the number of dwellings expected to be delivered at Canalside (1,050 to 950) will fail to deliver the requisite amount of completions during the plan period. Object to Banbury 2 as it contradicts the evidence base. Land at Warwick Road would be a more suitable site.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	281	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
183	Alan	Jones		281	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
184	Karen	Jones		281	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury		Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	281	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	The 600 dwellings should be recognised as a minimum. A recognition that the site is circa 43 hectares should be included. The number of homes should be confirmed as approximately 800. The opportunity for community self build affordable housing should be deleted. The reference to off-site contributions should be deleted from the policy. The opportunity to connect to the country park should be clarified. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.	Supports the allocation of Banbury 2 for residential development and considers that it provides a sustainable solution to housing need in Banbury. The reduction in housing numbers from 800 to 600 dwellings is noted however it would be appropriate and acceptable to accommodate 800 dwellings on the site. Policy seeks on-site community facilities whilst also identifying a possible requirement for contributions to the community hall at Hanwell Fields. Such provision is excessive and unreasonable. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	281	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)		The reduction in the number of dwellings expected to be delivered at Canalside (1,050 to 950) will fail to deliver the requisite amount of completions during the plan period. Object to Banbury 2 as it contradicts the evidence base. Land at Warwick Road would be a more suitable site.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	282	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
183	Alan	Jones		282	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
184	Karen	Jones		282	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury		Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	282	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)		Supports the proposed wording change
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	282	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	The 600 dwellings should be recognised as a minimum. A recognition that the site is circa 43 hectares should be included. The number of homes should be confirmed as approximately 800. The opportunity for community self build affordable housing should be deleted. The reference to off-site contributions should be deleted from the policy. The opportunity to connect to the country park should be clarified. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.	Supports the allocation of Banbury 2 for residential development and considers that it provides a sustainable solution to housing need in Banbury. The reduction in housing numbers from 800 to 600 dwellings is noted however it would be appropriate and acceptable to accommodate 800 dwellings on the site. Policy seeks on-site community facilities whilst also identifying a possible requirement for contributions to the community hall at Hanwell Fields. Such provision is excessive and unreasonable. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	282	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)		The reduction in the number of dwellings expected to be delivered at Canalside (1,050 to 950) will fail to deliver the requisite amount of completions during the plan period. Object to Banbury 2 as it contradicts the evidence base. Land at Warwick Road would be a more suitable site.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	283	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
183	Alan	Jones		283	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
184	Karen	Jones		283	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury		Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	283	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	The 600 dwellings should be recognised as a minimum. A recognition that the site is circa 43 hectares should be included. The number of homes should be confirmed as approximately 800. The opportunity for community self build affordable housing should be deleted. The reference to off-site contributions should be deleted from the policy. The opportunity to connect to the country park should be clarified. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.	Supports the allocation of Banbury 2 for residential development and considers that it provides a sustainable solution to housing need in Banbury. The reduction in housing numbers from 800 to 600 dwellings is noted however it would be appropriate and acceptable to accommodate 800 dwellings on the site. Policy seeks on-site community facilities whilst also identifying a possible requirement for contributions to the community hall at Hanwell Fields. Such provision is excessive and unreasonable. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	283	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)		The reduction in the number of dwellings expected to be delivered at Canalside (1,050 to 950) will fail to deliver the requisite amount of completions during the plan period. Object to Banbury 2 as it contradicts the evidence base. Land at Warwick Road would be a more suitable site.
75	Jack	Moeran	Environment Agency	284	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)		The suggested removal of the 7th bullet point indicates that a planning application has been submitted and a reduced housing number is now proposed meaning that there will be no requirement to develop in Flood Zones 2 or 3. Clarification needed for this change.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	284	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
183	Alan	Jones		284	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
184	Karen	Jones		284	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury		Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	284	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)		Supports the proposed wording change however will need to add "Protection of Hardwick Hill skyline from built development is required, in order to preserve Banbury's rural setting and green edge".
215	Graham	Simpkin	Graham Simpkin Planning / the London Cremation Co Ltd.	284	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)		The Policy needs to safeguard the setting of the Crematorium which is a sub-regional facility. An additional bullet point is needed as follows "Banbury Crematorium and Garden of Remembrance is an important sub-regional facility and the new housing development comprising residential dwellings and their gardens should be set a minimum of 50m away from the boundary of the Garden of Remembrance and this area shall be planted as a buffer zone between the new development and this facility. If this area is to be made available for access by the public then a security fence shall be provided along the boundary of the Garden of Remembrance".
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	284	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	The 600 dwellings should be recognised as a minimum. A recognition that the site is circa 43 hectares should be included. The number of homes should be confirmed as approximately 800. The opportunity for community self build affordable housing should be deleted. The reference to off-site contributions should be deleted from the policy. The opportunity to connect to the country park should be clarified. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.	Supports the allocation of Banbury 2 for residential development and considers that it provides a sustainable solution to housing need in Banbury. The reduction in housing numbers from 800 to 600 dwellings is noted however it would be appropriate and acceptable to accommodate 800 dwellings on the site. Policy seeks on-site community facilities whilst also identifying a possible requirement for contributions to the community hall at Hanwell Fields. Such provision is excessive and unreasonable. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	285	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
183	Alan	Jones		285	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
184	Karen	Jones		285	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury		Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	285	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	The 600 dwellings should be recognised as a minimum. A recognition that the site is circa 43 hectares should be included. The number of homes should be confirmed as approximately 800. The opportunity for community self build affordable housing should be deleted. The reference to off-site contributions should be deleted from the policy. The opportunity to connect to the country park should be clarified. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.	Supports the allocation of Banbury 2 for residential development and considers that it provides a sustainable solution to housing need in Banbury. The reduction in housing numbers from 800 to 600 dwellings is noted however it would be appropriate and acceptable to accommodate 800 dwellings on the site. Policy seeks on-site community facilities whilst also identifying a possible requirement for contributions to the community hall at Hanwell Fields. Such provision is excessive and unreasonable. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	286	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
183	Alan	Jones		286	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
184	Karen	Jones		286	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury		Banbury 2 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 2 East and West of Southam Road being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
232	Sinéad	Morrisey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd	286	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	The 600 dwellings should be recognised as a minimum. A recognition that the site is circa 43 hectares should be included. The number of homes should be confirmed as approximately 800. The opportunity for community self build affordable housing should be deleted. The reference to off-site contributions should be deleted from the policy. The opportunity to connect to the country park should be clarified. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.	Supports the allocation of Banbury 2 for residential development and considers that it provides a sustainable solution to housing need in Banbury. The reduction in housing numbers from 800 to 600 dwellings is noted however it would be appropriate and acceptable to accommodate 800 dwellings on the site. Policy seeks on-site community facilities whilst also identifying a possible requirement for contributions to the community hall at Hanwell Fields. Such provision is excessive and unreasonable. The Policy should revert back to its original wording from the Proposed Submission.
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd	287	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 3: West of Bretch Hill		Supports the proposed wording change
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd	288	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 3: West of Bretch Hill		Supports the deletion of the minimum density requirement and the reference made on Policy BSC 4. 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.
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd	289	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 3: West of Bretch Hill		Improvement should be made to existing surgeries, where evidence of need is provided, rather than provide an on site facility. The inclusion of Thames Valley on site Police drop in facility is questioned. Could be provided as part of improvements to community facilities within Bretch Hill.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	290	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 3: West of Bretch Hill		The 3rd bullet point needs to be amended to "Development must respect the historic environment, including Listed buildings, Drayton Conservation Area and Wroxton Abbey parkland and their settings".
299	Peter	Brown	Drayton Parish Council	290	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 3: West of Bretch Hill	Justification of the new housing site alongside other sites that are not included in Banbury.	There is no consideration of the additional traffic that will be generated by the new development West of Bretch Hill, both on Bretch Hill and the Warwick Road/Stratford Road Junction. No justification why this site was chosen over sites to the West of Easington.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	291	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		Supports the removal of the amount of land that will be developed for employment purposes in Change no. 291 and proposed wording change in Change no. 292. However the number of homes should be in gross terms. The land that may be required for the relocation of the football club cannot be determined at this stage. Banbury 4 and 12 will need to be open to more detailed future considerations.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	291	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		Supports the proposed wording change
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	292	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		Supports the removal of the amount of land that will be developed for employment purposes in Change no. 291 and proposed wording change in Change no. 292. However the number of homes should be in gross terms. The land that may be required for the relocation of the football club cannot be determined at this stage. Banbury 4 and 12 will need to be open to more detailed future considerations.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	292	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		Supports the proposed wording change
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	292	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		Land to the south of Bodicote is a suitable site for residential development which could accommodate up to 100 dwellings. The site should be recognised as being comparably sustainable with Bankside Phase 2.
48	Susan and Ian	Jelfs		293	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Banbury Phase 2		Concerned about Bankside Phase 2 due to its close proximity to Adderbury. This will need to be considered.
78	Alasdair	Jones	Marrons / Hallam Land Management	293	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		Supports the removal of the amount of land that will be developed for employment purposes in Change no. 291 and proposed wording change in Change no. 292. However the number of homes should be in gross terms. The land that may be required for the relocation of the football club cannot be determined at this stage. Banbury 4 and 12 will need to be open to more detailed future considerations.
127	Valerie	Russell	Bodicote Parish Council	293	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		Supports the proposed wording change
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	293	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		Supports the proposed wording change
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	293	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		Land to the south of Bodicote is a suitable site for residential development which could accommodate up to 100 dwellings. The site should be recognised as being comparably sustainable with Bankside Phase 2.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	293	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		"Provision of a bus service through the site" should be deleted as this has not yet been decided.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	294	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.143		Supports the proposed wording change

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	294	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.143		Land to the south of Bodicote is a suitable site for residential development which could accommodate up to 100 dwellings. The site should be recognised as being comparably sustainable with Bankside Phase 2.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	295	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.144		Supports the proposed wording change
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	295	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.144		Land to the south of Bodicote is a suitable site for residential development which could accommodate up to 100 dwellings. The site should be recognised as being comparably sustainable with Bankside Phase 2.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	296	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
183	Alan	Jones		296	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
184	Karen	Jones		296	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	296	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the proposed wording change. Banbury has the largest supply of employment land in the district and providing for economic growth and diversification is supported. The landscape assessment and conclusion are also supported.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	296	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the proposed wording change
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	296	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		The reduction in the number of dwellings expected to be delivered at Canalside (1,050 to 950) will fail to deliver the requisite amount of completions during the plan period. Object to Banbury 2 as it contradicts the evidence base. Land at Warwick Road would be a more suitable site.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	297	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
183	Alan	Jones		297	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
184	Karen	Jones		297	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	297	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Policy BSC 4 is too prescriptive. The evidence base to support the housing mix (SHMA 2012) has not been subject to detailed consultation. Greater flexibility needs to be incorporated into housing mix requirements with a particular emphasis on viability and the specific locational and demand requirements.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	297	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the proposed wording change
233	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Amber Developments	297	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Do not object to the principle of making provision of extra care housing or community self-build however the suitability of the site and mechanisms for delivery of these uses is questioned. No evidence provided to examine the delivery mechanisms for the requirement of community self-build. The policy needs greater flexibility.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	298	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
183	Alan	Jones		298	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
184	Karen	Jones		298	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	298	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the proposed wording change
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	298	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the proposed wording change
233	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Amber Developments	298	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the removal of reference to employment land.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	299	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
183	Alan	Jones		299	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
184	Karen	Jones		299	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	299	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the proposed wording change
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	299	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the proposed wording change

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
233	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Amber Developments	299	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		A strategic education solution is needed to help prospective developers understand the locations of the schools as well as financial contributions required. Welcomes the removal of the Local Centre requirement. There is a significant existing district centre to the north east of Hanwell Fields which the site would be well connected to and it is within easy walking and cycling distance.
158	Jayne	Gordon	Hanwell Parish Council	300	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
183	Alan	Jones		300	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
184	Karen	Jones		300	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Banbury 5 should be removed as a strategic allocation.	Object to the principle of Banbury 5 North of Hanwell Fields being allocated. There has been a significant change since the Draft Core Strategy 2010 which now contradicts the previous conclusions on sustainability. 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.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	300	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the proposed wording change

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	300	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields		Supports the proposed wording change
233	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Amber Developments	300	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Green Buffer policy should recognise the differences between the two parts of the site. The existing strategic landscaping is more important at the top of the slop and it softens the visual impact between the allocation and Hanwell Village. 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. The policy could provide further detail in relation to any specific heritage assets the scheme should be assessed against and their known significance.	Green Buffer policy should recognise the differences between the two parts of the site. The existing strategic landscaping is more important at the top of the slop and it softens the visual impact between the allocation and Hanwell Village. Lower down the slope the need for such an extent of landscaping is less necessary due to the topography and could be reduced in scale. Support deletion of reference to Policy ESD 17: The Oxford Canal. 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. The policy could provide further detail in relation to any specific heritage assets the scheme should be assessed against and their known significance. The provision of lighting and minimisation of light pollution appears to be somewhat onerous for an outline application and could easily be dealt with via a suitably worded condition. Wording on public art remains vague. A strategic flood risk assessment is not an appropriate type of assessment to inform the location of SuDs within an allocation. The location of SuDs should be left to the more detailed site specific assessment. If agricultural land classifications are already in existence the formulation of a detailed management plan appears unnecessary until such a time as the detailed design is being included. Could be covered under conditions.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	301	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.147		Supports the proposed wording change
26	David	Sullivan		302	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.148		The Plan should clearly identify transport and infrastructure development required to be in place before housing and industry development are built.
225	Alex	Arrol	Savills / Kennet Properties Ltd/Thames Water Group	303	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Strategic Development Banbury 6 - Employment Land West of M40		Supports this proposed allocation.
47	Martin	Small	English Heritage	304	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Strategic Development Banbury 6 - Employment Land West of M40		Policy Banbury 6 should include an additional key site-specific design and place shaping principle in respect of the Banbury 9 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. New bullet to be included "Development should not adversely affect the significance of the former Banbury 9 Filling Factory Scheduled Monument on the east side of the M40 or the associated archaeological remains of the filling factory on the west side of the motorway, which although not scheduled, are regarded by English Heritage as also being of national importance and contribute to the national significance of the Filling Factory complex. If hard to this significance is unavoidable, then a demonstration that the harm can be successfully mitigated by comprehensive recording and enhancements to the complex as a whole will be required".

