

**Appendix 2 – Summary of Representations received to Final Draft North West Bicester Supplementary Planning Document (November 2015)**

<b>Person/ Consultation Body</b>	<b>SPD Reference  (Final Draft November 2015)</b>	<b>Issue</b>	<b>CDC officer response</b>	<b>Proposed change (Reference Final SPD, February 2016)</b>
Gary Bell	None	General comments about consultation process and preparation of the SPD.	Noted.	No change.
Daniel Sharf	Development Principle 4 (DP4) – Homes  Page 24	The SPD should ensure that under occupancy of housing is avoided.	It is not the responsibility of planning policy to determine how development is occupied.	No change.
Daniel Sharf	Development Principle 4 (DP4) – Homes  Page 24	The development should not replicate the mix of dwellings that has evolved to meet the “demands” of homeowners for as much space they can afford with a view to providing a pension pot or to finance a care package.	The development is informed by demographic studies and supported by a residential strategy which sets out the housing types, size and mix. Section B.2 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan sets out policies for building sustainable communities based on housing need.	No change.

Daniel Sharf	Development Principle 4 (DP4) – Homes  Page 24	The SPD should cite the typical size of households in country towns (i.e. about 2.4 and failing) and provide dwellings predominantly to meet that “need”.	The Council is committed to meeting housing needs and accelerating delivery. The Local Plan and SPD are informed by various studies prepared as part of the Local Plan’s housing evidence base. It is therefore not considered necessary to include reference to typical household sizes in country towns.	No change.
Daniel Sharf	Development Principle 4 (DP4) – Homes  Page 24	Larger houses should be designed to be adaptable so that they can be divided simply and cheaply. Adaptability should be an important part of eco buildings.	Agreed. This is already included in the SPD supporting text to DP4 on page 23 which states “ <i>As well as providing attractive places for people to live, the new homes will also be adaptable and provide flexibility for residents to work from home.</i> ”	No change to text but format Development Principle 4 to clarify supporting text and highlight development principle section.
Daniel Sharf	Development Principle 4 (DP4) – Homes  Page 24	Permissions for residential development designed for adaptability should include conditions to prevent extensions without the express permission of the LPA so that the impact on housing mix <b>and</b> energy efficiency can be assessed in each case.	Development Requirement 4 – Homes, states: “ <i>Design principles will be set out and include the use of local materials, flexibility in house design and size including the potential for additions to the building to adapt to changing circumstances.</i> ” The Council does not intend to remove permitted development rights for home extensions unless in dealing with	No change.

			detailed designs it is justified.	
Daniel Sharf	Development Principle 4 (DP4) – Homes  Page 24	The SPD does not appear to be planning positively for either self/custom building/finishing or for co-housing. In this respect it is likely to be out of date when the Housing and Planning Bill is enacted to place an obligation on LPA's to find sites to meet the demand from individuals and associations for self/ group building. It is true that CDC has designated a site for self- building at Graven Hill but the allocation of one site does not amount to providing the choice which should be available to these important parts of housing supply. Those joining the registers might well include people not wanting to build at Graven Hill.	In Bicester, large scale provision for self build housing is to take place on The Graven Hill strategic development site and as such the Council has not identified a need at this site. However, there is the opportunity for individual parcels of land to bring forward this type of housing should the need arise. The self/custom build element of the housing market is emerging and it is recognised that there may be opportunities for it on the strategic development sites. Policy BSC3: Affordable Housing of the adopted Local Plan states, <i>“The Council will require active consideration of proposals for community self-build or self-finish housing particularly where it is to a high design standard and will result in suitable empty properties being brought into residential use.”</i> The SPD should reflect the changes in the housing market therefore it is proposed to insert the following wording at the end of the first paragraph 1 under Development	Insert the following wording at paragraph 4.77 under Development Requirement 4 – Homes:  <i>“The Council would welcome proposals for self-build, co-housing, or other innovative forms of residential development that meet local housing needs.”</i>

			<p>Requirement 4 – Homes:</p> <p><i>“The Council would welcome proposals for self-build, co-housing, or other innovative forms of residential development that meet local housing needs.”</i></p>	
Daniel Sharf	<p>Development Principle 4 (DP4) – Homes</p> <p>Page 24</p>	<p>Sites should be reserved for self-building on all development sites, giving time for these opportunities to be taken up before the development completes the building. Depending on the level of input from the self or custom builders (definitions should be included in the SPD) this should qualify to be included in the quota of affordable housing (both being exempt from CIL/s106 payments).</p>	<p>The adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 recognises in paragraph B.109) that securing new affordable housing on site as part of larger developments is the most significant way in which homes can be provided. Policy BSC3 seeks to achieve this so that the supply of new homes reflects the high level of need. Policy BSC4: Housing Mix is the starting point for the mix of affordable housing to be secured. Paragraphs B.117 to B.119 inclusive of the Local Plan refer to community self-build or self-finish affordable housing. At NW Bicester, self-build schemes are not envisaged in the SPD although individual developers may bring forward schemes in the future. The focus for self-build development in</p>	No change.

			Bicester will be at Graven Hill.	
Daniel Sharf	Development Principle 4 (DP4) – Homes  Page 24	The reference to associations of individuals in the Housing and Planning Bill could include co-housing schemes that should be supported in the SPD whether or not allied to self or custom building. This is the most suitable form of housing should play a prominent role in any eco-settlement. Land should be reserved for this form of use on permitted sites giving a reasonable time for groups to be formed (with the active assistance and encouragement of the LPA.)	The SPD does not make reference to the Housing and Planning Bill and it is considered not appropriate to do so at this stage as it has not passed into law. Co-housing has been considered as part of the Eco-town proposals but is not included in the SPD. Instead the Draft SPD makes reference to a local management organisation to support the community governance aspects of the scheme. The masterplan provides the spatial planning framework and proposed land uses for the site. It does not identify housing areas for particular sectors of the housing market and is designed to be flexibility in terms of the location and mix of housing within the parameters set by the SPD. The detail of affordable housing provision will be negotiated in individual planning applications. The SPD should reflect the changes in the housing market therefore it is proposed to insert the following wording at the end of the first paragraph 1 under Development Requirement 4 –	Insert the following wording at paragraph 4.77 under Development Requirement 4 – Homes:  “The Council would welcome proposals for self-build, co-housing, or other innovative forms of residential development that meet local housing needs.”

			Homes:  <i>“The Council would welcome proposals for self-build, co-housing, or other innovative forms of residential development that meet local housing needs.”</i>	
Daniel Sharf	DP6 (b)– Electric and low emission vehicles  Page 31	The SPD should emphasise the benefits in terms of both lower car ownership and use (and less risk of congestion) associated with car clubs. These should be developer funded (as part of all travel plans) and, importantly make membership available to both new and existing residents. Such clubs are more effective in reducing car ownership than car sharing schemes and can be made more popular through offering a range of vehicles – all could be EVs with a hybrid for longer journeys.	Noted. The SPD includes out a section on Transport, Movement and Access and expands upon this in the Development Principles that follow (DP6, 6 (a), 6 (b) and 6 (c). Low emission vehicles are encouraged in Development Principle 6(b) and car sharing and car clubs are referenced in DP 6 (a) recognising they have are an important element in reducing car ownership and use.	No change.
Daniel Sharf	DP6 (a) – Sustainable Transport – Mode Share and Containment  Page 31	It has been well established that the modal shift to low carbon transport is unlikely to happen in accordance with the UK Carbon Budgets or 2011 Carbon Plan.	Noted. The SPD sets ambitious and challenging targets for modal shift in transport to achieve reduction in carbon emissions.	No change.
Daniel Sharf	DP6 (b) – Electric and	The SPD must be bold in the measures that will be introduced to significantly reduce carbon from	Noted. The SPD is bold in terms of reducing carbon emissions from	No change.

	low emission vehicles Page 31	transport in ways that will provide examples to other new developments and existing residential areas.	transport.	
Daniel Sharf	DP7 – Healthy Lifestyles Green infrastructure Page 37	Suggest more attention is given to the Community Farm. This is shown on the masterplan but there is no reference to the Community Supported Agriculture movement which shows the potential of such a facility to contribute to most if not all those benefits associated to allotments. The main tenant of the community farm should be employed to provide education, and training as well as opportunities to tend livestock	The proposals for a Community Farm are indicative at this stage and will require more detailed consideration and design before they can be implemented.	No change.
Daniel Sharf	DR9 – Green infrastructure and landscape Page 38	Further land should be made available outside the development area for the provision of smallholdings and food processing facilities. Local food systems could and should form an important strand in the local economy (see NPPF para 161) and the SPD would be an appropriate if not necessary way of resolving the barriers that currently exist to new entrants. The SPD should also indicate that these land holdings must be made available at affordable prices or rents as must some suitably site housing (the agricultural occupancy condition would reduce the cost /rent to affordable levels and should be part of that provision.	The Local Plan recognises the importance of food processing to the economy of Bicester. The SPD cannot allocate land outside the development area for the uses proposed in this response.	No change.
Troth Wells – British Horse	Development Principle 6 - Transport,	The proposed development will impact on Bridleways in the area (129/9/10 and 148/4/10 in particular). Every effort should be made to protect	Noted. The bridleway leading from the eastern end of Howes Lane to Aldershot Farm is recognised in the	No change.

Society Oxon	Movement and Access and DP 9 – GI and landscape  Page 38	and preserve this vital route towards Heyford and Ardley	SPD as an important link between the town and countryside and is identified as a green corridor in the masterplan. Furthermore the SPD recognises public rights of way as important links to the countryside that should be enhanced and reinforced through the masterplan and individual planning applications. The route from Bicester to Heyford and Ardley will be preserved, protected and enhanced by the proposals.	
Troth Wells – British Horse Society Oxon	DP9 - Green infrastructure and landscape  Page 38	Horse riders are not mentioned at all in the document even though there are mentions of walkers and cyclists.	Noted. The SPD recognises the importance of the bridleway through the site but it does not refer to horse riders specifically. Many of the references to walkers and cyclists relate to sustainable modes of transport and healthy lifestyles. The reference to the bridleway in DP 9 on page 38 should be amended to take account of the needs of cyclists, walkers and horse riders.	Amend DP 9 as follows (paragraph 4.225):  “The bridleway leading from the eastern end of Howes Lane... is an important link between the town and countryside <u>for walkers, cyclists and equestrians</u> ”
Troth Wells – British Horse Society Oxon	DP9 - Green infrastructure and	The surface of the bridleway must be retained for equestrian use and not tarmacked over. Horse routes should be retained as soft grassy track	BP will be retained on its existing route and proposed to retain access for horses with the potential for the verge to be retained for	Amend text to include reference equestrians in paragraph 4.225–

	landscape Page 38		horse riders. Sufficient space for horses is provided. Detailed designs for the bridleway should consider use by horse riders. The SPD should make reference to horse riders and equestrian users of the bridleway	see above.
Chris Gaskell – Scottish and Southern Electric Power Distribution (SSEPD)	Various	General information provided relating to GIS mains records marked up for the site, letter to Chief Planning Officers.	Noted	No change
Chris Gaskell – Scottish and Southern Electric Power Distribution (SSEPD)	General	The housing and development land areas detailed in the SPD are typical of a number of recent sites across southern England where insufficient discussion has taken place between the LPA and SSE prior to planning permission being granted.	Noted	No change
Chris Gaskell – Scottish and Southern Electric Power Distribution (SSEPD)	General	The land is crossed by various 132kV overhead power lines and other transmission lines which form part of the Southern Electric Power Distribution's wider network and must be retained.	Noted	No change
Chris Gaskell – Scottish and Southern	General	General guidance on the provision of electricity infrastructure and the treatment of any existing	Noted	No change