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	304	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Strategic Development Banbury 6 - Employment Land West of M40		A new bullet point should be added as "Development must not adversely affect the setting of the Banbury No 9 Filling Factory Scheduled Monument on the E. side of the M40. Archaeological remains of the non-Scheduled filling factory on the W. side of the motorway are regarded by English Heritage as being of national importance and will need to be protected or recorded".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	306	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.151		Supports the proposed wording change
254	Greg	Mitchell	Framptons Planning / Barwood Developments Ltd	307	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.154		A confusing picture for proposals at Bolton Road is presented however supports that 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.
257	David	Smith	Turley Associates / Scottish Widows Investment Partnership	307	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.154	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.	The last paragraph is at odds with the accompanying Banbury Key Proposals Map. Clarification needed for the policy wording. 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.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	308	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.155		Supports the proposed wording change
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	309	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy 7: Strengthening Banbury Town Centre		Supports the proposed wording change
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	310	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.156		Supports the proposed wording change
254	Greg	Mitchell	Framptons Planning / Barwood Developments Ltd	310	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.156		A confusing picture for proposals at Bolton Road is presented however supports that 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.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	311	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.158		Supports the proposed wording change
254	Greg	Mitchell	Framptons Planning / Barwood Developments Ltd	311	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.158	Delete reference to "which could include a supermarket". Such a use could be accommodated on the Kraft Employment Opportunity site.	A confusing picture for proposals at Bolton Road is presented however supports that 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. The paragraph introduces a significant degree of uncertainty which stated "which could include a supermarket".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	312	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 8: Land at Bolton Road		Supports the proposed wording change

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
254	Greg	Mitchell	Framptons Planning / Barwood Developments Ltd	312	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 8: Land at Bolton Road		A confusing picture for proposals at Bolton Road is presented however supports that 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.
167	Matthew	Williams	Deloitte Real Estate / Aberdeen Property Investors	313	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 8: Land at Bolton Road		The changes to the current policy makes the objectives inconsistent. Clarification needed on 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. Bolton Road does and should continue to be the primary focus for accommodating additional convenience floorspace in Banbury. There are no other suitable sites for a foodstore. Wording on Policy Banbury 8 to be reconsidered to include the foodstore reference.
214	Tim	Rainbird	Quod / Gala Bingo Ltd	315	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 8: Land at Bolton Road		Welcome the reference of the bingo hall however do not support the loss of Gala's existing unit on Bolton Road. Gala Leisure currently has a leasehold interest in the Bingo hall that does not expire until 2023. No discussions held between the Council and Gala Leisure therefore there has been no indication that the bingo hall will be relocated. No alternative site has been identified for the relocation of the bingo hall.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	316	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 8: Land at Bolton Road		The 12th bullet point is inappropriate and simultaneously too vague and too prescriptive. Amend the bullet point to read "Larger units may be located on the Castle Street frontage, but they should present a welcoming and attractive streetscape and an active frontage".
217	Mark	Recchia	Banbury Town Council	316	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 8: Land at Bolton Road		The possible larger units on the Castle Street frontage is accepted however they should present a welcoming and attractive streetscape and an active frontage.
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	317	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury			The NPPF discourages the production of SPDs where these add to the policy and they should not be used where they add additional costs to development.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	317	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 8: Land at Bolton Road	The Local Plan should set the development policy requirements and not rely on a SPD.	The Local Plan should set the development policy requirements and not rely on a SPD.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	317	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 8: Land at Bolton Road		A new requirement to be added as "Given much of the site's location within the medieval town, appropriate archaeological surveys and mitigation will be required".
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	318	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area		Supports the proposed wording change
257	David	Smith	Turley Associates / Scottish Widows Investment Partnership	318	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area		Supports the proposed wording change how the policy should include explicit reference to the potential foodstore provision on the Spiceball Development Area. Reference should also be made to residential uses where these can be satisfactory accommodated on site.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	319	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area		Supports the proposed wording change
75	Jack	Moeran	Environment Agency	320	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area		Supports the proposed wording change

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	320	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area		Supports the proposed wording change
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	320	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area		Amend the sentence to read "Public transport should be provided for, including the provision of new bus stops".
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	321	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area		The NPPF discourages the production of SPDs where these add to the policy and they should not be used where they add additional costs to development.
204	James	Stevens	Home Builders Federation	321	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area	The Local Plan should set the development policy requirements and not rely on a SPD.	The Local Plan should set the development policy requirements and not rely on a SPD.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	321	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 9: Spiceball Development Area		A new requirement to be added as "Development should enhance the setting of the Listed medieval bridge and should make it more visible and accessible" and "Given the site's existing and former industrial heritage, localised archaeological surveys and mitigation will be required".
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton	325	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	C.172		Pitch allocations required to be made 'through the Local Plan process' which they are not.
24	Heather	Johnston		328	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 12: Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC		Proposed site for the relocation of Banbury United FC - Sport England will need to be involved in discussions relating to the 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.
127	Valerie	Russell	Bodicote Parish Council	328	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 12: Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC		The policy should clearly state "proposed Banbury United FC relocation" as the relocation has not been debated. The location does not conform to the intention of sustainability in the area. Alternative sites needs to be considered. The transport assessment must be undertaken at peak traffic times and especially at weekends, when people are visiting the nearby facilities.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	328	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 12: Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC		Supports the proposed wording change
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	330	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.188		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	331	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.189		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	332	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.190		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	332	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.190		Supports the proposed wording change
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		332	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.190	Reference should be made on Kidlington Masterplan. Clarification needed on the term "Framework" in terms of adding statutory weight to planning applications and policy.	The term "Framework" needs clarification in terms of adding statutory weight to planning applications and policy.
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	332	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.190		Supports the proposed wording change
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park
84	Ian	Scargill	Oxford Green Belt Network	333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192		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. The paragraph is unclear - Would the airport be part of the proposed Green Belt review at Langford Lane, or would there be further loss of Green Belt in connection with airport expansion, or if there will be another review at the airport in addition to those to the Plan.
108	Alan	Lodwick		333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192	Additional wording could include "Assessment would be undertaken to ensure that any new employment to be accommodated would not result in pressure for housing which would require further Green Belt reviews and would not have unacceptable implications for transport infrastructure". Consider looking at alternative sites available in Central Oxfordshire.	The proposed local Green Belt review will have implications for travel to work patterns and transport infrastructure and increase pressure for housing development elsewhere in the Green Belt in Kidlington. This needs to be adequately addressed. The demand is from Central Oxfordshire therefore does not meet the needs of Kidlington or even the District. Alternative sites could be made elsewhere.
132	Jacqueline	Mulliner	Terrence O'Rourke / Blenheim Palace Estate	333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192		Supports the small scale local review of the Green Belt at Kidlington and Begbroke Science Park however it is still insufficient. Employment growth potential offered by the airport, technology and science park should be maximised. The land owned by Blenheim Palace Estate which is located between Langford Lane and Begbroke Science Park should be included as part of the small scale local review of the Green Belt. The land should also be considered for some small scale housing.
148	Tom	Ashley	Turnberry Planning / Oxford University	333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192		Supports the proposed changes. The exact boundary of the review is needed. Confirmation needed that the Kidlington plan is indicative of the general extent of the local review, and that the eventual location of the amended Green Belt boundary could potentially be drawn outside of the area indicated on the plan if the relevant evidence demonstrated that this was appropriate.
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192		The following wording to be included within the 1st paragraph. "Langford Lane has in recent years become a location for a wide range of commercial uses. The proposals in this Local Plan now aim to improve the quality of the employment offer and, in doing so, establish a new gateway at this northern entrance to Kidlington" "special circumstances" in the 3rd paragraph should

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192	Reword as "The review will need to consider exactly how and where the Green Belt boundary will be changed to accommodate employment and unmet local housing needs associated with the new employment, and identified in the Local Neighbourhoods DPD".	It is unreasonable and unsustainable to exclude housing need whilst supporting significant employment growth within the Langford Lane Green Belt review.
230	Patricia	Redpath	Kidlington Parish Council	333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192	Amend sentence to read "Therefore to meet this need, and the accompanying housing need it would generate".	The exclusion of housing needs from the Langford Lane review will make it difficult if not impossible to meet such needs.
251	Nick	Alston	GVA / Oxford Aviation Services Ltd	333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192		Amend the 2nd paragraph to read "Progressive improvements to the Langford Lane employment area and Oxford Airport will be encouraged to accommodate higher value employment uses....."
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192		Amend the name of the airport to London Oxford Airport.
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	333	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.192		The following wording to be included within the 1st paragraph. "Langford Lane has in recent years become a location for a wide range of commercial uses. The proposals in this Local Plan now aim to improve the quality of the employment offer and, in doing so, establish a new gateway at this northern entrance to Kidlington". "special circumstances" in the 3rd paragraph should be replaced with "exceptional circumstances". Object to the 4th paragraph and would like to reinstate the wording from the Proposed Submission.
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	334	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Section Heading		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park
148	Tom	Ashley	Turnberry Planning / Oxford University	334	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Section Heading		Supports the proposed changes. The exact boundary of the review is needed. Confirmation needed that the Kidlington plan is indicative of the general extent of the local review, and that the eventual location of the amended Green Belt boundary could potentially be drawn outside of the area
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	334	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Section Heading		Objects to the deletion of "Langford Lane Technology Park". The reference should be changed to Oxford Technology Park
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	334	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Section Heading		Objects to the deletion of "Langford Lane Technology Park". The reference should be changed to Oxford Technology Park
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	335	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.193		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
148	Tom	Ashley	Turnberry Planning / Oxford University	335	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.193		Supports the proposed changes. The exact boundary of the review is needed. Confirmation needed that the Kidlington plan is indicative of the general extent of the local review, and that the eventual location of the amended Green Belt boundary could potentially be drawn outside of the area indicated on the plan if the relevant evidence demonstrated that this was appropriate.
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	336	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.194		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park
148	Tom	Ashley	Turnberry Planning / Oxford University	336	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.194		Supports the proposed changes. The exact boundary of the review is needed. Confirmation needed that the Kidlington plan is indicative of the general extent of the local review, and that the eventual location of the amended Green Belt boundary could potentially be drawn outside of the area indicated on the plan if the relevant evidence demonstrated that this was appropriate.
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	337	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.195		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park
148	Tom	Ashley	Turnberry Planning / Oxford University	337	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.195		Supports the proposed changes. The exact boundary of the review is needed. Confirmation needed that the Kidlington plan is indicative of the general extent of the local review, and that the eventual location of the amended Green Belt boundary could potentially be drawn outside of the area indicated on the plan if the relevant evidence demonstrated that this was appropriate.
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	338	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1 - Heading		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park
148	Tom	Ashley	Turnberry Planning / Oxford University	338	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1 - Heading		Supports the proposed changes. The exact boundary of the review is needed. Confirmation needed that the Kidlington plan is indicative of the general extent of the local review, and that the eventual location of the amended Green Belt boundary could potentially be drawn outside of the area indicated on the plan if the relevant evidence demonstrated that this was appropriate.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		338	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1 Heading	Add "and associated housing requirements" to heading. Add "and meet local housing need" after the proposed wording.	This should reflect the reality that major employment development in Kidlington is likely to require nearby housing land.
230	Patricia	Redpath	Kidlington Parish Council	338	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1 - Heading	Amend sentence to read "to accommodate identified employment needs at Kidlington and the accompanying housing need".	The exclusion of housing needs from the Langford Lane review will make it difficult if not impossible to meet such needs.
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	339	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1		The Plan should be amended to positively plan to meet the strategic employment needs identified in the Employment Land Review. This requirement should be reflected in the Policy Kidlington 1: Langford Lane Technology Park

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
132	Jacqueline	Mulliner	Terrence O'Rourke / Blenheim Palace Estate	339	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1		Supports the small scale local review of the Green Belt at Kidlington and Begbroke Science Park however it is still insufficient. Employment growth potential offered by the airport, technology and science park should be maximised. The land owned by Blenheim Palace Estate which is located between Langford Lane and Begbroke Science Park should be included as part of the small scale local review of the Green Belt. The land should also be considered for some small scale housing.
148	Tom	Ashley	Turnberry Planning / Oxford University	339	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1		Supports the proposed changes. The exact boundary of the review is needed. Confirmation needed that the Kidlington plan is indicative of the general extent of the local review, and that the eventual location of the amended Green Belt boundary could potentially be drawn outside of the area indicated on the plan if the relevant evidence demonstrated that this was appropriate.
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	339	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1		Reference to Begbroke Science Park should be deleted. The site is not within Kidlington and the Green Belt circumstances are different.
251	Nick	Alston	GVA / Oxford Aviation Services Ltd	339	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1		Amend the 1st paragraph to read "We will undertake a small scale review of the Green Belt to accommodate identified high value needs at Oxford: London Airport/Langford Lane Technology Park and Begbroke Science Park".
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	339	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	Strategic Development Kidlington 1		Reference to Begbroke Science Park should be deleted. The site is not within Kidlington and the Green Belt circumstances are different.
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	340	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.197		Supports the proposed wording change
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited	340	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.197		Supports the proposed wording change
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		341	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.199	The text the implies that local business is unwelcome or will not be supported in Kidlington Village Centre should be removed.	This paragraph gives a negative picture of Kidlington Village Centre.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		344	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.201	A clause to be added for restricting the growth of Oxford Airport such that it is in keeping with the current curtilage and neighbourhood context.	The paragraph should set the context and scope for airport expansion such that it is not unlimited. Uncontrolled expansion of the airport is undesirable.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	345	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.202		A large majority of rural villages do not have a significant proportion of their population who derive employment from farming or tourism. Employment is generally provided in local towns and distant cities.
186	Sarah	Turner		345	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.202		Support the proposed wording change
197	Dominic	Lawson	Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning Ltd / Gracewell Healthcare	345	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.202		Supports the proposed wording change
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	346	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.205		The need should be to enhance and not just protect services and facilities.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
186	Sarah	Turner		346	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.205		The addition of the new last sentence is a significant improvement: protecting services and facilities in villages and rural areas is very important.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	346	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.205		Supports the proposed wording change. The threat of increasing number of speculative developments are undermining existing services to the extent that the service ceases to provide facilities for the village and neighbouring cluster of villages.
197	Dominic	Lawson	Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning Ltd / Gracewell Healthcare	346	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington	C.205		Supports the proposed wording change. The Plan should recognise that protecting services and facilities in rural areas "wherever possible" often requires the support of development.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	346	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.205		The number of schools in Cherwell is not declining.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	347	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.207		Supports the proposed wording change
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	349	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.209		Supports the proposed wording change
197	Dominic	Lawson	Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning Ltd / Gracewell Healthcare	349	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.209		Supports the proposed wording change
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	350	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.210		Supports the proposed wording change
19	Suzanne	Bangert	Terence O'Rourke / The Ashworth Family	351	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.215		Villages in Category 'C' will be left to stagnate or decline as Village Policy 1 only provides for conversions. Greater flexibility is needed for Policy Villages 1.
188	Steve	Waterman		351	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.215		The categorisation of villages does not take into account thresholds and capacity constraints to services such that new housing will mean additional costs have to be met in order to build or develop new services. There may be opportunities for smaller villages to be sustainable if they became larger. The Plan allocates growth to the larger villages however there is a risk that these villages will lead to small towns by default. It is unlikely that the housing growth will be accompanied by increased local employment therefore there will be a dormitory village/town effect. The Plan needs to clearly set out a criteria for villages in terms of size, shape, facilities and character.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	351	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.215		Clarification is needed on the criteria informing the judgement on sustainability. A robust study is required to assess the sustainability of villages in the current climate. The infilling or minor development should be in line with the Neighbourhood Development Plan of a village. The housing density for each development could be agreed through the NDP and DPD.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
197	Dominic	Lawson	Dominic Lawson Bespoke Planning Ltd / Gracewell Healthcare	351	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.215		Supports the proposed wording change
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	351	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.215	A clear focus on development in the villages in terms and allocation and through explanation of what this means in terms of a priority for development. A greater distinction between the purpose of allocations and that of windfall in meeting housing needs in the villages. An expression of how the provision of housing in the villages and rural areas is intended to achieve the housing objectives of the Plan.	The categorisation of villages based on sustainability considerations indicates that the development provided in these settlements will in turn support their service function.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	351	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.215	No further change is sought to this paragraph at this time.	Supports the proposed wording change however concerned that too much development is focused at Banbury and Bicester and not carefully considering the rural areas.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	352	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.216		Supports the removal of text
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	353	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.217		Supports the proposed wording change
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	353	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.217		The Council should consider introducing a new criteria based policy relating to the sustainability of villages. The suitability of individual sites to be assessed through the Local Neighbourhoods DPD would create a delay that conflicts with the NPPF.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	353	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.217		Neighbourhood Plans are still only addressed in the Our Villages and Rural Areas section. The Localism Act applied equally to both urban and rural communities. The Plan should acknowledge the rights of all communities to develop and adopt their own policy, subject to it being 'in general conformity with the Development Plan', whether in urban or rural neighbourhoods.
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	353	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.217	A clear rationale needs to be set out for housing distribution to the villages. Consider reinstating paragraphs C.236 and C.237.	There is reference only to assessing the "suitability" of individual sites however there is no indication as to how the sites will be identified through a rationale for distribution.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	354	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.219		Supports the proposed wording change
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	354	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.219		Need to outline clearly how the neighbourhood plans will fit in with the Local Plan. The current reference to neighbourhood planning lacks clarity and is potentially misleading.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	354	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.219		Neighbourhood Plans are still only addressed in the Our Villages and Rural Areas section. The Localism Act applied equally to both urban and rural communities. The Plan should acknowledge the rights of all communities to develop and adopt their own policy, subject to it being 'in general conformity with the Development Plan', whether in urban or rural neighbourhoods.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	355	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.221		CRAITLUS does not provide a logical methodology of how the various factors determine the appropriate categorisation of villages.
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	355	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.221	Reinstate the references to the SHLAA and the method of distribution set out at paragraphs C.236 and C.237.	The methodology behind Policy Villages 2 is unclear. The function of the SHLAA in the plan process has been deleted which should be reinstated.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	356	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.226		Supports the proposed wording change
95	Bruce	Tremayne	CPRE Oxfordshire	357	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.227		Concerned that Yarnton and Begbroke appear to be unconstrained in their potential to impinge upon the Green Belt. Suggest including Yarnton and Begbroke in the wording of C.227.
250	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Mr Markham	358	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.232		Charlton-on-Otmoor is identified as a Category C Village which limits the type of developments to only conversions. Charlton-on-Otmoor should be classified on its merits and not be restricted to a universal type of development permitted. Each site that comes forward should be regarded on their individual merits. The village does not provide significant support in preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another due to the distance from the towns, in particular Oxford. The village does not contribute significantly to the historic importance of local historic towns.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	359	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.233		Supports the proposed wording change. A robust sustainability and appropriateness analysis should be undertaken to support and provide evidence to this policy.
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	359	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.233	Clarity needed as to how the housing allocations are expected to achieve the well intentioned housing objectives for the villages. A reduced reliance on windfall development in the rural areas with greater emphasis on the positive allocations. More certainty over the policy intention with allocations to the villages and their purpose.	There is no reference to specific needs in specific locations or any indication as to how the identified sustainable villages will achieve any particular level of improvement. Housing allocations reduced to the significant reliance on windfalls.
252	Oliver	Taylor	Framptons Planning / Mintondale Developments Ltd	359	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.233		Supports the proposed wording change. Bloxham is one of the most sustainable rural settlements which is capable of delivering further growth.
92	Rosie	Burland		360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		There is no reference on ensuring that housing is allocated to what the villages actually need. An up to date local housing needs assessments required.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		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 up to 2031. 'Local' housing need is not defined nor are any criteria specified. It is not demonstrated, by reference to a robust evidence base that the revised allocation is responsive to aggregate anticipated actual year on year local housing need in the 23 rural villages. CRAITLUS states that workers from Group 1 and 2 villages travel 14 miles to work whilst residents in Deddington travel 37.5 miles to work (2001 Census). An up to date housing needs assessment needed.
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		The policy appears to utilise sustainable villages as a "sweeper" once all other opportunities for housing growth are explored. This is fundamentally flawed as sustainable villages should be provided with a degree of new housing in their own right in order to achieve mixed and balanced communities and promote sustainable rural communities. Reference made to The Taylor Review which provides important background in relation to the distribution of housing and, in particular, the need for housing to be located within and on the edge of sustainable villages.
122	John & Susie	Minshaw		360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		The revised housing allocations does not ensure that developments are in response to identified local housing needs. The Housing Trajectory shows the allocation for rural housing of 10 or more dwellings only up to 2018 with no developments between 2018 to 2031. The housing allocations should be distributed evenly throughout the Plan period.
150	Paul	Teasdale		360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		Windfall sites of 10 or more houses is too broad so a maximum figure should be set. The allocations set is intended to be in line with local housing needs therefore future planning applications should include current housing needs assessments to demonstrate their relevance. The Housing Trajectory covers the period up to 2018 with no other developments in rural areas between 2018 and 2031. Allocations should be distributed evenly across the Plan period. Sites for ten or more houses will be expected to be identified in advance which makes no allowance for the changing opportunities.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council	360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		Adderbury should not be in the group identified as there is a lack of services provided in the village. Infilling and conversions in Adderbury will be more suitable.
188	Steve	Waterman		360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		The Plan is not clear how housing need for a particular village is to be assessed. The Plan should include a requirement for any planning proposal to be accompanied by a current housing needs assessment for the relevant village. It will be useful for the Plan to include guidance and criteria for how such housing needs assessments should be made.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		Supports the proposed changes