Electric Power Distribution (SSEPD)		infrastructure in relation to future development.		
Chris Gaskell – Scottish and Southern Electric Power Distribution (SSEPD)	General	Connections for new developments from existing infrastructure can be provided subject to cost and timescale.	Noted	No change
Chris Gaskell – Scottish and Southern Electric Power Distribution (SSEPD)	General	Where existing infrastructure is inadequate to support the increased demands from the new development, the costs of any necessary upstream reinforcement required would normally be apportioned between the developer and DNO (Distribution Network Operator) in accordance with the Current Statement of Charging Methodology agreed with the industry regulator (OFGEM). Maximum timescales in these instances are usually up to 2 years and should not impede any proposed housing development.	Noted	No change
Chris Gaskell – Scottish and Southern Electric Power Distribution (SSEPD)	General	In order to minimise costs, wherever possible existing overhead power lines can remain in place with such uses as open space, parking, garages or public highways generally being permitted in proximity to overhead lines. Where this is not practicable or where developers choose to lay out their proposals otherwise then agreement will be needed as to how these will be dealt with including	Noted	No change

		agreeing costs and identifying suitable alternative routing for the circuits. The existing customer base should not be burdened by any costs arising from new development proposals.		
Chris Gaskell – Scottish and Southern Electric Power Distribution (SSEPD)	General	To ensure certainty of delivery of a development site, any anticipated relocation of existing overhead power lines should be formally agreed with SSEPD, prior to submission of a planning application.	Noted	No change
Chris Gaskell – Scottish and Southern Electric Power Distribution (SSEPD)	General	<p>The existing supply 33kV supply from Headington substation together with the Bicester 33/11kV primary substation is almost to full capacity. SSEPD has started the process of undertaking reinforcement works in order to be able to provide significant additional electrical capacity for the Bicester area comprising a new Grid Substation at NE Bicester off Skimmingdish Lane. To supply the Eco town it will be necessary to provide primary substation at an early stage of the development which will be supplied by 2 x 33kV underground circuits from the NE Bicester Grid S/S. Discussions have already taken place with A2Dominion and a suitable location for the S/S agreed with a planning application submitted</p> <p>Due to the timescales involved the exemplar phase of the development will be supplied from the existing hv distribution network supplied by the</p>	Noted	No change

		existing substation but will be transferred onto the eco town primary substation once completed.		
Martin Small – Historic England	2.0 Site context Page 8	Welcome reference to historic parkland of Bignell Park, particularly the reference to the Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation (HLC) are previously requested in accordance with para ET15.1 of the Eco-towns PPS.	Noted	No change
Martin Small – Historic England	5.0 Design and character areas  Page 49	The HLC should be used to greater effect than simply a map regression exercise as currently indicated in the site history section. The HLC should inform each stage of the design process, from setting the site boundaries through to the masterplan and onto the detailed design ideally through an iterative process between masterplanners/designers and those with understanding of the site's past history.	Noted. Section 5 does not include reference to the Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Characterisation Project. From the comments it should include reference to the HLC in the design.	Amend Section 5 paragraph 5.2, to include reference to HLC as follows:  <i>The HLC should inform each stage of the design process, from setting the site boundaries through to the masterplan and onto the detailed design ideally through an iterative process between masterplanners/designers and those with understanding of the site's past history.</i>
Martin Small – Historic	Masterplan	The boundaries of the development area have been drawn with no regard for the existing pattern of field boundaries, slicing through them and	Noted. The boundaries of the masterplan reflect the landownerships of the site and a	No change.

England		leaving awkwardly shaped remnants of fields all around the site boundary, a problem recognised on page 11 of the SPD.	topographical survey.	
Martin Small – Historic England	Masterplan	A more sensitive consideration of the site boundaries in relation to the existing landscape framework would significantly help integrate the proposed development into the existing and future landscape.	The masterplanning of the site has been informed by a Landscape Character Assessment and Landscape and Visual Impact Study. The proposed built development does not go up to the site boundaries to ensure appropriate integration with the surrounding landscape.	No change.
Martin Small – Historic England	Masterplan	The masterplan and detailed design should be informed by a good understanding of how the landscape within land adjacent to the site has developed historically and how this has shaped its present day character (as documented by the HLC and other sources). This would help to ensure that the development meets the requirement of para 58 of the NPPF for developments to respond to “local character and history, and reflect the identity of local surroundings and materials...”	Noted.	No change.
Martin Small – Historic England	Masterplan framework Figure 10 Page 19	From Figure 10, it appears consideration has been giving to historic field patterns and landscape framework in the masterplan framework. Suggest detailed design and layout should be informed by a much close consideration of the existing (and historical) patterns on the site, as documented in	Noted. Include reference to historic field patterns and landscape framework is included in Section 5 Design and Character areas on page 49.	Amend final bullet on page 49 referring to GI and landscape to include historic landscape and field boundaries.

		the HLC and related sources (such as historic mapping).		
Martin Small – Historic England	Archaeology Page 11	Welcome the archaeological assessment and the recognition of the site’s known potential for remains dating from the prehistoric period.	Noted	No change
Martin Small – Historic England	2.0 Site context – page 11	Welcome reference to the Oxfordshire Environment Record	Noted	No change
Martin Small – Historic England	Masterplan framework Figure 10 Page 19	Welcome recognition of the grade II* listed St Lawrence’s Church, just to the north east of the site, however masterplan should be amended to highlight these designated heritage assets with a specific notation.	Noted. Scale of masterplan does not allow individual buildings to be shown, the SPD relies therefore on the Development Principles, requirements and supporting documents as the evidence for protecting historic buildings on site.	No change
Martin Small – Historic England	3.0 Vision Page 16	Include in vision reference to the conservation and enhancement of heritage assets, including historic landscape features	The masterplan makes provision for the listed buildings on the site and this should be reflected in the Vision.	Insert at paragraph 3.5 after landscape setting: <i>“Conserves and enhances heritage assets, including historic landscape features...”</i>
Martin Small – Historic England	5.0 Design and character areas	Suggest SPD confirms that designated heritage assets, and any identified or potential non-designated heritage assets will be retained and their settings respected and any other historic landscape features (such as may be identified by	Listed buildings have been retained in the masterplanning of the site as part of the mixed use development proposals for the existing farmsteads. This should be	Insert under character and setting (paragraph 5.24): “Heritage assets, and

	Page 50	the HLC) also retained and ideally their significance better revealed. This would be consistent with para ET 15.1 of the Eco-towns PPS which requires Eco-town proposals to set out measures to conserve and where appropriate enhance both heritage assets and their setting through proposed development.	recognised in the SPD supporting text and it is considered appropriate to include text in the design and character areas section.	any identified or potential non-designated heritage assets will be retained and their settings respected and any other historic landscape features (such as may be identified by the HLC ) also retained and ideally their significance better revealed.“
Martin Small – Historic England	Masterplan	Is there a case for keeping Gowell Farmstead?	Gowell Farm has been considered as part of the masterplanning and is not to be retained as the land is required for the realignment of Howes Lane and secondary school site. The buildings are in a poor condition and as such it is not proposed to retain them.	No change.
Martin Small – Historic England	Masterplan 5.0 Design and character areas.	Careful thought about the way the farms related to the agricultural land around them may point towards ways in which the retained buildings can be integrated into the new surroundings in a way that retains a degree of historical sense.	Noted. Now that the masterplan has been fixed and approved as part of the SPD, the SPD should make reference to the existing farms in more detail.	Insert at end of Section 5.0 (paragraph 5.39):  <i>“Careful thought about the way the farms related to the agricultural land around them may point towards ways in which the</i>

				<i>retained buildings can be integrated into the new surroundings in a way that retains a degree of historical sense."</i>
Martin Small – Historic England	Character areas	Suggest public open space could be used to retain some of the setting of the farm complexes.	This could be included in the design principles at the end of Section 5.0	Add at paragraph 5.39:  <i>"Public open space could be used to retain the setting of the farm complexes"</i>
Martin Small – Historic England	Character areas - Existing farms	The proposals for mixed use development at the existing farmsteads should retain and respect the list bars at Himley Farm and the listed farmhouse at Home Farm. Could these complexes be the heart of different neighbourhoods, reflecting their historical role as focal points in the local landscape?	The masterplanning has resulted in the retention of the existing farm complexes as Himley Farm and Home Farm. These will provide a mix of uses and be integrated into the wider development but it is not intended that they become the focal point of the neighbourhood. Consideration has been given to the appropriate treatment and location of the farmsteads in the masterplanning of the site, for example, Himley Farm will be the centre of a new neighbourhood on the western area of the site. Home Farm is located on the eastern	No change.

			periphery of the site and does not lend itself to being the heart of a neighbourhood.	
Martin Small – Historic England	DP9 – GI and landscape page 38 and page 51	Welcome recognition on page 38 of the SPD of the need to handle the interface with Bignell Park and the import views of St Lawrence’s church in Caversfield with sensitivity (and the further recognition of this on page 51).	Noted	No change
Martin Small – Historic England	DP9 – GI and landscape page 38	Welcome recognition on page 38 of setting of listed buildings within the site being considered carefully when preparing planning applications. And the recognition of the setting of St Lawrence’s Church, Himely Farm Barns and Home Farm as key considerations for any development in their area on page 51	Noted	No change
Martin Small – Historic England	DP9 (b) – Development edges  Page 40	Consideration of the setting of listed buildings should be reflected in the Development Principles	The setting of listed buildings is recognised in the masterplan and should be reflected in the SPD as part of an expanded DP9 (b) – development edges. Insert a new Development Requirement/Principle on the setting of listed buildings.	Add at the end of DP9 (b) (paragraph 4.253):  <i>Development should give consideration to the setting of listed buildings</i>
Martin Small – Historic England	DP14 – Cultural Wellbeing	Disappointing that conservation and enhancement of the historic environment is not a development principle or requirement in its own right or included as part of development principle 14.	Given the response to previous comments it would appear reasonable to include a reference to conservation and enhancement of historic assets as a final bullet	Add bullet to DR14 paragraph 4.350 as follows:  <i>Conservation and</i>

	Page 48		point to DR14 – Cultural wellbeing.	<i>enhancement of the historic environment.</i>
David Leigh	5.0 Design and Character Areas – Building Heights  Page 50	The SPD makes mention of controlling building heights but should be more specific in relation to the heights of the industrial units. There is a general statement that buildings will only be 2 stories in height but no specific limits on buildings which will have the greatest environmental impact.	The masterplanning of the site has provided a business park in the south west corner of the site to accommodate large format commercial buildings. The prominence of the business park in relation to existing development and the wider masterplan is recognised in the SPD. Detailed designs will establish the building heights.	No change
David Leigh	Employment DP5 and DR5  Page 25	There is very little, if any, consideration of the impact on existing residents of the proposed B8 development particularly in terms of noise light traffic and transportation	The masterplan identifies the opportunity for mixed use development. Consideration has been given to how the employment land is accessed to minimise impact on existing residential property. The masterplan proposes mixed use employment and identifies a specific area for B8 uses surrounded by a landscape buffer to mitigate any potential negative impacts. The buildings will be designed to a high standard to meet the requirements of the SPD. Heavy goods vehicles will access the site from Middleton	No change.