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
202	Rob	Hindle	Rural Solutions / Mr Clive Treadwell	360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234	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. Where necessary a review of available sites adjacent to sustainable villages should be carried out to proactively identify sites for allocation in these villages to ensure that the Plan is not disproportionately reliant on windfall sites.	Object to the reduction in the housing provision for the rural areas and the windfall allowance in these areas. The Council does not have an up to date assessment of all potential sites. The distribution of housing is not guided by the Villages Categorisation but instead the CRAITLUS report is used. A call for sites should have been carried out. The reliance on windfall sites in the rural areas could potentially fail to deliver the necessary levels of housing to meet the local needs. No provision has been made for releasing further allocations during the Plan period.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234	Reword as "A further 50 dwellings will be made at Kidlington as a minimum figure, which will be updated after Kidlington's housing need has been reassessed through the Local Neighbourhoods DPD findings and the Green Belt review at Langford Lane".	The housing allocation for Kidlington should be flexible following the Local Neighbourhoods DPD and the Kidlington Masterplan.
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234	Clarity needed as to how the housing allocations are expected to achieve the well intentioned housing objectives for the villages. A reduced reliance on windfall development in the rural areas with greater emphasis on the positive allocations. More certainty over the policy intention with allocations to the villages and their purpose.	The housing need of individual villages is unknown therefore there is no certainty over the groupings of villages and the distribution of growth.
224	David	French		360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.
226	Yngve	Granne		360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		There is nothing to ensure that developments are responsive to identified local housing need rather than the dormitory needs of car dependent commuters. The paragraph should be amended to require planning applications to be accompanied by an up to date local housing needs assessment for the relevant village.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
227	Grahame	Handley		360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning	360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234	New policy suggested.	The Plan needs to go further to assist in the delivery of housing in rural areas, and in meeting the overall targets for growth in the local authority area. The Plan lacks creativity encouraged by the NPPF. The Development Strategy should include an additional 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 as well.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	360	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.234		Object to the windfall allowance in rural areas as there is no compelling evidence for the figure of 980 dwellings. This is significantly different to what was included in the 2013 SHLAA which has identified a potential for only 143 dwellings from within the rural settlements. The strategy fails to provide for sufficient dwellings at the larger and most sustainable rural villages, including at Bloxham.
19	Suzanne	Bangert	Terence O'Rourke / The Ashworth Family	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		The proposed policy continues to set out the anticipated number of houses that will be built in the three groups of villages over the plan period.
27	David	Sullivan		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		Removing the "target" figures for development would allow CDC to properly assess proposals against their criteria rather than allow development just to make up the numbers.
48	Susan and Ian	Jelfs		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		Supports the reduced housing allocations in villages however disagree with the grouping of villages. Adderbury cannot be compared with the other 5 villages in terms of sustainability therefore Adderbury should be placed in the 2nd group of villages. Reason behind the grouping of villages is unclear. Housing allocation should be distributed equally across the villages within the group.
52	Iain	Rae		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	Remove Hook Norton from the first group as planning permission has already been given for 40 dwellings therefore meeting the village's requirement. Re-insert the requirement for the developments to be roughly equally distributed within the various village groupings.	Disagree with the grouping of villages. Some villages in the second group could accommodate a higher number of dwellings than those in the first group. An application for 40 dwellings has recently been approved in Hook Norton which has already met Hook Norton's requirement.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
92	Rosie	Burland		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		There is no limit on the size of the developments that can be built in the villages. It was previously identified that infill, conversion and minor development will be appropriate. Suggest that there is a limit per village. The revised Housing Trajectory shows that rural completions of 10 or more dwellings are all due to be completed by 2018 however houses will continue to be built after 2018 and any developments of 10 or more dwellings should be spread evenly throughout the life of the Local Plan.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		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 up to 2031. 'Local' housing need is not defined nor are any criteria specified. It is not demonstrated, by reference to a robust evidence base that the revised allocation is responsive to aggregate anticipated actual year on year local housing need in the 23 rural villages. CRAITLUS states that workers from Group 1 and 2 villages travel 14 miles to work whilst residents in Deddington travel 37.5 miles to work (2001 Census). An up to date housing needs assessment needed.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235	Suggest including the proposed wording "and should generally not exceed 20 dwellings" at the end of the third sentence. The third sentence should read "Sites should generally not exceed 20 dwellings. Allocations of sites and/or criteria for the identification of sites will be set out in either the Local Neighbourhoods DPD or in Neighbourhood Plans".	Suggest including the proposed wording "and should generally not exceed 20 dwellings" at the end of the third sentence. The third sentence should read "Sites should generally not exceed 20 dwellings. Allocations of sites and/or criteria for the identification of sites will be set out in either the Local Neighbourhoods DPD or in Neighbourhood Plans".
105	Janice	Parkes	Cerda Planning / CALA Homes (Midlands) Ltd	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		Do not agree with the number of new homes allocated in the villages as they appear to be too low. The policy is overly restrictive and seeks to limit development to sustainable villages to be small scale only. Reference made to The Taylor Review which provides important background in relation to the distribution of housing and, in particular, the need for housing to be located within and on the edge of sustainable villages.
120	Terri	Teasdale		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		There is no limit on the size of developments for the allocations in rural villages. Suggest including a maximum of 20 dwellings for sites in villages. The revised housing allocations does not ensure that developments are in response to identified local housing needs. The Housing Trajectory shows the allocation for rural housing only up to 2018 with no developments between 2018 to 2031. The housing allocations should be distributed evenly throughout the Plan period.
122	John & Susie	Minshaw		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		There is no limit on the size of developments for the allocations in rural villages. This leaves rural villages exposed to disproportionately large developments and would encourage 'dormitory' housing primarily for the benefit of car dependent commuters. Suggest including a maximum of 20 dwellings for sites in villages.
132	Jacqueline	Mulliner	Terrence O'Rourke / Blenheim Palace Estate	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		The local housing need is unknown therefore limiting development at Kidlington to 50 dwellings is premature. 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.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
147	Frank	Davies		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		There is no limit on the size of developments for the allocations in rural villages. This leaves rural villages exposed to disproportionately large developments and would encourage 'dormitory' housing primarily for the benefit of car dependent commuters. Suggest including a maximum of 20 dwellings for sites in villages.
162	Colin	Lambert		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		Deddington has absorbed many new houses in the past and suggest that allocations should be distributed evenly across the Plan period.
168	Tom	Smailes	Kemp & Kemp / Berkeley Homes (Oxford and Chiltern) Ltd	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		No justification or evidence as to why some villages have been reallocated to different groups.
187	Jan	Molyneux	Molyneux Planning	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	Increase the housing provision to the larger group of villages.	The proposed number and distribution of housing within the identified smaller rural settlements (96) will not allow for sufficient development within those settlements to support existing and new service provision. A higher level of housing provision should be proposed as this will help settlements to remain viable and benefit from the provision of services.
188	Steve	Waterman		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		The policy does not set a maxima for individual developments and as a result there is a risk of inappropriate and out of scale developments in villages.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		The categories in Policy Villages 1 and the groups in Policy Villages 2 do not translate which is confusing and also misleading. Categorisation of villages and distribution of allocations remains unclear. Additional housing should be allocated in villages which allows flexibility if Banbury and Bicester fail to deliver as quickly or as many units as hoped. Policy Villages 2 is too prescriptive and the rationale for the distribution of housing is unclear. Explanation is required.
199	Peter	Atkin	Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	The number of dwellings for the 'Rural Areas' needs to be increased. The proportion and number allocated to the most sustainable 'Group 1 Villages' should be increased.	The identification of Deddington as a Category A village is supported. Deddington is one of the largest settlements in the District and has a good range of services and facilities. Additional development could be accommodated in Deddington. There is no justification for the significant reduction in the housing provision for the rural areas. There is a lack of affordable homes of all types in rural areas therefore more housing should be allocated to these areas and not increasing the housing provision at Bicester.
202	Rob	Hindle	Rural Solutions / Mr Clive Treadwell	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	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. Where necessary a review of available sites adjacent to sustainable villages should be carried out to proactively identify sites for allocation in these villages to ensure that the Plan is not disproportionately reliant on windfall sites.	Object to the reduction in the housing provision for the rural areas and in particular Weston on the Green. The proposed housing allocations are not justified by the evidence base particularly the CRAITLUS report. The proposed allocations is not guided by the categorisation of villages. A call for sites is needed as the Council does not have an up to date assessment of all potential sites.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
203	Sheila	Davies		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		A maxima for Policy Villages 2 is needed to prevent large and inappropriate scale developments in villages. Sites of less than 10 dwellings should not be ignored.
208	Jonathan	Porter	Barton Willmore / Archstone Land Ltd	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		The Plan places too much emphasis and reliance on the large strategic housing sites associated with the Major Towns. Housing allocations in the rural areas are too low. This is contrary to the Vision of the Local Plan. The 2011/12 completions and permissions has influenced the changes to the housing provisions however clarification is needed on this. The changes to the village groupings and distribution needs an explanation.
213	Laura	Wilkinson	D2 Planning Ltd / Blue Cedar Homes	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		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 policy should be redrafted to encourage the provision of specific housing requirements to be provided where a local need exists and not primarily focussed within those villages identified as the main focus for housing development.
219	Matthew	Taylor	Brian Barber Associates / Mr Clive Tredwell	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	A fair assessment and split of villages is needed. It should see Bloxham separated from the smaller, but still sustainable settlements. Housing allocations in the rural areas should be increased.	The Council has continued to use the housing requirements set in the South East Plan. There is no evidence to demonstrate that this would be sufficient to meet the future requirements for the District based on demographic change and migration. All villages should have the potential to expand and not to become stagnant. Each village should be looked upon based on its size and an appropriate scale of housing proposed. The Plan does not break down the allocations for each village. The Plan relies heavily on urban extensions to provide the housing need for the District, however, there will be issues of deliverability. Smaller sites should be released to ensure progressive housing growth. Housing allocations in the rural areas should be increased.
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	Reinstate the references to the SHLAA and the method of distribution set out at paragraphs C.236 and C.237. Clarity needed as to how the housing allocations are expected to achieve the well intentioned housing objectives for the villages. A reduced reliance on windfall development in the rural areas with greater emphasis on the positive allocations. More certainty over the	Insufficient explanation and justification for the changes proposed. The housing distribution should reflect a specific assessment of those villages.
224	David	French		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
224	David	French		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	Paragraph C.235 should be amended as follows: Insert "and should generally not exceed 20 dwellings" at the end of the 3rd sentence.	A maximum size for rural developments has not been set. A maximum of 20 dwellings per site would be more appropriate with a view to ensuring a proportionate distribution of housing growth amongst the rural villages. Paragraph C.235 to be amended.
226	Yngve	Granne		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		There is no limit on the size of developments in rural villages. This leaves rural villages exposed to disproportionately large developments and would encourage dormitory housing primarily for the benefit of car dependent commuters. A maximum of 20 dwellings per site should be set.
227	Grahame	Handley		361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated as "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up to date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years".	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 up to 2031. 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. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated with new wording.
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	New policy suggested.	The Plan needs to go further to assist in the delivery of housing in rural areas, and in meeting the overall targets for growth in the local authority area. The Plan lacks creativity encouraged by the NPPF. The Development Strategy should include an additional 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 as well.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		Object to the windfall allowance in rural areas as there is no compelling evidence for the figure of 980 dwellings. This is significantly different to what was included in the 2013 SHLAA which has identified a potential for only 143 dwellings from within the rural settlements. The strategy fails to provide for sufficient dwellings at the larger and most sustainable rural villages, including at Bloxham.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	No further change is sought to this paragraph at this time.	The Plan fails to provide a clear justified and effective way to meet the District's housing needs across the plan period, and fails to provide an effective strategy for resolving the District's on-going housing land supply problems. The majority of development will be directed to the urban areas which is not justified by the NPPF. 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. Rural allocations should be increased to the levels set in the Proposed Submission. As a result housing allocated to strategic sites around Banbury and Bicester and windfall allowance should be reduced. The proposed housing distribution strategy should be reviewed in light of recent and relevant market and economic signals.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
241	Kathryn	Ventham	Barton Wilmore / Taylor Wimpey South West	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	Allocations in the rural areas should be increased. Hook Norton, Bloxham and Chesterton should accommodate a high proportion of the rural allocations.	Allocations in the rural areas should be increased so that villages could grow and maintain their level of sustainability. Minimum dwelling delivery targets on a settlement by settlement basis is unknown. Individual targets needed. A high proportion of growth should be allocated in Hook Norton, Bloxham and Chesterton in order to take account of the sustainability of the settlements and the development opportunities at Bourne Lane, north of Milton Road and land to the north of Green Lane.
252	Oliver	Taylor	Framptons Planning / Mintondale Developments Ltd	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	Explanation needed for the changes made to Policy. The Plan places reliant upon strategic allocations but also restricting developments in the rural areas. This is not demonstrating the need to boost significantly housing land supply. Greater flexibility is needed for rural areas.	Object to Bloxham being moved into the next group of villages where the settlements are less sustainable. Explanation needed for the change. The Plan places reliant upon strategic allocations but also restricting developments in the rural areas. This is not demonstrating the need to boost significantly housing land supply. Greater flexibility is needed for rural areas.
253	Kathryn	Ventham	Barton Willmore / Archstone Land and Persimmon Homes	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	Allocations in the rural areas should be increased. Adderbury should accommodate a high proportion of the rural allocations.	Allocations in the rural areas should be increased so that villages could grow and maintain their level of sustainability. Minimum dwelling delivery targets on a settlement by settlement basis is unknown. Individual targets needed. A high proportion of growth should be allocated in Adderbury in order to take account of the sustainability of the settlements and the development opportunities at land to the north of Aynho Road.
260	Julia	Edwards	Hook Norton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		Clarification needed as to whether the most recent (2011 based) household projections have been taken into account in Policy Villages 2
262	Alison	Wright	Savills / The Estate of J W Tustain Deceased	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		Milcombe is a sustainable location with a good level of services and facilities. Milcombe could accommodate a large share of the overall housing target of 398 dwellings. The distribution of housing numbers amongst the villages should be changed and Milcombe should be identified within a village grouping with a greater housing target. Land adjacent to Oak Farm is a suitable site that could accommodate up to 40 dwellings. This should be considered in the Local Neighbourhoods DPD.
279	Peter	Burrows	Adderbury Conservation Action Group	361	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas		Evidence needed for the categorisation of villages.
19	Suzanne	Bangert	Terence O'Rourke / The Ashworth Family	362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		The Local Neighbourhoods Development Plan Document will not be effective when delivery of units will be subject to the acceptability of the detail when considered through a planning application. A more robust approach such as writing a flexible policy, which includes a numerical range or approximate dwelling figures will be more suitable.
28	David	Sullivan		362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		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.
31	Steven	Daggitt		362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		Supports the proposed wording change

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
35	Elizabeth	Kendall		362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		Supports the proposed wording change. Land off Webbs Way, Kidlington - Representation 291 on the Proposed Submission Local Plan suggested that the site was suitable for development. The site should be protected from development and keep the land designated as Green Belt. It preserves the setting and special character of the historic towns of Oxford and Kidlington. It is in a Conservation Area and forms part of the Church Fields Character Area. A study of the map shows that development on site would, contrary to the statement in representation 291, extend the built up area beyond existing limits. The existing hedgerow was planted by the developer in around 1996 which has had a negative impact to the views of the countryside.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235	Suggest the proposed wording for the 3rd sentence. "Sites will be allocated and/or criteria for the identification of sites will be set out in either the Local Neighbourhoods DPD or in Neighbourhood Plans". Consider adding a maximum number for allocations. e.g. 20 dwellings. This could change paragraph C.235 which will then read "Sites should generally not exceed 20 dwellings. Allocations of sites and/or criteria for the identification of sites will be set out in either the Local Neighbourhoods DPD or Neighbourhoods Plans".	It is not realistic to expect to be able to identify and allocate new housing sites (for 10 or more dwellings) in the rural areas up to 18 years in advance until 2031. The proposed approach is excessively prescriptive and risks excluding the development of sites with appropriate sustainability credentials, the availability of which may not emerge until later in the Plan period. The precise number of homes to be allocated to each village will be included in the Local Neighbourhoods DPD therefore the numbers will be unknown until then. This will affect villages when preparing Neighbourhood Plans. There is no flexibility to respond to unforeseen changes in the availability of housing land over the remaining plan period. New wording suggested.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235	Suggest including the proposed wording "and should generally not exceed 20 dwellings" at the end of the third sentence. The third sentence should read "Sites should generally not exceed 20 dwellings. Allocations of sites and/or criteria for the identification of sites will be set out in either the Local Neighbourhoods DPD or in Neighbourhood Plans".	Suggest including the proposed wording "and should generally not exceed 20 dwellings" at the end of the third sentence. The third sentence should read "Sites should generally not exceed 20 dwellings. Allocations of sites and/or criteria for the identification of sites will be set out in either the Local Neighbourhoods DPD or in Neighbourhood Plans".
108	Alan	Lodwick		362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235	Suggest revising the order of the final two sentences with additional words to read "The Plan makes no provision for reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries within the District to accommodate residential development. At Bletchingdon and Weston on the Green development will take place outside that part of the village that is within the Green Belt". If this is not clarified then change no. 365 (deletion of para C.238) should not be made.	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 (Bletchingdon and Weston on the Green). Suggest revising the order of the final two sentences with additional words to read "The Plan makes no provision for reviewing the existing Green Belt boundaries within the District to accommodate residential development. At Bletchingdon and Weston on the Green development will take place outside that part of the village that is within the Green Belt". If this is not clarified then change no. 365 (deletion of Para C.238) should not be made.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
122	John & Susie	Minshaw		362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		There is no flexibility to respond to unforeseen changes in the availability of housing land up to 2031. The paragraph should be amended to give the option to develop criteria for the identification of sites as an alternative to specific site allocations.
127	Valerie	Russell	Bodicote Parish Council	362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		Reference to Bodicote has been proposed to be removed. This should be reinstated as a large part of the Bankside development falls within Bodicote Parish and this must be acknowledged.
168	Tom	Smailes	Kemp & Kemp / Berkeley Homes (Oxford and Chiltern) Ltd	362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		Five of the six villages in the first group of villages have seen high levels of development however Adderbury has not received any significant growth in recent years. Adderbury should contribute towards the housing needs and Land south of Milton Road has been identified as a suitable site in the final draft 2013 SHLAA.
188	Steve	Waterman		362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		The proposal to identify all potential development sites at the start of the 18 year development period is questionable. It precludes the possibility of responding flexibly to unforeseen changes in the availability of land through to 2031.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		Supports the proposed changes but would view any future development to be only in line with either an agreed DPD or Bloxham's NDP.
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235	A clear focus on development in the villages in terms and allocation and through explanation of what this means in terms of a priority for development. A greater distinction between the purpose of allocations and that of windfall in meeting housing needs in the villages. An expression of how the provision of housing in the villages and rural areas is intended to achieve the housing objectives of the Plan.	The question remains as to whether a site would or could be allocated on the basis of local need if there was no requirement in overall housing numbers.
224	David	French		362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235	The 3rd sentence of paragraph C.235 should be amended to read "Sites will be allocated and/or criteria for the identification of sites will be set out in either the Local Neighbourhoods DPD or in Neighbourhood Plans".	It is not realistic to expect to be able to identify and allocate new housing sites (for 10 or more dwellings) in the rural areas up to 18 years in advance until 2031. The proposed approach is excessively prescriptive and risks excluding the development of sites with appropriate sustainability credentials, the availability of which may not emerge until later in the Plan period. Villages which are endeavouring to finalise Neighbourhood Plans will be inhibited from making site allocations as contemplated by revised paragraph C.235 because the precise number of homes to be allocated to each village will not be unknown. There is no flexibility to respond to unforeseen changes in the availability of housing land (for 10 or more dwellings) over the remaining plan period. Paragraph to be amended.
224	David	French		362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235	Paragraph C.235 should be amended as follows: Insert "and should generally not exceed 20 dwellings" at the end of the 3rd sentence.	A maximum size for rural developments has not been set. A maximum of 20 dwellings per site would be more appropriate with a view to ensuring a proportionate distribution of housing growth amongst the rural villages. Paragraph C.235 to be amended.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
226	Yngve	Granne		362	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.235		The paragraph should be amended to give the option to develop criteria for the identification of sites as an alternative to specific site allocations.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	363	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.236		Reinstate paragraph C.236 with the proposed wording "Applications for planning permission (on sites of 10 or more dwellings) should be supported by an up-to-date local housing needs assessment in respect of the current identified housing need of people who live and (if in employment) work in the village where the application site is located, or work relatively close by, and for the following 4 years". This will be responsive to objectively established local housing need, support the Plan's vision and avoid dormitory developments.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	363	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.236		Supports the removal of text
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	363	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.236	A clear justification for the changes to Policy Villages 2 is needed and paragraph C.236 to be reinstated. Clarity needed as to how the housing allocations are expected to achieve the well intentioned housing objectives for the villages. A reduced reliance on windfall development in the rural areas with greater emphasis on the positive allocations.	Paragraph C.236 which has been deleted was the only indication of a clear approach to the distribution of housing in the villages.
260	Julia	Edwards	Hook Norton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	363	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	C.236	Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated. Limit the size of any one development to that which is justified for that village, based on criteria to ensure development is appropriate.	The only policy provision dealing with distribution is the Local Neighbourhoods DPD or Neighbourhood Plans. There is no provision for development guidance in the period until the DPD is produced, not to ensure that Neighbourhood Plans are effectively co-ordinated. Paragraph C.236 should be reinstated. Limit the size of any one development to that which is justified for that village, based on criteria to ensure development is appropriate.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	364	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.237		Supports the removal of text
222	James	Sharp	Ian Jewson Planning Ltd / Banner Homes	364	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.237	A clear justification for the changes to Policy Villages 2 is needed and paragraph C.236 to be reinstated. Clarity needed as to how the housing allocations are expected to achieve the well intentioned housing objectives for the villages. A reduced reliance on windfall development in the rural areas with greater emphasis on the positive allocations.	Paragraph C.236 which has been deleted was the only indication of a clear approach to the distribution of housing in the villages.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	365	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.238		Supports the removal of text
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	366	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.239		Supports the removal of text
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning	368	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 3: Rural Exception Sites	New policy suggested.	The Plan needs to go further to assist in the delivery of housing in rural areas, and in meeting the overall targets for growth in the local authority area. The Plan lacks creativity encouraged by the NPPF. The Development Strategy should include an additional 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 as well.
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	368	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	Policy Villages 3: Rural Exception Sites	Clarification needed on the upper limit.	There is no justification for applying the upper limit and a clarification on this is needed.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	372	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas			The recognition of the potential for accommodating further significant development at Upper Heyford is removed from the Plan and an explanation is needed. There are sound and proper planning reasons for Upper Heyford's potential to be realised within the Plan period to 2031 as a windfall. Upper Heyford is a large brownfield site in a sustainable location for development.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	373	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas	C.257		Supports the proposed wording change
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	373	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas			The recognition of the potential for accommodating further significant development at Upper Heyford is removed from the Plan and an explanation is needed. There are sound and proper planning reasons for Upper Heyford's potential to be realised within the Plan period to 2031 as a windfall. Upper Heyford is a large brownfield site in a sustainable location for development.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	374	C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas			The recognition of the potential for accommodating further significant development at Upper Heyford is removed from the Plan and an explanation is needed. There are sound and proper planning reasons for Upper Heyford's potential to be realised within the Plan period to 2031 as a windfall. Upper Heyford is a large brownfield site in a sustainable location for development.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	377	D. Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.1		"SE" should be deleted
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council	378	D Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.2		The Infrastructure Delivery Plan must include provision for a northern ring road to serve the NW Bicester development, the Garden Quarter, etc. Table 13 on page 243 does not mention the northern relief road yet it includes the South East relief road. It is not acceptable to refer to the SE relief road as possible or potential which could be interpreted as evading a very important local issue. A full consultation needed before any SE Bicester relief road is considered.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	386	D. Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.14		Amend sentence to read "The Local Transport Plan sets out the likely infrastructure requirements and priorities for Cherwell aimed at tackling congestion, promoting sustainable travel, safer roads and improving the street environment".
185	Stephen	Bawtree	Pegasus Group / Persimmon Homes	390	D Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.20		Plan needs to be realistic, and should ensure that the impact of the policies when read as whole should be such that the plan is deliverable. The Plan does not consider the Sir John Harman Report "Viability Testing Local Plans". Local Plan allocations should not be subject to such a scale of obligations, standards and policy burdens that cumulatively threatens the Plan's viability to be developed viably.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society	390	D Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.20		The Plan should recognise that developer contributions, including Community Infrastructure Levy, needs to be used within the relevant communities. It would be inappropriate for levies on development in Banbury to fund the Bicester SE Relief Road for example.
193	Brett	Chambers	Wendlebury Parish Council	392	D Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.22		South East relief road should not be specifically mentioned as no decision has been made therefore the paragraph should include the 3 possible routes.
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning	392	D Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.22	New policy suggested.	The Plan needs to go further to assist in the delivery of housing in rural areas, and in meeting the overall targets for growth in the local authority area. The Plan lacks creativity encouraged by the NPPF. The Development Strategy should include an additional 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 as well.
243	Sarah	Chambers		392	D Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.22		3 routes were identified in the Bicester Movement Study therefore the Plan should make reference to all 3 routes.
255	Brett	Chambers		392	D Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.22		South East relief road should not be specifically mentioned as no decision has been made therefore the paragraph should include the 3 possible routes.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	392	D. Infrastructure Delivery Plan	D.22		Amend text to read "The delivery of highway capacity improvements on peripheral routes in Bicester is fundamental.....".
6	Dominic	Woodfield	Bioscan (UK) Ltd	393	D Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Infrastructure Proposals for Bicester, Banbury, Kidlington and Rural Areas		Removal of reference to Gavray Drive as a consented site is welcomed. This recognition reflects the current position of impasse with the promoters of that site, and it is worth stressing that this situation is not of Cherwell District Councils making but due to the applicant's continued reluctance to change their proposals to comply with local and national planning policy.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	393	D Infrastructure Delivery Plan	Infrastructure Proposals for Bicester, Banbury, Kidlington and Rural Areas		Reference to the provision of a remote park and ride site should be reworded. Greater clarity should be given as to the nature and extend of the proposals for the park and ride. Reference in relation to Policy Bicester 3 should be removed.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
132	Jacqueline	Mulliner	Terrence O'Rourke / Blenheim Palace Estate	395		Infrastructure Proposals for Bicester, Banbury, Kidlington and Rural Areas		Supports the small scale local review of the Green Belt at Kidlington and Begbroke Science Park however it is still insufficient. Employment growth potential offered by the airport, technology and science park should be maximised. The land owned by Blenheim Palace Estate which is located between Langford Lane and Begbroke Science Park should be included as part of the small scale local review of the Green Belt. The land should also be considered for some small scale housing.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith		395		Infrastructure Proposals for Bicester, Banbury, Kidlington and Rural Areas	Reword as "50 homes subject to update as a result of Local Neighbourhoods DPD review of Kidlington's housing needs".	Amend the wording to read "50 homes subject to update as a result of Local Neighbourhoods DPD review of Kidlington's housing needs". The low target is not compatible with the need to revitalise and enhance the village centre economy.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	397	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	398	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	399	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	400	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	401	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	402	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	403	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	404	E Monitoring	New Paragraph		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements (the SHMA). The Council will need to work with neighbouring authorities as well as producing a SHLAA to establish a realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability of land to meet the identified need for housing. There is no evidence to support the suggested windfall allowance. The production of SHMA and Duty to Cooperate are essential and must feed into the Plan. The Plan should identify Land at Warwick Road, Banbury as a housing allocation to provide for approximately 300 dwellings. The Housing Trajectory will need reviewing in particular the windfall allowance and the delivery rate at Canalside. Guidance and clarification needed on housing growth at rural villages.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt	404	E Monitoring	New Paragraph	Paragraph should be revised to read "If the supply of deliverable housing land drops to five years or below and where the Council is unable to rectify this within the next monitoring year there will be a need for the early release of sites identified within this strategy or the release of additional identified in this plan". Paragraph 42 of the NPPF should be included in the Plan.	Welcomes the new paragraph however it should be revised to read "If the supply of deliverable housing land drops to five years or below and where the Council is unable to rectify this within the next monitoring year there will be a need for the early release of sites identified within this strategy or the release of additional identified in this plan". Paragraph 42 of the NPPF should be included in the Plan.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	404	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	405	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	406	E Monitoring			Monitoring does not go far enough and fail to provide any definitive strategy for the released of land to plug any gap caused by non-delivery elsewhere.