			Stoney Road and routing restrictions can be used to control the impact on the neighbouring local highway network	
David Leigh	Employment	The SPD contains specific guidance for various aspects of the development such as Eco-town standards and an appendix for design principles for schools, however, there is no guidance or specific requirements for the design and use of employment areas – even though 1,000 jobs are anticipated and which will unavoidably generate noise and light disturbance. In particular the positioning of B8 uses in the centre of a residential area needs to be considered carefully.	The SPD contains a section on employment proposals. The section includes a development principle and requirement for employment on the site to create local jobs. The detailed design and impacts of the employment uses will be considered at the planning application stage and develop the design principles in Section 5.0.	No change
David Leigh	DR 5 – page 26 - Employment	As a minimum, the SPD should set out:  Limits on noise generation by commercial developments including specific noise level limits for various times of day/night at existing buildings  Control of visual intrusion and lighting impacts  Control of vehicle movements into and out of the industrial area together with an undertaking to limit the noise impact of the additional traffic generated.	The assessment of noise impact, visual impact, traffic and lighting will be made at the planning application stage. The SPD sets out the broad development principles and requirements of developers in preparing planning submissions however it could provide further detail on the requirements for planning applications to consider the impact of employment proposals on adjacent uses. For clarification, the following bullet points should be	Insert at paragraph 4.103 after “Relationship to neighbouring uses“:  “so that they do not have an adverse impact on adjacent properties” in the list of requirements employment proposals will need to address”

			<p>added to DR5:</p> <p><i>Not have an adverse impact on adjacent uses;</i></p> <p><i>Provide a satisfactory relationship with adjacent properties.</i></p>	
Becky Micklem – Berkshire, Buckinghamshire and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust (BBOWT)	<p>DP9 (c ) DR 9 (c)</p> <p>DP9 (e) DR 9 (e)</p>	Welcome Development Principle and Development requirements that have been included on biodiversity (9e) and hedgerow corridor (9c)	Noted	No change
Becky Micklem – BBOWT	<p>Masterplanning and comprehensive development</p> <p>DR9 – GI and landscape</p>	The SPD needs to include the mechanism to ensure the nature reserve is delivered	The Council is looking to require net biodiversity gain as planning applications come forward. The SPD recognises the importance of securing the land for the nature reserve. The Council is looking to negotiate a net gain in biodiversity on planning applications as they are submitted and will also seek to secure land for the nature reserve as the opportunity arises.	No change
Becky Micklem –	Appendices	The Biodiversity Strategy for the masterplan area and the NW Bicester masterplan green infrastructure and landscape strategy should be	It is not considered appropriate to include supporting strategies in the appendices; rather they should be	No change

BBOWT		included as appendices	available online as background and a resource for the preparation of planning applications.	
Becky Micklem – BBOWT	DP 9 (e) – Biodiversity page 42	The SPD should include a minimum buffer width requirement for ponds and woodlands. The biodiversity strategy identifies the need for woodlands and ponds to have a minimum buffer width of 10m with a 50m buffer around ponds supporting great crested newts. These minimum standards should be incorporated in the SPD.	The masterplan makes provision for buffers as part of the Green infrastructure framework but it would provide clarity to include reference to 10 metre buffers around ponds and 50 metres for ponds supporting great crested newts.	Include further reference under development Principle 9 (e) at paragraph 4.285:  “The biodiversity strategy identifies the need for woodlands and ponds to have a minimum buffer width of 10m with a 50m buffer around ponds supporting great crested newts.”
Becky Micklem – BBOWT	Masterplanning and comprehensive development  DR9 – GI and landscape	It is identified that the creation of a nature reserve is fundamental to the principle of a net biodiversity gain. The lack of a holistic approach to individual planning applications coming forward for the masterplan area could fail to deliver the nature reserve and thus a net gain in biodiversity. This concern is founded on the current position whereby the only parcel of land within the masterplan area not covered by a current planning application or permission includes the area identified for the nature reserve. The development as a whole relies	The mechanism to deliver the nature reserve is being negotiated as part of the comprehensive development of the site.	No change

		on the nature reserve to achieve a gain in biodiversity; it would be useful for the SPD to identify the mechanism to ensure individual permissions do not go ahead without the delivery of the nature reserve being secured.		
Becky Micklem – BBOWT	DR9 (e) – Biodiversity Page 42	Whilst the requirement of a landscape and habitats management plan is identified in the DR for Biodiversity 9 (e) it is not included as one of the documents needed to accompany planning applications in the PPA section of Chapter 6 Delivery. For clarity and completeness it would be useful to see LHMP listed in this section.	Agreed. Reference to the requirement for a Landscape and Habitats Management Plan to be submitted with planning applications should be included in the list of supporting information for planning applications.	Insert at 6.15:  Landscape and Habitats Management Plan  In list of requirements for planning applications.
Becky Micklem – BBOWT	DR9 (e) – Biodiversity page 42	Welcome contributions towards off site mitigation for impacts on farmland birds but note no detail is included as to how it will be achieved. Concerns were set out in BBOWT consultation response to Planning Application reference 14/01641/OUT). Best option would be for funds to be allocated for land purchase in an agreed area and subsequent management for nature conservation by an appropriate body.	Noted	No change
Becky Micklem – BBOWT	DR9 (e) – Biodiversity page 43	Welcome reference to a biodiversity strategy and suggest it is included as an appendix so that it is easily found and referenced.	The SPD should be read alongside the evidence base for the NW Bicester masterplan which includes the Biodiversity Strategy and Green Infrastructure and Landscape Plan. All supporting	No change