97	D J	French	Deddington Development Watch	407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory	Housing trajectory - Delete all figures in the Rural Areas (10 or more dwellings) rows. Substitute 57 in the 12/13 column and 42 in each of columns 13/14 to 30/31. Make other changes to reflect this.	The proposed revised Policy Villages 2 is stated to be in respect of the period 2012 - 2031 however is not reflected in the revised housing trajectory on page 272. It indicates that the whole allocation should be built, or planning permissions granted, up-front during the first six years up to 2017/18 with an even number of completions or permissions for each of these years and no allocation thereafter. The revised housing trajectory is virtually the opposite of the trajectory in the Proposed Submission Plan. 'Local' housing need is not defined nor are any criteria specified. It is not demonstrated, by reference to a robust evidence base that the revised allocation is responsive to aggregate anticipated actual year on year local housing need in the 23 rural villages.
188	Steve	Waterman		407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory		The revised Housing Trajectory shows that rural completions of 10 or more dwellings are all due to be completed by 2018 with no completions thereafter. Developments of 10 or more dwellings should be spread evenly throughout the life of the Local Plan.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council	407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory		The revised Housing Trajectory shows that rural completions of 10 or more dwellings are all due to be completed by 2018 however houses will continue to be built after 2018 and any developments of 10 or more dwellings should be spread evenly throughout the life of the Local Plan. Windfall sites of less than 10 dwellings in rural areas would be encouraging "garden grabbing" which would be contrary to Government's policies.
194	Adrian	Barker	Terence O'Rourke / Countryside Properties (Bicester) Ltd	407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory		A revised phasing strategy for SW Bicester Phase 2 is provided.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
212	David	Keene	David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates Ltd	407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory	Wykham Park Farm should be a strategic allocation and be included as part of the housing trajectory.	The Council has continued to use the housing requirements set in the South East Plan. The 2012 AMR confirms that the Council has persistently failed to deliver the required level of housing growth therefore resulting in an existing backlog of some 1441 dwellings at March 2013. The proposed housing trajectory does not demonstrate a reasonable approach to planning for the growth of the District. The delivery rates are over optimistic. The allocation of Wykham Park Farm would contribute to housing delivery on a broader range of sites and would further help the high required rate of delivery.
224	David	French		407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory	The rural allocations within the housing trajectory should be amended as "57 in te 2012/13 column and 42 in each of the columns 2013/14 to 2030/31. Tthe sub totals and totals will need to be amended accordingly.	The housing allocation for rural areas is expected is for the period 2012-2031 however the proposed housing trajectory indicates that the rural housing allocations will all be developed by 2017/18 with no other homes to be built thereafter. There is no provision for any more completions or permissions (on sites of 10 or more homes) at all to meet local housing need in rural areas between 2018 and 2031. The rural allocations within the housing trajectory should be distributed evenly throughout the Plan period.
226	Yngve	Granne		407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory		The rural allocations within the housing trajectory should be distributed evenly throughout the Plan period.
227	Grahame	Handley		407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory	The rural allocations within the housing trajectory should be amended as "57 in te 2012/13 column and 42 in each of the columns 2013/14 to 2030/31. Tthe sub totals and totals will need to be amended accordingly.	The housing allocation for rural areas is expected is for the period 2012-2031 however the proposed housing trajectory indicates that the rural housing allocations will all be developed by 2017/18 with no other homes to be built thereafter. There is no provision for any more completions or permissions (on sites of 10 or more homes) at all to meet local housing need in rural areas between 2018 and 2031. The rural allocations within the housing trajectory should be distributed evenly throughout the Plan period.
236	S	Brown	Woolf Bond Planning LLP / Miller Strategic Land	407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory		The continued use of the housing requirement set in South East Plan raises concern. The Plan must be based upon objectively assessed development requirements (the SHMA). The Council will need to work with neighbouring authorities as well as producing a SHLAA to establish a realistic assumptions about the availability, suitability of land to meet the identified need for housing. There is no evidence to support the suggested windfall allowance. The production of SHMA and Duty to Cooperate are essential and must feed into the Plan. The Plan should identify Land at Warwick Road, Banbury as a housing allocation to provide for approximately 300 dwellings. The Housing Trajectory will need reviewing in particular the windfall allowance and the delivery rate at Canalside. Guidance and clarification needed on housing growth at rural villages.
249	Paul	Burrell	Pegasus Group / the Dorchester Group	407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory		Concerned over the delivery rates at Bicester as they are over optimistic. The annual completion rates at Bicester since 1996 has not reached the expected numbers in the Housing Trajectory. It is a high risk strategy to focus growth in Banbury and Bicester as it offers little or no flexibility to ensure delivery is maintained at levels necessary to provide an adequate housing land supply. The Plan should consider wider opportunities for growth.
260	Julia	Edwards	Hook Norton Neighbourhood Plan Steering Group	407	E.2	Proposed Housing Trajectory	Rural allocations should be distributed evenly throughout the Plan period.	The revised Housing Trajectory shows that rural completions of 10 or more dwellings are all due to be completed by 2018. Rural allocations should be distributed evenly throughout the Plan period.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
6	Dominic	Woodfield	Bioscan (UK) Ltd	411	Appendix 1: Background to Cherwell's Places	1.12		Removal of reference to Gavray Drive as a consented site is welcomed. This recognition reflects the current position of impasse with the promoters of that site, and it is worth stressing that this situation is not of Cherwell District Councils making but due to the applicant's continued reluctance to change their proposals to comply with local and national planning policy.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	419	Appendix 3: Evidence Base	Evidence Base and Relevant Documents / Data Sources		Updating of evidence base is supported however concerns raised regarding the SHMA and SHLAA. There is a lack of consultation on the two documents and have only been made available at this very late stage in the process. These evidence base documents cannot possibly have informed the proposals, it appears more likely that these documents have been retrofitted to support the proposed policy requirements. Evidence base documents should be published earlier.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	419	Appendix 3: Evidence Base	Evidence Base and Relevant Documents / Data Sources		The 2012 SHMA update is not sufficient as it only addresses Cherwell's housing needs in isolation and also only addresses the affordable element.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	419	Appendix 3: Evidence Base	Evidence Base and Relevant Documents / Data Sources		Clarification needed for the reference to "Draft Final Report" and whether the SHLAA will be consulted on.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	420	Appendix 3: Evidence Base	Evidence Base and Relevant Documents / Data Sources		Updating of evidence base is supported however concerns raised regarding the SHMA and SHLAA. There is a lack of consultation on the two documents and have only been made available at this very late stage in the process. These evidence base documents cannot possibly have informed the proposals, it appears more likely that these documents have been retrofitted to support the proposed policy requirements. Evidence base documents should be published earlier.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	420	Appendix 3: Evidence Base	Evidence Base and Relevant Documents / Data Sources		The 2012 SHMA update is not sufficient as it only addresses Cherwell's housing needs in isolation and also only addresses the affordable element.
196	Russell	Spencer	Gladman Developments Ltd	420	Appendix 3: Evidence Base	Evidence Base and Relevant Documents / Data Sources		Clarification needed for the reference to "Draft Final Report" and whether the SHLAA will be consulted on.
6	Dominic	Woodfield	Bioscan (UK) Ltd	424	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester		Removal of reference to Gavray Drive as a consented site is welcomed. This recognition reflects the current position of impasse with the promoters of that site, and it is worth stressing that this situation is not of Cherwell District Councils making but due to the applicant's continued reluctance to change their proposals to comply with local and national planning policy.
53	Michael and Frideswide	Curry		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
54	Judith	de la Bedoyere		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
56	Mark	Ford-Langstaff		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
57	Martin	Whitford		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
58	Helena	Masters		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
59	Claudia	Copithorne		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
61	Robert	Cornford		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
62	Chris	Fox		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
63	Rachel	Burn		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
65	Keith	Dixon		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
66	Denise	Whitford		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
67	Sally and Jim	Harris		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
71	Allison	Ford-Langstaff		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
72	John	Stephens		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
73	Bob	Roberts		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
74	Patsy	Stephens		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
79	Cheryl and Mike	Murphy		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
80	Maggie	Harvey		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
81	Howard	Hill		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
83	Keith	Austin		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
85	Matthew	Burn		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
86	Gwenda and Iain	West		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
87	Anthony	Meacock		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
88	Edward	Sanders		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
89	Jennifer	Dixon		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
91	Fiona	Chalk		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
93	Keith	Kidney		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
96	Cathy	Procopiou		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
100	C J	Foster		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
101	Simon	Turner	Launton Parish Council	428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	The Green Buffer around Launton should be extended to cover 200 - 300m the other sides of the railway lines to the NW and SW of the village in addition to the area already shown.	The major reduction in extent of the Green Buffer protecting Launton from Bicester renders the buffer completely ineffective as developers will be building closer to Launton. The change conflicts with notes about risk of coalescence in the Sustainability Appraisal Report, Green Buffer report and Officer's response to the Options for Growth 2009 consultation. The current separation between the village and Bicester is less than 200m which the Bicester Green Buffer report describes as "very limited gap" implying that such a small separation is undesirable and should not be reduced further. The SA report Annex B ruled out as an alternative housing allocation due to the risk of coalescence with Launton village. This risk was also identified in the Officer's response to the Options for Growth 2009 consultation. The risk has been ignored in the Bicester Green Buffer report. The Green Buffer around Launton should be extended to cover 200 - 300m on the other sides of the railway lines to the NW and SW of the village in addition to the area already shown.
106	Nick	Lord		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
107	Lesley	Thompson		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
121	Andy & Lindsay	Eastwood		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
123	Sharon	Fowler		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
124	Stuart	Smith		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
125	Lida	Eddy		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
133	Lucy	Giles		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
135	Ian	Humphries		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
136	Sue	Morkill		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
145	Nathan	Parker		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
151	Jackie	Hackett		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
153	Simon	Liddicot		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
154	Stack, Rivett			428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
155	G G	Ancil		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
156	Gaye	Cornford		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
159	Deborah	Beasley		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
160	Peter	Beasley		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
161	Kim and Neil	Ormrod		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
163	Wendy	Foster		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
165	Theresa	Carlyle		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
166	Beverley	Byrne		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
169	Marcus and Rachel	Goldsbrough		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
172	Penny	Stephens		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
175	Chris	Dolan		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
179	William	Gattrell		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
180	Jane	Packer		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
181	Rod	Fine		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
182	Bryan	Mooney		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
186	Sarah	Turner		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Green Buffer to be extended beyond the two railway lines to give a significant buffer around Launton comparable to that around the other villages in the vicinity of Bicester, whilst retaining (or improving) the buffer between the edges of the village and the railway lines. The Green Buffer should also be extended to the south of the village to prevent the village growing outwards towards the railway line.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. The Green Buffer is too small and will be ineffective. The edge of Launton is within 200m of the existing edge of Bicester. The Green Buffer boundary should be extended beyond the two railway lines to give a significant buffer around Launton comparable to that around the other villages in the vicinity of Bicester, whilst retaining (or improving) the buffer between the edges of the village and the railway lines. The Green Buffer should also be extended to the south of the village to prevent the village growing outwards towards the railway line. The railway lines themselves would not provide sufficient demarcation if development were to come right up to the lines from the other side.
190	David	Thompson		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
191	Teresa	Tallis-Calver		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
198	Stuart	Carlyle		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
216	Hannah	Gattrell		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes	428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester		Bicester 12 appears to fix the position of green space to a central position extending east from the scheduled ancient monument however there is no evidence to suggest this. The designation appears to wrap around the east boundary of the site which may impinge upon future expansion east of the site. The Map should be amended to include the green space designation around the scheduled ancient monument only. It is unclear how the red line around the site has been arrived at as it does not appear to relate to any fixed points on the ground. The site area could be increased or the red line could be removed and replaced with an asterisk illustrating a broad area for growth to the south east of the town.
256	Michael	Stack	Michael Stack Accountants	428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
259	Jane	Hawes		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Return to the original Green Buffer proposed for Launton in the Proposed Submission Local Plan or even extend the boundary.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. Launton's Green Buffer is too small to meet its purpose. The Green Buffer could even be extended from the Proposed Submission Local Plan and not reduced.
300	Jackie	Webber		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Green Buffer to be extended beyond the two railway lines to give a significant buffer around Launton comparable to that around the other villages in the vicinity of Bicester, whilst retaining (or improving) the buffer between the edges of the village and the railway lines. The Green Buffer should also be extended to the south of the village to prevent the village growing outwards towards the railway line.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. The Green Buffer is too small and will be ineffective. The edge of Launton is within 200m of the existing edge of Bicester. The Green Buffer boundary should be extended beyond the two railway lines to give a significant buffer around Launton comparable to that around the other villages in the vicinity of Bicester, whilst retaining (or improving) the buffer between the edges of the village and the railway lines. The Green Buffer should also be extended to the South of the village to prevent the village growing outwards towards the railway line. The railway lines themselves would not provide sufficient demarcation if development were to come right up to the lines from the other side.
302	Gillian	Kinselley		428	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester	Green Buffer to be extended beyond the two railway lines to give a significant buffer around Launton comparable to that around the other villages in the vicinity of Bicester, whilst retaining (or improving) the buffer between the edges of the village and the railway lines. The Green Buffer should also be extended to the south of the village to prevent the village growing outwards towards the railway line.	The Green Buffer boundary at Launton has been reduced whilst other villages have seen an increase. The Green Buffer is too small and will be ineffective. The edge of Launton is within 200m of the existing edge of Bicester. The Green Buffer boundary should be extended beyond the two railway lines to give a significant buffer around Launton comparable to that around the other villages in the vicinity of Bicester, whilst retaining (or improving) the buffer between the edges of the village and the railway lines. The Green Buffer should also be extended to the south of the village to prevent the village growing outwards towards the railway line. The railway lines themselves would not provide sufficient demarcation if development were to come right up to the lines from the other side.
261	Ellen	O'Grady	Defence Infrastructure Organisation	429	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Bicester		The proposed Green Buffer sites within the current MOD land ownership boundary, reducing developable land. No justification for its inclusion within the site boundary has been afforded. The map must be redrawn to show any Green Buffer on land outside MOD land ownership.
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning	433	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Banbury	Major development that has been permitted should be recognised on the proposals map in the same manor that approved employment sites have been recognised.	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. This is inconsistent. The site should be shown as "Approved employment sites". Major developments that has been permitted should also be shown on the proposals map.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
69	Rowland	Bratt		436	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Banbury		The combination of the approved development at Bankside and the further housing allocation at Banbury 4 completes the coalescence of Banbury and Bodicote. The Plan makes no provision or recommendation as to where long term growth would be appropriate and in what circumstances Green Buffer boundaries might be adjusted. This failure to recognise long term needs for expansion and development is in conflict with the NPPF. The current proposed Green Buffer boundary will inevitably result in impeding growth with need for modifications to the buffers each time a proposal for strategic development is received. This conflicts with the NPPF.
127	Valerie	Russell	Bodicote Parish Council	436	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Banbury		Supports the retention of the Green Buffer zones to the south of Salt Way and to the west and south of Bodicote. It is vital that Bodicote retains its separate identify.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity	436	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Banbury	Delete Green Buffer from the Map and Key	The Bicester and Banbury Green Buffer reports and landscape assessments post-date the Green Buffer policy.
127	Valerie	Russell	Bodicote Parish Council	437	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Banbury		Site 12 within the Key should be labelled as "Proposed Banbury United FC relocation".
127	Valerie	Russell	Bodicote Parish Council	437	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Banbury		The Plan should consider relocating the Banbury United FC to BAN14 which is currently being proposed as a Country Park.
132	Jacqueline	Mulliner	Terrence O'Rourke / Blenheim Palace Estate	438	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Kidlington		Supports the small scale local review of the Green Belt at Kidlington and Begbroke Science Park however it is still insufficient. Employment growth potential offered by the airport, technology and science park should be maximised. The land owned by Blenheim Palace Estate which is located between Langford Lane and Begbroke Science Park should be included as part of the small scale local review of the Green Belt. The land should also be considered for some small scale housing.
251	Nick	Alston	GVA / Oxford Aviation Services Ltd	438	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Kidlington		Amend the Key to read Indicative Location of Limited Green Belt Review
29	Suzi	Coyne	Suzi Coyne Planning / Worton Farms Ltd	439	Appendix 5: Maps	Key Proposals Map Kidlington		In order for the Plan to be based on robust evidence and to comply with the NPPF, the site should be removed from the Key Proposals Map.
36	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Oxford University Press	439	Appendix 5: Maps	Kidlington Proposals Map		Table 1 should be amended to include the employment allocation at Kidlington as a Strategic Employment Allocation. The Key Proposals Map for Kidlington should be amended to include a broader area to be reviewed in the Langford Lane area.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	440		Table 13		Remove the word 'remote' before park and ride. Under Bicester amend to read "highway capacity improvements on peripheral routes". Essential transport schemes have been missed such as level crossings in Bicester, A34 improvements, public transport improvements, A41 Oxford Road Corridor etc. Some essential transport schemes are also missing from Banbury.
263	Jacqui	Cox	Oxfordshire County Council	442		Table 15		May's Builders Yard on the Moors, Kidlington is shown as existing green space which is incorrect as it is a privately owned builders yard.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
3	Janet	Cullop						No provision made for water storage, i.e. underground storage facilities, and treatment of sewage has not been considered. New homes should have solar panels and water run off from roofs should be channelled into underground storage tanks. Geo thermal energy should be explored. Reed beds should be made compulsory for new housing estates. Water shortage will be a key problem in the future.
4	Angela	Atkinson	Marine Management Organisation					No comment
5	Stephanie	Ainsworth	Homes and Communities Agency					No comment
6	Dominic	Woodfield	Bioscan (UK) Ltd					The SA needs to be amended to take account of Gavray Drive. Table 5.1 of the SA still refers to the delivery of 4.6ha of amenity green space at land north of Gavray Drive. This needs to be removed and the formal open space shortfall will need to be recalculated.
7	Patrick and Julia	Marcks						Land off Webbs Way (Kidlington) to be protected from development and keep the land designation as Green Belt. Any development on the site will increase the risk of flooding in the area, and will also harm the habitat and species (flaura, fauna, dear, badgers, foxes). The reasonably new hedgerow forming the northern boundary has affected the view of the countryside and the purpose of this hedgerow has been made unclear. New homes in the area will increase traffic in both Vicarage Road and Mill Street.
8	Martin	Palmer						Land off Webbs Way (Kidlington) to be protected from development and keep the land designation as Green Belt. Any development on the site will increase the risk of flooding in the area.
9	Claire	Streather	The Coal Authority					No comment
11	Janet	Cullop						Water supply and treatment of sewage have not been considered for the proposed homes. Reed beds can be used on an industrial scale, and water conservation, built underground before a housing estate is even built are possible solutions.
12	Diana	Broun						Decisions have already been made for totally unsustainable development, particularly traffic issues, which cannot be solved by new roundabouts. New homes will continue to be built.
13	Nigel	Adamson						The meaning of the three themes are unclear. The district is over populated and thousands of homes are being built for the population coming from immigration. Existing infrastructure struggling to meet the current demand. Further development and population increase are not sustainable and will put a strain on existing infrastructure.
14	John and Hilary	Maddicott						Land off Webbs Way (Kidlington) to be protected from development and keep the land designation as Green Belt. Any development on the site will increase the risk of flooding in the area.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
15	P V F	Kavanagh						Land off Webbs Way (Kidlington) to be protected from development and keep the land designation as Green Belt. Any development on the site will increase the risk of flooding in the area.
16	Chris	Gaskell	Scottish and Southern Energy					Discussions on the strategic developments within the Proposed Submission Local Plan will need to take place between Cherwell District Council and Scottish and Southern Energy prior to planning permission being granted. Planning conditions should be made to the developer and not the distribution network operator.
17	Phil	Collett						Aspirations for further road junctions. Over development of residential, commercial and industrial development on a critical system. Traffic flows in Banbury have not been considered.
18	Alex and Felicity	Duncan						Land off Webbs Way (Kidlington) to be protected from development and keep the land designation as Green Belt. Development on site will change the characteristic of the area and will affect the setting for a number of listed buildings and the conservation area.
20	R	Oliver						Developments in Adderbury will turn the village into a town like Banbury which will affect the local infrastructure. Green fields and village life will be lost. Bringing empty buildings into use will help meet the needs. Immigration is an issue and hasn't been looked at.
21	Troth	Wells	The British Horse Society					No mention of equestrians in the Plan. Little reference to Public Rights of Way except where mentioned at specific development sites. There is also little reference to tourism. Both of these have particular connection to the equestrian community and its contribution to the local economy.
21	Troth	Wells	The British Horse Society					There needs to be good access to, and provision of Public Rights of Way for equestrians so that the countryside can be enjoyed. This requires adequate green infrastructure, especially in any new building developments.
21	Troth	Wells	The British Horse Society					Equestrian activities contribute to tourism and spend considerable money to take their horses to try new rides. In doing so, they spend on accommodation for themselves and their horse; in pubs, shops, feed merchants, garages, farriers and vets.
21	Troth	Wells	The British Horse Society					There is no mention of horse riding as a sustainable means of transport. Some people travel on horseback or carriage-driving. Safe equestrian crossings across major roads, lower speed limits, horse warning signs are all needed.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
21	Troth	Wells	The British Horse Society		Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development			Ways to enhance the Green Infrastructure for equestrians as follows: - The development of community/parish/village/satellite circular circuits from 3 miles in length upwards. - Riders need safe off-road circular routes adjacent to where their horse is kept. - Creation/identification of circular interlinking rides, linking into each other like Olympic rings across the District, should pass through areas of high horse population, be short enough for local everyday use but also, by joining up routes, be useful for the more adventurous local rider and for equestrian tourists. - Development of circular routes around settlements would offer a route which can, with suitable rideable spokes to the wheel, offer a circular ride from centres where horses are kept. - Development of routes around settlements based on bridleways/restricted byways, rather than just footpaths, will cater for all non-motorised users and offer best value.
22	D and R	Wojtowicz and Drozda						Land off Webbs Way (Kidlington) to be protected from development and keep the land designation as Green Belt. Any development on the site will increase the risk of flooding in the area.
23	R A	Sutton						Possible site allocation - Land rear of A44 at Begbroke. The land is within Green Belt and is being used as a builder's yard therefore making it a brownfield site. Site plan enclosed.
30	Roger and Christine	Howes						Land off Webbs Way (Kidlington) to be protected from development and keep the land designation as Green Belt and Conservation Area. Any development on the site will increase the risk of flooding in the area. Development on site will change the characteristic of the area and will lead to an increase in traffic.
31	Steven	Daggitt						Land off Webbs Way, Kidlington - Representation 291 on the Proposed Submission Local Plan suggested that the site was suitable for development. The site should be protected from development and keep the land designated as Green Belt. It preserves the setting and special character of the historic towns of Oxford and Kidlington. It is in a Conservation Area and forms part of the Church Fields Character Area. A study of the map shows that development on site would, contrary to the statement in representation 291, extend the built up area beyond existing limits. The existing hedgerow was planted by the developer in around 1996 which has had a negative impact to the views of the countryside.
32	J M	Osborne	JM Osborne & Co		C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		Objecting to the proposed uses at Banbury Canalside. 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. The existing use will be relocated to an out of town location which will increase the environmental impact which is not supported by the NPPF. e.g. developing on greenfield and increased pollution from increased travelling. There is no viable argument to redevelop the site and not include B uses as part of the redevelopment. Modernisation of some units and a program of aesthetic improvements would be a more sustainable solution. The proposed residential and retail will be against the NPPF as it will be making it more difficult to create jobs in cities, towns and villages. Retail will not be supported due to the growing number of vacant shops in the area. Consultation needed with present occupiers.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
33	R	Everitt						Noted the detail in relations to Banbury and Bloxham, and the proposed developments in the areas. Extant planning permissions should be progressed so that its true impact can be considered.
34	Adrian	Shooter	Bicester Vision Partnership					The Plan does not deliver sufficient employment land and opportunities that are sufficiently flexible to secure the significant number of jobs required for Bicester. Allocations for employment land is not sufficient despite knowing the future housing growth and migration levels into Bicester. Employment land allocations should not be restricted to certain uses and they should be annotated "Employment Zones" without further designation. No additional allocations have been identified for employment land. Some of the existing mixed use allocations may not get developed for employment or will meet the required quantity or quality of employment opportunities.
34	Adrian	Shooter	Bicester Vision Partnership					There have been significant increases to the proposed Green Buffers at Bicester therefore limiting opportunities to locate large employment areas close to Bicester. It is important to provide sufficient land for employment uses to accommodate the substantial growth anticipated in Bicester.
39	Sue	Mackrell	Bicester Town Council					Policy does not sufficiently address future burial needs or make reference to provision. Suggestion - provision should be allied to the policies for 40% green space of which 20% is publically available that are being applied to NW Bicester.
39	Sue	Mackrell	Bicester Town Council					Concerns about providing sufficient services, facilities, employment opportunities and social infrastructure to meet the needs of the future population.
39	Sue	Mackrell	Bicester Town Council					Policies to continue to promote very small play areas, specifically designed for under 5 year olds. These do not help with educational and social development and are of no benefit to stimulating community development and cohesion. Policies demanding a play area within 100m of each house are county productive. Need larger, well designed play areas to accommodate for all ages.
39	Sue	Mackrell	Bicester Town Council					Insufficient land allocated for employment use in Bicester. Important to bring a wide range of employment opportunities to Bicester. 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.
39	Sue	Mackrell	Bicester Town Council					Concerned about the unplanned residential growth. Permitted small scale residential developments are detrimental to Bicester's character and viability. They also add to infrastructure pressures. The Plan has identified the number of homes to be developed in Bicester however there are no policies tackling the growing trend to build in back gardens or in small green spaces between houses in the present town.
42	Ian	Carmichael	Thames Valley Police					A specific strategic policy has not been included to address the impact of development on crime, the fear of crime and community safety. High quality design and crime were referenced in the Foreword and the Council's Sustainable Communities Strategy however was not mentioned in the plan. A policy is needed that addresses community safety and crime prevention and reduction. The policy will encourage developers to assist in the building of safe and sustainable communities.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
42	Ian	Carmichael	Thames Valley Police		Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.87		A community cannot be sustainable if it suffers from crime, ASB and/or a lack of community cohesion through poor design and/or specification. In addition to the personal, social and financial costs, the carbon footprint of crime in the UK currently stands at more than 12 million tonnes of Co2 per annum. The carbon cost of crime will increase due to the increase of new homes. Police resources are reducing therefore it will help to have design out crime at the planning stage.
42	Ian	Carmichael	Thames Valley Police		Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	B.82		New housing could not achieve the required "high design standards" unless Police recommended 'minimum' standards are included within specifications. If Secured by Design accreditation is made a requirement of all development, said 'minimum' standards on dwelling security would be met. This will also meet NPPF para 58 and 69 and Local Authority obligations under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.
43	Anthony	Powell	Highways Agency				Consider	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 and accompanying land use allocations that will affect the national route network will need to be considered in the transport evidence base. Allocations will need to demonstrate how impacts can be mitigated to safeguard congestion and safety on the national road network.
44	Vic	Keeble	Chesterton Parish Council					There is no mention of the proposed Park and Ride at Bicester. Can this be incorporated in the Plan?
45	Michael	O'Brien						The original plan suggested that Deddington could expect around 85 new houses over the next 20 years which seemed sensible and in line with the history of the village. Infill building has not been taken into account which could contribute 3-5 houses a year / 60-80 houses over the 20 years. There is no upper limit to estate sizes. The number designated within the plan is front loaded to be built out by 2018 and it is believed that the Council will resist any further development after this time. How do we fulfil local housing needs? Affordable housing for local people, one or two bedroom terraced accommodation.
46	Nik	Lyzba	JPPC / Merton College					The Local Plan evidence base shows a clear need for further employment land and the delivery of more housing, particularly that which is affordable. The Merton College land would provide a sustainable location for new residential and employment development being close to existing services and facilities which would promote sustainable transport choices.
49	Tim	Child						Land off Webbs Way (Kidlington) to be protected from development and keep the land designation as Green Belt. Development on site will change the characteristic of the area and will affect the setting for a number of listed buildings and the conservation area.
55	Patrick	Blake	Highways Agency					Concerned about any traffic increase on the strategic road network as a result of planned growth without careful consideration of mitigation measures. Infrastructure requirements will be needed before developments take place.
70	Charles	Routh	Natural England					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.
70	Charles	Routh	Natural England					Strategic Development Sites - Reference on species surveys is not sufficient. More evidence needed on the site allocations.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
70	Charles	Routh	Natural England					Statement of Consultation March 2013: Appendix 4 - "Employment land at the M40 is supported by Natural England". This is incorrect as Natural England did not support any employment land.
75	Jack	Moeran	Environment Agency		C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 1: Banbury Canalside		Supports the proposed wording change
77	Carl	Smith	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council					There is limited information on the Community Infrastructure Levy. The Parish is likely to suffer from some adverse consequences associated with proposed developments in North Oxfordshire. The Parish Council would like those developments that create problems to be funded from CIL payments being made by developers. In particular: A) Improving transport and connections to the Parish and Chiltern Railways Water Eaton Parkway and Park and Ride. B) Flood defences and improvements to the River Cherwell and River Ray.
77	Carl	Smith	Gosford and Water Eaton Parish Council					The Plan needs confirmation that a proportion of CIL money will be passed to Parish Councils.
94	Antony	Watts	Hanwell Fields Development Action Group					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.
102	Cicely	Kerr						Object to the proposed relief road at south east Bicester (route 3). It is too near to Wendlebury and will have an impact on the traffic volume through the village. It does not form part of the ring road and as such does not offer the potential to achieve the aim of relieving traffic congestion and further increases the likelihood that it will increase traffic flow through Wendlebury by drivers using it as an alternative route to cross the M40 and join the A34. One of the aims of the Bicester Masterplan is to maintain a buffer around Bicester to contain development and protect the surrounding villages. The aim should be prioritised in the Plan.
103	Gordon	Wills						Object to the proposed relief road at south east Bicester (route 3). It is too near to Wendlebury and will have an impact on the traffic volume through the village. It does not form part of the ring road and as such does not offer the potential to achieve the aim of relieving traffic congestion and further increases the likelihood that it will increase traffic flow through Wendlebury by drivers using it as an alternative route to cross the M40 and join the A34. One of the aims of the Bicester Masterplan is to maintain a buffer around Bicester to contain development and protect the surrounding villages. The aim should be prioritised in the Plan.
114	Jane / E. John	Wilson / Price						Villages such as Deddington should be limited to a maximum size of 30-35 houses. The rural development and growth should be steady, or incremental, over the period 2012 to 2031, and not all in the first few years. More weight should be given to the need to preserve agricultural land for farming. Need to consider that the villages do not offer jobs for people in larger developments so adding to the burden of commuting on already crowded and under-maintained roads.