			information will be easily accessible on the CDC Planning Policy Webpage	
Carmelle Bell – Savills for Thames Water plc	DP10 and DR10 – Water	Happy to see comments submitted in January 2015 have been taken on Board and included in the final Draft SPD, as such Thames Water support both DP 10 and DR10 in relation to Water. As further information becomes available as to the location and scale of specific developments TW would like to be contacted to discuss how this will impact on their assets further.	Noted	No change
Andrew F Hickman – Middleton Stoney Parish Council	2.0 Site context	Disappointed that none of previous concerns have been addressed in the Final Draft SPD. Major concern relates to traffic impacts on Middleton Stoney. There appears to be a supposition that the main access to the M40 should be along the B4030 to the crossroads at Middleton Stoney village via the B430 north through Ardley to J10 of the M40. The crossroads at Middleton Stoney is already at capacity at peak times and accommodating further west bound traffic will be difficult without encouraging further traffic to access the M40 via the J10. It should be clearly stated within the SPD that the main access to the M40 should be at J9 with the NW Bicester traffic using Vendee Drive	The SPD refers to the Middleton Stoney Road in a description of the site location. It describes the current character and use of the road. As the development comes forward the character of the road will change. Middleton Stoney Road provides access to the site and links to the surrounding highway network. Transport modelling shows that the number of vehicles on the network and trips will increase in the future, across the whole area not just in Bicester. At the same time the NW Bicester SPD aims to reduce the need to travel is reduced for residents and users of the North West Bicester	No change

			<p>site. Sustainable modes (walking, cycling and public transport) will be the first choice of travel, however there will inevitably be an increase in traffic using routes through Middleton Stoney as a result of the proposed growth in the area, however, it is not possible for the SPD to restrict movement of private motor vehicles on the surrounding highway network. Other measures such as traffic calming schemes will be considered as part of detailed planning applications where there is evidence to justify a negative impact.</p>	
<p>Andrew F Hickman – Middleton Stoney Parish Council</p>	<p>DP6 (c) and DR6 (c) – Proposed highways infrastructure – strategic link road and highway realignment pages 32 and 33</p>	<p>The construction of a new road from Middleton Stoney Road roundabout to Lords Lane east of Purslane Drive fails to provide the strategic link which is required. There must be a robust transport route to bypass Bicester to the West. The current Howes Lane/ Lords Lane route is an important strategic route which accomplishes this at present. The proposed new road, “a tree lined boulevard” is shown to meander through the residential areas of the NW Bicester Eco town site. It proposes a road with a maximum speed limit of 30 mph and traffic calming measures will be introduced. This concept is fundamentally flawed.</p>	<p>The proposed strategic link road is required to facilitate the integration of the new development with the existing and has been shown to accommodate increase vehicle capacity anticipated from transport modelling. The concept has been established through the masterplanning and various other options including an outer perimeter road have been explored and discounted.</p>	<p>No change</p>

		The proposed road will be virtually useless for traffic wishing to bypass the town to the west, particularly the HGV traffic currently using Howes Lane		
Andrew F Hickman – Middleton Stoney Parish Council	DP6 (c) and DR6 (c) – Proposed highways infrastructure – strategic link road and highway realignment pages 32 and 33	A semi-fast perimeter or orbital road with a speed limit of 40/50 mph is required. Alternatively, consideration should be given to widening Howes Lane.	Bicester has a perimeter route, sometimes referred to as “the ring road” with speed limits of 40/50 mph providing an orbital route for through traffic to avoid the town centre. As the town centre grows as proposed by the strategic development sites around the edge of the existing urban area, the character and design of the perimeter route will have to be amended to accommodate increased traffic volumes, provide integration with new development and increase safety.	No change
Andrew F Hickman – Middleton Stoney Parish Council	DP6 (c) and DR6 (c) – Proposed highways infrastructure – strategic link road and highway realignment pages 32 and	With many new developments in and around Bicester, OCC and CDC need to ensure there are robust conditions in place for developers to build roads to the appropriate highway standard and this applies to Howes Lane realignment.	Noted. The proposed strategic link road to be provided as part of the realignment of Howes Lane has been designed and engineered to the required standards.	No change

	33			
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Employment	<p>The Eco-towns PPS states under Standard ET10 that:</p> <p><i>“It is important to ensure that eco-towns are genuine mixed-use communities...”</i></p> <p>There is no policy statement within the PPS, NPPF or NPPG that suggests a particular form of employment is objectionable as a matter of principle within an eco-town. That employment within Class B8 – logistics sector – is inconsistent with the aspirations for an eco-town is an elitist/absurd proposition – employment within an office environment with an employee working on a computer is acceptable, whereas an employee working on a computer in a logistics is objectionable.</p>	<p>Noted. The masterplan and employment proposals for NW Bicester have been guided by the Eco-towns PPS and the Council welcomes the attention drawn to Eco-town standard ET10 as this is a fundamental principle underpinning the development framework for the site. In developing the Economic Strategy that supports the masterplanning, the focus has been on job creation and providing facilities that provide employment on site for local residents thus avoiding the need to travel and creating “genuine mixed-use communities” including employment created in the local centres and jobs created as part as the overall growth of the town. At the same time, the economic strategy has identified target sectors and the development of a business park as part of the employment mix and opportunities for local jobs.</p>	No change
Peter Bateman –	Employment	The Council’s Employment Land Study 2012 refers to a report provided by Cranfield University,	Noted	No change