Appendix 5D 2013 Summary of Representations

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
118	Terry	Byrd	Merton Parish Council					Merton Parish Council would like to produce a Neighbourhood Plan however it is difficult without knowing the current and future needs which is from the Local Plan. The CRAITLUS is incomplete, outdated and skewed. There is a potential site for 37 new homes in Merton however this has not been considered. To restrict developments in the village to conversion is inappropriate as there are no properties suitable for conversion and typically barn conversions tend not to provide affordable houses.
129	Tim	Hibbert						Object to Option 3. No explanation as to why the 3 options have been established. A public meeting is required to discuss the options. Consideration of the proposed relief roads should be suspended until further information is provided.
129	Tim	Hibbert						There is no evidence to show that the Council has considered the impact on flooding from developments. Clarification needed to demonstrate that flooding has been taking into consideration.
147	Frank	Davies						The Plan does not relate to local need. 4 or 5 bedroom properties are not required in villages such as Deddington. There are no jobs in Deddington resulting in the village becoming a dormitory for Banbury or Oxford. There are traffic issues. Lower cost houses to meet the needs of young first buyers and older people wishing to downsize are needed. Clarification needed for the definition of Sustainability.
157	Alan	Collins	Deddington Parish Council				Consider Deddington only as part of the legally constituted parish including Clifton and Hempton and therefore count any housing development thus encompassed towards the requirement.	The Plan considers Deddington in isolation of the other two villages that make up the parish that is engaged in a Neighbourhood Plan. Deddington has no legally defined and understood boundary.
173	Owen	Jones	Boyer Planning / Bloor Homes (Western) Ltd			Housing Trajectory		Supports the accelerated trajectory for Land West of Bretch Hill. Footnote which recognised that accelerated delivery is not precluded should be reinstated. There should not be any arbitrary phasing restriction applied through the planning application process.
174	Theresa	Goss	Adderbury Parish Council		C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2		The Parish Council objects to Bankside Phase 2 as it is seen as coalescence of Adderbury and Banbury.
178	Michael	Crofton Briggs	Oxford City Council					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.
178	Michael	Crofton Briggs	Oxford City Council					Oxford City Council would welcome a discussion with Cherwell District Council on concerns for Bicester.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
189	M	Boswell			C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Banbury	Policy Banbury 3: West of Bretch Hill		Object to Banbury 3 as the proposed development will have a visual intrusion into the countryside and a coalescence of settlements with Wroxton and Drayton Conservation area. Grade 1, 2 and 3a agricultural land will be lost permanently therefore significant protection to this should be given. Impact to the surrounding landscape and its historic features and environment. The allocation is in direct contravention of SO 12. There will be an increase in traffic which will need addressing. North of Hanwell Fields (Banbury 5) is considered to be a more suitable and sustainable site.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council					There is no reference on garden land developments. There should be a clear endorsement of the need to prevent the loss of gardens. There are benefits of gardens to the health and wellbeing of people and the environment.
192	Theresa	Goss	Bloxham Parish Council					Mitigation of development in villages is subject to the creation of local Travel Plans however there is no evidence for the production of these. The SA assumes infill rather than development on greenfield land. It identifies the negative effects of development in rural areas such as transport and loss of air quality.
199	Peter	Atkin	Pegasus Group / Prudential Pensions Ltd			Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation	Remove the the Type of Development column	The identification of Deddington as a Category A village is supported. Deddington is one of the largest settlements in the District and has a good range of services and facilities. The inclusion of the "Type of Development" to be permitted is ambiguous and should be deleted. A definition is needed for 'minor development'
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society					Infrastructure Delivery Plan - Objects to the deletion of all references to the Banbury South to East Link Road (except change 390). This road has long been regarded as essential to Banbury's sustainable growth and almost all references have been deleted from this iteration of the Plan, notwithstanding that Banbury is now expected to accommodate 1600 more homes. The junction improvements will not be able to cope with the traffic increase. The Plan should identify and protect a route for the Banbury South-to-East link road in locations other than Employment Land West of the M40 and that development of sites provides sections of the road as appropriate.
207	Rob	Kinchin-Smith	Banbury Civic Society			Table 14 Infrastructure Plan: Banbury		Banbury South-to-East Link Road to be included?
211	David	Keene	David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates Ltd (Gavray Drive)			Housing Trajectory		The Plan uses the housing target of 670 dwellings per year which is set in the South East Plan. The 2012 Annual Monitoring Report confirms that there has been an under delivery of new homes in the District. There is an overreliance on South East Bicester to meet a larger proportion of housing growth in Bicester which is required to be delivered within a much shorter timescale. The Housing Trajectory does not demonstrate a reasonable approach to plan for the growth of the District. The number of dwellings and the delivery rate are over optimistic.
213	Laura	Wilkinson	D2 Planning Ltd / Blue Cedar Homes			B.124		The identified need needs to be translated into specific policies to ensure that the required housing is provided to meet the changing needs and demands. The provision of specialist accommodation for the elderly should be specified by a quantum or target to meet the growing needs of the elderly.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
217	Mark	Recchia	Banbury Town Council		D Infrastructure Delivery Plan			Concerned about the lack of any reference to the Banbury South to East Link Road. This road has long been regarded as essential to Banbury's sustainable growth. Almost all references have been deleted, notwithstanding that Banbury is now expected to accommodate 1600 more homes. Junction improvements have been identified. The increased number of cars will lead to further congestion and increase in pollution. The Banbury South to East link road should be identified and protected in the Plan.
218	R	Jones	John Phillips Planning Consultancy / Dr R Jones					The site to the South West of Bicester which is positioned between the A41 and the Wendlebury Road should be made allocated for employment use. The site could be included as part of Bicester 10. The site meets the Council's criteria in the Policy SLE 1 for non-allocated employment proposals, being accessible to an existing and proposed labour supply with good access to public transport and transport links. The site could also be in hotel/leisure use and would comply with Policy SLE 3. The site should be removed from the Green Buffer.
220	Andrew	Hornsby-Smith				Policy Villages 4	Clarification needed that this is an aspirational policy in respect of Kidlington, and 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.	There is no significant land available within Kidlington to meet the open space need except for the land already identified as part of the Green Belt review.
225	Alex	Arrol	Savills / Kennet Properties Ltd/Thames Water Group					The Council does not intend to progress a specific site allocation DPD that would cover the 3 main settlements of the District. The Bicester and Banbury Masterplans will be SPDs therefore cannot make site allocations, they can only provide additional detail clarifying such allocations.
227	Grahame	Handley			C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Our Villages and Rural Areas		Paragraph C.235 should be amended as follows: Insert "and should generally not exceed 20 dwellings" at the end of the 3rd sentence.	A maximum size for rural developments has not been set. A maximum of 20 dwellings per site would be more appropriate with a view to ensuring a proportionate distribution of housing growth amongst the rural villages. Paragraph C.235 to be amended.
235	Serena	Page	WYG Planning		Executive Summary		New policy suggested.	The Plan needs to go further to assist in the delivery of housing in rural areas, and in meeting the overall targets for growth in the local authority area. The Plan lacks creativity encouraged by the NPPF. The Development Strategy should include an additional 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 as well.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group					Supports the Plan period extension up to 2031.
237	Alex	Wilson	Barton Willmore / A2 Dominion Group		D Infrastructure Delivery Plan			The requirements would not appear to be based upon a robust assessment. The Bicester Masterplan is supported in principle. There is no evidence base document adequately assessing the infrastructure requirements arising from the proposed growth at Bicester, how this relates to the strategic sites and how this may be delivered.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
238	Simon	Gamage	RPS Planning and Development / Banner Homes and Mr R Bratt		Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy		Paragraph B.42 needs amending to make it less negative and bring it in line with Paras B.45, B.46 and Policy SLE1. Wording as "New employment development will be encouraged in the most sustainable and accessible locations in the urban and rural areas. This accords with the Council's strategy for focusing new housing development at Banbury and Bicester, ensuring housing and employment are located in the same place".	The Plan fails to address the development needs of the District outside of Banbury and Bicester. No target identified for the amount of employment development to the rural areas. The Plan does not distribute new development around the District toward the most sustainable locations (other than to Banbury and Bicester).
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes			Housing Trajectory		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 market in 2005/06.
242	John	Howitt	PJ Panning / Watershore Ltd			Appendix 5 Maps	The extent of the area excluded from the area shown as Green Infrastructure on the Proposals Map be amended to tie in with the area by the Section 106 Agreement.	Lack of recognition of an existing site for the provision of essential community facilities at Holm Square. The extent of the site is incorrectly drawn on the proposals map. The Plan should make full use of its existing assets.
244	Peter	Cox						Object to the proposed Green Buffer at Launton. An area of land was originally designated by the Council as potential residential land in 2007. Green Buffer to the immediate east of the A4421 roundabout and next to the East West Rail has been removed. This appears to be an error as it would appear to be incongruous with earlier possibilities of being industrial with a buffer to the east at the point of the old redundant railway to the airfield.
246	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Banner Homes Ltd		Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable Communities	Policy BSC 1: District Wide Housing Distribution		The overarching vision of the Local Plan inadequately makes reference to the provision of development needs that the District requires during the Plan period. The required development needs derived from objective assessments can be provided while maintaining and enhancing the heritage and green environment of the District. The Plan does not meet the full, objectively assessed needs for the market and affordable housing in the housing market area. The focused growth to Banbury and Bicester is not supported as the town centres will need to be strengthened so that they retain their function as large market towns, serving the resident population and a rural hinterland. The Plan should consider allocating a number of smaller sites which will encourage supply and delivery rather than potentially risk saturation through the large developments. The strategic residential allocations are for 400 or more units therefore it will not be easy to deliver these units quickly. Land south of Broughton Road is a suitable site for future housing delivery which will help the Council to maintain a supply of housing land.
246	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Banner Homes Ltd		Theme Three: Policies for Ensuring Sustainable Development	Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth		Land south of Broughton Road should be removed from the proposed Green Buffer as this designation is unnecessary and unjustified. No robust evidence base for the proposed Green Buffers. Policy ESD 15 should introduce an element of flexibility to deliver small and medium sizes allocations in sustainable locations which does not harm the character of the area. Land south of Broughton Road is a suitable site for housing. The site will not harm the setting of the settlement of Banbury's distinctive identity.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
246	Peter	Frampton	Framptons Planning / Banner Homes Ltd					Land south of Broughton Road should be allocated for housing. The site is well related to the existing urban form of the settlement and would be comparable in terms of distance to key facilities in the town centre. To the south of the site is naturally constrained by Crouch Hill which will be defensible boundary for the town in the southerly direction.
261	Ellen	O'Grady	Defence Infrastructure Organisation		C Policies for Cherwell's Places: Bicester	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 and an explanation is needed. The Policy should be amended as "Provision of a peripheral road within the site to function as a relief road for Bicester, enabling through traffic to bypass the Bicester Village roundabout, to access the A41 and thus alleviate existing congestion as part of a secured scheme for the delivery of the SE perimeter road". It is unclear what the 13th bullet point seeks to achieve. MOD cannot control access over land outside its ownership. The site cannot link to Bicester Business Park due to land ownership constraints and the physical barrier of railway embankment. Further amendment as "Sustainable access routes shall be provided including footpaths and cycleways, enhancing green modal accessibility beyond the site to the town centre and Bicester Town Rail Station, where possible linking the development to the existing Public Rights of Way Network". Further amendment as "The use of SuDS in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment". A number of requirements should be deleted as they are either not necessary or there is no evidence to justify the requirement.
268	Anne	Hibbert						Flooding is a major and continuous issue for Wendlebury. No evidence to show the potential knock on effect that developments in Bicester may have on Wendlebury from flooding. Clarification needed on this and mitigation measures considered.
281	V N	Smith	Quantock House					No reference made on the potential use of empty buildings or reference to the scale of the problem.
293	Kevin	Hardy	Power Park Ltd					The current land bank held by Power Park Limited is currently within the proposed Green Buffer boundary. The site should be removed from the Green Buffer.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP			A.23		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. Bicester's traffic congestion will continue to worsen due to the planned growth therefore growth should be focused at Banbury.
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP			Policy ESD 13: Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement		The Policy needs to better reflect the balance between landscape impacts and other factors that weigh in favour of development of particular sites, including sustainability of locations in addition to the capacity of the landscape to accept change. Some of the areas proposed for development in the Plan (for example Banbury 2) are located in an area that is visually sensitive. Proposals in these locations will inevitably cause visual intrusion into open countryside contrary to the 1st bullet point of the policy.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
303	Arron	Twamley	Savills / Barwood Strategic Land II LLP			C.124		The Green Buffers show extensive areas of land that are not between the settlement and surrounding villages, nor related to proposed new development. They effectively form 'Greenbelt' around the main settlements preventing sustainable growth. It is clearly evident that the green boundaries shown within the Banbury and Bicester Masterplans have been introduced so as to 'retrofit' the evidence base to the development strategy. The Council should base policy on up to date and relevant evidence base. There is no need for Policy ESD 15. It is considered development at South West of Banbury can be sensitively laid out and designed to maintain Banbury's distinctive identity and setting.. The last bullet point of the policy should be deleted and amended to "for each of the proposed new strategic development areas consideration will need to be given to the landscape setting and the edge to Banbury".
25	David	Sullivan				Sustainability Appraisal		SA. The Plan is not sustainable with the reasons already given. Without effective transport links businesses will not be attracted to Banbury and there will be no jobs for new residents.
26	David	Sullivan				Sustainability Appraisal		SA Without the required transport infrastructure the Plan will not meet the requirements to reduce transport emissions.
94	Antony	Watts	Hanwell Fields Development Action Group			Sustainability Appraisal		SA. Items listed is not consistent for each site, and the Bankside site is not analysed at all, meaning there is no analytical way of presenting the results or benchmarking against an approved site. It is not clear that Banbury 2 and 5 have more negatives than positives. The SA report does not assign scores, just colours. The best sites for sustainable development are Banbury 1 and Banbury 3.
101	Simon	Turner	Launton Parish Council			Sustainability Appraisal		SA. The major reduction in extent of the Green Buffer protecting Launton from Bicester renders the buffer completely ineffective as developers will be building closer to Launton. The change conflicts with notes about risk of coalescence in the Sustainability Appraisal Report and Officer's response to the Options for Growth 2009 consultation. The Sustainability Appraisal clearly shows that it has already been established that building up to the railway line would encroach towards Launton, and is unacceptable due to the risk of coalescence: so why does the Green Buffer report seem to think that development up to that railway line would be acceptable
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA. Para 3.2.2: It is the view of the ODBF that the 2013 work (evidence) has been a post-hoc justification of policies and text that previously had minimal evidence-based support, rather than, for example, an update based on changing baselines.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA. SA Para 3.4 sets out how 'significance' of impacts has been assessed, including: 'How valuable and vulnerable is the receptor that is being impacted?' The PSLPC fail to make the same distinction, in that they are giving a 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. Hence, when considering SA Tables 3.2 and 6.1, LP Policy ESD 15 and its associated paragraphs make it impossible to distinguish between 'Minor negative' and 'Major negative' impacts
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA Para 3.6.1 refers to consultation responses that identified issues with the Pre-Submission Local Plan, including (inter alia): How the need for additional growth and alternative sites was assessed and how the process of selection of sites was undertaken; Why some strategic housing sites which had identified environmental constraints had still been taken forward; Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth was not assessed;
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA Table 5.1: Sustainability baseline data summary: 10) Landscape and Historic Assets: The 2nd and third bullets of this table section refer to the 2010 and 2013 Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Studies. The landscape of the District has not changed so much over three years as to justify a new Study. It is the ODBF view that the Local Plan allocations and Green Buffer policy could not be justified by the 2010 Study (the purpose of which was to inform the Local Plan); so a second Study was commissioned to provide post-hoc justification for those allocations and policies.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA Table 5.1: Sustainability baseline data summary: 10) Landscape and Historic Assets: The landscape and historic assets scheduled in Table 5.1 do not include Salt Way. It is not until Table 5.1 at p47, 3rd bullet, that Salt Way is referred to as a constraint – with no prior evidence in Table 5.1 as to why it should be, and with footnoted reference to the 2013 Landscape Study. It therefore appears that there was no evidence of the value of Salt Way at the time that the housing allocations and Green Buffers were set.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA Table 5.1: Sustainability baseline data summary: 10) Landscape and Historic Assets: p48, final two bullets: The Green Buffers were included in the PreSubmission Local Plan. This section of Table 5.1 and its related footnotes make it clear that the Green Buffer policy and extent were given post-hoc justification only in January 2013. This significantly undermines the evidence base and soundness of Policy ESD 15 and its associated paragraphs and Proposals Map. The penultimate bullet point refers to Banbury, with reference to: 'the historic Salt Way and important views'. There appears to be no judgment in using 'historic' and 'important' here, as required by SA Para 3.4: 'How valuable and vulnerable is the receptor that is being impacted?'