Framptons Planning	- general	“Making and Moving: The Future Prospects of British Industry 2007” explains clearly how the B8 sector has change fundamentally over the past years with the consequent “blurring” of the Use Classes.		
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Employment – general	The SPD should build on the policies of the adopted Local Plan and give direction for development proposals reflecting the fact this is a unique Eco-town location. The SPD should embrace the realities of the modern business world, where a rigid division between Use Classes is less prevalent. Modern production (Class B2) and logistics (Class B8) buildings now comprise substantial office components and sophisticated logistics systems, together with other transferred processes, including assembly, servicing and finishing. The modern logistics sector should be fully embraced within the objective to create ‘a genuine mixed use community’. The prevailing perception in the SPD remains that employment in the logistics sector is a ‘low value, bad job’ and is not wanted in this development.	Noted. The NW Bicester Economic Strategy supporting the masterplan identifies logistics as one of five key economic sectors supporting the economy of Bicester. The strategy also considers how to support jobs growth in the main opportunity areas (including logistics) related to NW Bicester and Bicester’s location. Bicester has a high proportion of employment in the logistics sector. The site’s location provides an opportunity for jobs creation in the high value logistics sector.	No change
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Employment	The SPD needs to be more detailed and flexible to address the reality that if a policy framework remains as restricting Uses Classes as “limited” as stated within Policy Bicester 1, this site will not provide jobs early in the Plan period.	Policy Bicester 1 of the Local Plan sets out the requirement for employment to be for business uses within Use Class B1 with some general industrial uses (Use Class B2) and storage or distribution (Use Class B8). This is	No change

			considered reasonable as it allows the proposed development to respond to market signals and provides flexibility to encourage investment and implementation.	
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	DP5 – Employment page 26	<p>Development Principle 5 (page 26) states that planning applications should:</p> <p><i>“Demonstrate access to at least one new opportunity per home on-site and within Bicester.”</i></p> <p>The meaning of this requirement is opaque. A LPA has no land use power to insist upon a set number of jobs to be provided by individual companies. Policy Bicester 1 has anticipated between 700-1,000 jobs – this statement of expectation is sufficient for the land use planning process. The above requirement should be deleted.</p>	Noted. The requirement for at least one new employment per new home is taken from the Eco-towns PPS and supported by the NW Bicester economic strategy. It is a fundamental principle of the masterplan and should not be deleted. The requirement for one job per new dwelling has resulted in identification of land for employment uses and mixed use development has is proposed in the masterplan.	No change.
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	DR5 – Employment (page 26)	The DR5 (p26) states that applications should ‘pursue target sectors of the high value logistics, manufacturing (including performance engineering) and low carbon companies is welcomed. This requirement emphasises the need for the restricted employment uses (as set out in Policy Bicester 1) to be omitted by the SPD and the Use Classes as being flexible.	To clarify the development requirement it should be reworded to confirm that target sectors include high value logistics and performance engineering within the business park. The target sectors should be flexible allowing the development to respond to the latest economic baseline information and the economic strategy submitted with individual	Amend the requirement as follows (paragraph 4.103):  <i>Pursue target sectors <u>including high value logistics, manufacturing (including performance engineering) and low carbon <u>environmental goods and services.</u></u></i>

			applications while being broadly consistent with the masterplan economic strategy.	
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	DP6 – Transport Movement and Access (p29)	The key constraint impacting on all development at North West Bicester is the railway line which splits the Bicester 1 allocation into two parts. The critical issue, which the SPD needs to assist resolving if it is to constitute a credible place making tool, is to assist facilitating the ability for traffic movement between the two sections of the allocation which is presently only achieved via a substandard and awkward junction arrangement.	The SPD masterplan shows the realignment of Howes Lane and the reconfiguring of the road layout around the Howes Lane Bucknell Road junction to provide connectivity between the areas of the site on either side of the railway line via a route under it.	No change
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	DP6 – Transport Movement and Access (p29) 6.0 Delivery	Suggest the SPD should be used by the LPA to provide a mechanism for adequately defining the issues of road capacity over a memorandum produced by one of the applicants of NW Bicester as this will be more transparent and likely to deliver a fair and equitable delivery mechanism.	The SPD sets out the strategic issues relating to transport. Further detail is provided in the supporting transport documents. The delivery section of the SPD sets out the general approach to delivering the infrastructure requirements of the site. Now applications have been submitted for the majority of the site detailed negotiations are taking place with developers and applicants.	No change
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Section 6 (p53)	Section 6 is silent on the railway tunnel delivery mechanism and does not define a “framework agreement”.	Noted. The railway tunnel is being negotiated through the planning application process and a framework agreement is being	No change

			considered.	
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Page 55	<p>SPD states:</p> <p><i>'Developers will be expected to work collaboratively to deliver the infrastructure.'</i></p> <p>Such arrangements are already being discussed between Albion Land and A2Dominion. A2D acknowledges that is essential Albion Land is able to respond to market signals in terms of the provision of employment buildings. Unless a planning permission is available to Albion Land that responds to market demand, Albion Land is not able to deliver infrastructure for the wider development in isolation.</p> <p>It is essential that the developers and the local planning authority work collaboratively towards the delivery of infrastructure. The LPA cannot ignore its responsibilities to ensure implementable planning permissions are issued to enable development, including infrastructure, to be delivered.</p> <p>The delivery of infrastructure is dependent on obtaining viable and deliverable planning permissions. Land cannot be brought forward without such consents because it is the creation of value through the granting of planning. The delivery of infrastructure is dependent on obtaining viable and deliverable planning permissions. Land</p>	Noted. The delivery of infrastructure is being progressed through the planning application/development management process.	No change