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA Table 6.1 pp 61/62: SA Objective 11: This sets out the countryside and historic environment objectives of the SA. These objectives should be applied with the significance weighting set out in the SA (see above).
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA Justification of Selection of Reasonable Alternatives at the options for growth stage for the Strategic Distribution of Development; 2nd Para: ODBF does not agree that landscape constraints limit development at Banbury to the extent claimed by the Council and the SA – a similar point is made at Para 2.4 above.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA Table 8.1 Theme 3, pp 86, 87, 2nd column, 3rd Para: The SA finds Policy ESD15 acceptable. However, it fails to apply the SA Para 3.2.2 'value' principle, or the weighting required by NPPF Paras 14, 113 and 128-141: it does not assess the effects on housing provision and flexibility that will arise from applying a development constraint based on assets of only local value. (SA Table 6.1 SA Objectives 1,6 and 7, in balance with Objective 11). The SA does not provide an accurate account of the sustainability credentials of the options for strategic development at Banbury and therefore fails to ensure that the 17 policies and proposals within the PSLPC represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against the reasonable alternatives.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA. Canalside – even though expected housing out-turn has reduced, the sustainability performance of Banbury Canalside has been overstated. The re-development of the site relies on the extensive relocation of employment uses (with circa 50 different land ownership interests) many of which exist because of the town centre location – it is currently unclear where alternative sites are to be found. As such there is a clear risk to existing businesses and the economic performance of Banbury. CPO powers will be required to assemble the land - it has not been demonstrated that the proposals are deliverable within the plan period. The above factors have not been taken into account in the SA.
195	Andrew	Docherty	Hives Planning / Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance (ODBF) and the trustees of the Adderbury and Milton Feoffee Charity			Sustainability Appraisal		SA. South Banbury – the relative sustainability benefits associated with development south of Banbury have not been accurately assessed in the SA, particularly when compared to other sites in the PSLP and PSLPC.
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		SA. Section 2.4 (page 14) - We feel that the three bullet points do not adequately explain the on-going role of Kidlington; the danger being that this settlement could be given a somewhat confused identity. Is it identified for (modest) growth, or will growth be limited in line with a rural area categorization. We suggest that the strategy should be set out as four bullets, not three (on page 14); and we note that Kidlington is five times the size of the next rural settlement (Bloxham). We are clear that the 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, in particular. Failing to do this may undermine and limit the potential of the proposed localized Green Belt review (as it may lack consistency with the Sustainability Appraisal). This is a presentational point.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Table 5.1 - We have the following observations:</p> <p>a. Part 5 (Communities) - We note the deficiencies in parks and gardens and the proposals for additional provision on the northern outskirts of Kidlington. Generally, we feel that the north of Kidlington offers good potential for 'community building' including an improved gateway on Langford Lane and better accessibility to jobs.</p> <p>b. Part 8 (Air Quality) - We note concerns regarding air quality on Bicester Road, Kidlington.</p> <p>c. Part 11 (Transport) - We note that Kidlington can accommodate development in a sustainable way with minimal adverse impact on the transport network.</p> <p>d. Part 16 (Economy) - We are surprised that no mention is made of the latest Employment Land Review (URS, 2012), nor is there any definition of how the Kidlington market has performed relative to Bicester and Banbury. In a similar vein, a key challenge is the lack of employment land available in Kidlington; which will certainly have a bearing on the Sustainability Appraisal (ie a negative impact if not addressed).</p> <p>e. Page 74 - in relation to the Green Belt, we take a slightly different interpretation of the South East Plan; which (in our opinion) is clear that a strategic review of the Green Belt around Oxford is not necessary, but it does provide scope for selective localized reviews, which is what we are seeking to encourage in relation to Langford Lane. We concur that there is no case for reviewing the strategic components of the Oxford Green Belt, including the important gaps around settlements such as Begbroke and Yarnton, and the approaches to Oxford along the A44. We note that the level of analysis in the Sustainability Assessment stops short of differentiating between the impacts of a localized review of the Green Belt, compared with the strategic impacts (and justification); for example in relation to Table B27.</p>
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Table B14 Bicester Gateway - The Sustainability Appraisal lists four key areas for mitigation: an FRA for commercial development; an assessment of agricultural land quality; a Habitats Management Plan; and archaeology. Our initial investigations confirm that all of these considerations can be mitigated within the Master Plan for this site. This is a good site for development and has the potential to signal and lead the development proposed in the Bicester Master Plan.</p>

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Table B27 Kidlington 1 - We have the following observations:</p> <p>f. Objective 2: The Sustainability Assessment should record that Langford Lane is not in a flood risk area.</p> <p>g. Objective 8: The land for Oxford Technology Park was (more than 10 years ago) a rugby club and, as such, is not the best or most versatile agricultural land. It is not farmed at present.</p> <p>h. Objective 10: Our Ecology Report for Oxford Technology Park is with the Council. The development of this land will not give rise to any significant biodiversity impacts.</p> <p>i. Objective 11: Oxford Technology Park provides an opportunity to create a well-designed approach to the urban edge of Kidlington, as approached along Langford Lane. There is no impact on the rather more rural approach to Oxford along the A44 (as evidenced in our Landscape & Green Belt Review undertaken by LDA, 2013).</p>
209	Angus	Bates	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Generally, we would suggest that the Sustainability Appraisal should have differentiated between the two 'Kidlington 1' areas identified to be subject to a Green Belt review. They are different in characteristic, the employment offer is different, the employment need is different (eg in terms of the existing availability of space at Begbroke Science Park) and the promotion efforts are at different stages (the case for Oxford Technology Park is at an advanced stage).</p>
211	David	Keene	David Lock Associates / Gallagher Estates Ltd (Gavray Drive)			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Table B16 of Annex B: Selected Sites and Policies Assessment Tables provides an assessment of the South East Bicester site, yet fails to acknowledge: the increase in dwelling capacity from 150 to 400; and the impacts associated with this increase and any changes to mitigation or enhancement strategies.</p>

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. The appraisal in Table 8.1 in respect of the sites in Banbury is very inconsistent in terms of the impacts identified relative to each of the housing sites. The full benefits of BAN2 are simply not recognised relative to other sites.</p> <p>By definition, the same significant positive effects that are identified for the other Banbury housing allocations equally apply to BAN2, Similarly, it is considered that there are minor positive effects in relation to health and well-being, sustaining vibrant communities, road congestion and travel rather than purely negative effects. BAN2 must score more positively, certainly in terms of congestion and travel related to economic opportunities given its location adjacent to established employment areas. BAN3 and 5 are identified as minor positive in all of these.</p> <p>The inconsistencies in the analysis become even more apparent when compared to the Theme 2 Housing and Community policies in Table 8.1 on page 94 of the Document. Similar arguments apply in relation to SA Objective 1 in terms of housing allocations helping to meet requirements. The SA needs to more positively recognise BAN 2.</p>
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Table 8.3 dealing with cumulative effects identifies that ALL Banbury strategic Site Policies have potential positive cumulative effects in terms of new development contributing to reducing poverty and social exclusion and creating vibrant communities – this is far from fully recognised within Table 8.1 in relation to BAN2.</p>
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Page 5 notes: “the SA Report includes updated evidence and had taken into account Representations received during the Consultation...” We do not accept that this is the case, as the ‘response’ to our original representations set out in Annex D does not address our concerns, but merely states what new studies have been done to justify a reduction in the development level on the western side of Southam Road.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.6.1 of the Report gives a very brief summary of the key points made during the earlier consultation, but makes NO mention of BAN2 reps, whilst Hanwell Fields and West of Bretch Hill are specifically mentioned.</p>
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>There is a lack of ‘follow through’/accuracy in Table 8.1 relative to the changes being made to the Policy and the effect that these changes would have on the sustainability appraisal within Annex B Table B18.</p>
232	Sinéad	Morrissey	Rapleys LLP / Pandora Ltd			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>Table B18 Appraisal objective 4 recognises the provision of extra care housing, but this is NOT reflected in comment on objective 1.</p>

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
240	Steven	Neal	Boyer Planning / Wates Developments and Redrow Homes			Sustainability Appraisal		SA. Table B16 of the Sustainability Appraisal has not been updated in its entirety. Under the heading 'SA Objective 1' relating to "the opportunity to live in a decent, sustainably constructed and affordable home", the synopsis makes reference to the provision of 150 new homes. Accordingly, the table needs to be updated to reflect the increase, which we suggest should be to 800 units. We consider that the assessment for the site in each of the short, medium and long term should be increased from '+' to '++' to ensure consistency with the appraisal of other sites. For instance, the assessment of South West Bicester Phase 2 in table B9 credits the site with '++' for 21 hectare provision of housing land. In the case of South east Bicester, the total allocation is 22 hectares which has the potential to contribute a greater provision of housing and should therefore be amended to reflect this.
284	J	Burrett				Sustainability Appraisal		SA. Where the site of the Roman town plus annexe and surrounding fields is mentioned in this report there is a spelling mistake ALCHESTER is the official name not ACHESTER
284	J	Burrett				Sustainability Appraisal		SA. Reference is made to the GAGLE BROOK in particular which flows from Bignell Park area through Chesterton, under the Wendlebury to Bicester old road, past the ALCHESTER site and then into the Langford Brook and to the River Ray system. Because of the proposed 'possible Bicester Relief Road' which might go from the A41 to Aylesbury, through the Graven Hill site and connect with the A41 near J9/M40 with a roundabout just north of Wendlebury village I now enclose a copy of the catchment location plan for WENDLEBURY BROOK. The costs to mitigate the proposed route for the "possible strategic Bicester Relief Road" to connect to the A41 just north of Wendlebury will be very high due to mitigation required to protect Wendlebury from the additional flood risks which would arise because of speed of run off from the hard road surface drainage systems. Greater areas of farm land would be used up for mitigation ponds as well as the land needed for the roads.

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
284	J	Burrett				Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Page 31 Table 5.1</p> <p>From my own experience of 33 years in Wendlebury I know that when high water events were expected in the past that semi-treated sewage had to be released into the Langford Brook from the Bicester treatment works. This led to much higher growth levels of vegetation in the Langford Brook because of the bacteria levels.</p> <p>As far as Wendlebury specifically has been concerned, over the decades, the positive pumping of foul water back up to Bicester Treatment works has had problems on many occasions.</p> <p>As the sustainability appraisal report sets out on page 31, there may be many more of these events in Wendlebury because of the increase in sudden rainfall events in both winter and summer. Flooding also leads to sewage treatment problems not only to excess surface water for a while. Management of sewage treatment for the communities around Bicester is just as important as for the increased housing and development proposed in the Bicester Master Plan and the Local Plan. Thames Water should be actively involved so that the potential responsibilities and costs for developers are made very clear indeed. It is not something which CDC can add on afterwards.</p>
299	Peter	Brown	Drayton Parish Council			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Supports the addition of Sor Brook as part of the Council's Landscape Evidence Base but considers that the redefining of Wroxton Park puts the Arch at risk.</p> <p>The revised wording of the clause refers to a green edge rather than clear green boundaries and is as a result a weaker policy for maintaining the separation between Banbury and Drayton Village.</p>
301		Gerald	Baldwin			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Support route 2b in preference but if either 2c or 3 were implemented, we would seek that the council (a) situates the routes as far from our boundaries as possible (b) does not encroach on to our land and (c) implements noise prevention measures. The 5 Wretchwick farm properties are Grade II listed and have been here for over 200 years. We consider therefore that they should not be demolished in favour of any road. We strongly object to this. We believe that a different solution can be achieved that will not impact on any of our properties</p>
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Section 2.4 (page 14) - We feel that the three bullet points do not adequately explain the on-going role of Kidlington; the danger being that this settlement could be given a somewhat confused identity. Is it identified for (modest) growth, or will growth be limited in line with a rural area categorization. We suggest that the strategy should be set out as four bullets, not three (on page 14); and we note that Kidlington is five times the size of the next rural settlement (Bloxham). We are clear that the 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, in particular. Failing to do this may undermine and limit the potential of the proposed localized Green Belt review (as it may lack consistency with the Sustainability Appraisal). This is a presentational point.</p>

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Table 5.1 - We have the following observations:</p> <p>a. Part 5 (Communities) - We note the deficiencies in parks and gardens and the proposals for additional provision on the northern outskirts of Kidlington. Generally, we feel that the north of Kidlington offers good potential for 'community building' including an improved gateway on Langford Lane and better accessibility to jobs.</p> <p>b. Part 8 (Air Quality) - We note concerns regarding air quality on Bicester Road, Kidlington.</p> <p>c. Part 11 (Transport) - We note that Kidlington can accommodate development in a sustainable way with minimal adverse impact on the transport network.</p> <p>d. Part 16 (Economy) - We are surprised that no mention is made of the latest Employment Land Review (URS, 2012), nor is there any definition of how the Kidlington market has performed relative to Bicester and Banbury. In a similar vein, a key challenge is the lack of employment land available in Kidlington; which will certainly have a bearing on the Sustainability Appraisal (ie a negative impact if not addressed).</p> <p>e. Page 74 - in relation to the Green Belt, we take a slightly different interpretation of the South East Plan; which (in our opinion) is clear that a strategic review of the Green Belt around Oxford is not necessary, but it does provide scope for selective localized reviews, which is what we are seeking to encourage in relation to Langford Lane. We concur that there is no case for reviewing the strategic components of the Oxford Green Belt, including the important gaps around settlements such as Begbroke and Yarnton, and the approaches to Oxford along the A44. We note that the level of analysis in the Sustainability Assessment stops short of differentiating between the impacts of a localized review of the Green Belt, compared with the strategic impacts (and justification); for example in relation to Table B27.</p>
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Table B14 Bicester Gateway - The Sustainability Appraisal lists four key areas for mitigation: an FRA for commercial development; an assessment of agricultural land quality; a Habitats Management Plan; and archaeology. Our initial investigations confirm that all of these considerations can be mitigated within the Master Plan for this site. This is a good site for development and has the potential to signal and lead the development proposed in the Bicester Master Plan.</p>

Rep ID No.	First Name	Surname	Organisation	Change No.	Section of PSLP	Location of Change	Changes sought	Comments
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Table B27 Kidlington 1 - We have the following observations:</p> <p>f. Objective 2: The Sustainability Assessment should record that Langford Lane is not in a flood risk area.</p> <p>g. Objective 8: The land for Oxford Technology Park was (more than 10 years ago) a rugby club and, as such, is not the best or most versatile agricultural land. It is not farmed at present.</p> <p>h. Objective 10: Our Ecology Report for Oxford Technology Park is with the Council. The development of this land will not give rise to any significant biodiversity impacts.</p> <p>i. Objective 11: Oxford Technology Park provides an opportunity to create a well-designed approach to the urban edge of Kidlington, as approached along Langford Lane. There is no impact on the rather more rural approach to Oxford along the A44 (as evidenced in our Landscape & Green Belt Review undertaken by LDA, 2013).</p>
308	Richard	Cutler	Bloombridge Hill Street Holdings Limited			Sustainability Appraisal		<p>SA. Generally, we would suggest that the Sustainability Appraisal should have differentiated between the two 'Kidlington 1' areas identified to be subject to a Green Belt review. They are different in characteristic, the employment offer is different, the employment need is different (eg in terms of the existing availability of space at Begbroke Science Park) and the promotion efforts are at different stages (the case for Oxford Technology Park is at an advanced stage).</p>