		cannot be brought forward without such consents because it is the creation of value through the granting of planning permission which enables investment to be undertaken in infrastructure.		
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Page 49	The SPD at page 49 states:  <i>'The following design principles should be incorporated into proposals submitted as planning applications.'</i>  It is essential the principles are reasonable in the context of the objectives for NW Bicester and do not frustrate delivery of development.	Noted	No change
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Design and Character Areas – Adaptability  Page 49	Support the principle of flexibility in design and uses. Allowing buildings to 'change use, or serve a different purpose' is welcomed. However, this principle is not facilitated by the restrictive tone for the commercial buildings on the main employment site, provided for by Policy Bicester 1 and the SPD should make it clear that flexibility of employment buildings is desirable where justified.	Support is welcomed. The section on adaptability is intend to apply to all buildings on the site and should be reworded to reflect this.	In Section 5 "Design and character areas", amend first bullet under adaptability as follows (paragraph 5.11):  "Ensure flexibility and adaptability of <b><i>all</i></b> buildings including provision for homeworking <b><i>in homes</i></b> "
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Building Heights (page 50)	The SPD allows for taller buildings up to 20 metres in height 'along the strategic routes' – which includes the realigned Howes Lane. Notwithstanding the 20 metre provision, the height of the proposed business park is required to relate	Noted. The intention in wording this design principle is to ensure the height of the buildings in the proposed business park is carefully considered. However, the wording	Insert (paragraph 5.20):  <i>The masterplan sets out the separation between the existing development and</i>

		<p>to the ‘residential neighbourhood to the south of Howes Lane.’ This residential development is a suburban two storey development about 9 metres in height – and is wholly unacceptable in the context of market signals – where building volume is as important as floor area to impose unjustified restrictions.</p>	<p>could be clarified as follows:</p> <p><i>The masterplan sets out the separation between the existing development and proposed commercial buildings. The realignment of Howes Lane sets back the proposed business park and separates it from the existing housing development on the edge of the town to the south. Given the separation planning applications and design of employment proposals should take account of the existing housing and ensure new buildings have a suitable relationship in terms of height, distancing, separation and landscape schemes.”</i></p>	<p><i>proposed commercial buildings. The realignment of Howes Lane sets back the proposed business park and separates it from the existing housing development to the south. Given the separation planning applications and design of employment proposals should take account of the existing housing and ensure new buildings have a suitable relationship in terms of height, distancing, separation and landscape schemes.”</i></p>
<p>Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning</p>	<p>Building heights (page 50)</p>	<p>Irrespective of the text included in the SPD, the submitted masterplan produced by Albion Land has safeguarded a significant and satisfactory spatial separation between the existing housing on Howes Lane and the proposed business park with buildings up to 16.75 metres in height. There is no cogent planning argument for restricting the height of the building below this height.</p>	<p>Noted. The masterplanning of the wider site and proposals for the business park seek to provide separation between the proposed commercial buildings and the existing residential development to the south of the site.</p>	<p>No change</p>

Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Commercial Development Design (page 50)	The reference to BREEAM is inconsistent with the provision of Policy Bicester 1 in seeking to introduce a restriction that BREEAM Excellent will be reached ‘on occupation of 50% of development’. Achieving BREEAM Excellent depends upon the occupiers requirements and should not be imposed upon the entire development. This provision acts as a deterrent to the delivery of jobs and infrastructure for NW Bicester.	Noted. The reference to BREEAM requirements should be consistent with the Local Plan Policy Bicester 1. It is recognised that BREEAM Excellent is difficult to achieve early in the development when some site facilities may not be in place. However, it is anticipated by the time 50% of the site is built out that the development will address the BREEAM Excellent requirement.	Include reference to BREEAM Excellent on occupation of 50% of the development in Development Requirement 5 – employment (paragraph 4.103).
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	General – zero carbon	Repeated reference to zero carbon is unduly onerous given Policy Bicester 1 includes a requirement submission of a ‘carbon management plan’ for all employment applications. This clear difference should be noted in the SPD.	The development will be required to meet the definition of zero carbon as set out in the Eco-towns PPS and subsequently referred to “True Zero Carbon”. The Carbon Management should set out how the proposals will reduce carbon emissions.	No change.
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Code for sustainable homes – explanatory text page 3	Reference to Code for Sustainable Homes is now obsolete as it has been deleted by Government.	Noted. Officers have agreed to retain the reference to the Code for Sustainable Homes as it reflects the policies in the adopted Local Plan	No change.
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Pages 22 and 23 – 6 <sup>th</sup> bullet	Still requires CSH 5 which should be deleted	Noted. Officers have agreed to retain the reference to the Code for Sustainable Homes as it reflects the policies in the adopted Local	No change

			Plan	
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Page 24	Delete reference to CSH5	Noted. Officers have agreed to retain the reference to the Code for Sustainable Homes as it reflects the policies in the adopted Local Plan	No change
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	General comment – page 19	Masterplan has been superseded. It includes an area of Green infrastructure on what is now residential. It is requested all figures in the SPD reflect the most recent data.	The masterplan sets out the spatial planning and development for the site. As detailed proposals come forward some land uses may change and this is recognised in the Eco-towns PPS standard ET 20 which states there should be a presumption in favour of the original masterplan; that is the first permitted masterplan. Any subsequent planning applications that would materially alter and negatively impact on the integrity of the original masterplan should be refused consent.	No change.
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	General comment – Appendix 3 page 61	Copies PPS1 supplement – Eco-towns and adds it to the SPD. It is not necessary for an SPD to copy central government guidance in this manner. Why should it form part of an SPD and effectively be kept alive should the Government delete it?  Matters covered in the PPS do not need repeating by the SPD and if guidance changes replacement	The Eco-towns PPS informed the Local Plan and SPD. The extract forms part of the SPD as it underpins the development principles and requirements in the SPD. It is also the basis of the masterplanning of the site and a	No change.

		policy advice will be forthcoming from the Government.	useful reference in preparing subsequent development proposals. It is included as an extract to retain its integrity and provide a reference.	
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	DP14 – Cultural Wellbeing page 48  Appendix 5 page 70	The requirement for a Cultural Wellbeing Strategy to accompany planning applications is not mentioned elsewhere in the SPD nor in the Part 1 Local Plan and would be linked to a Section 106 Agreement. It has no basis in the adopted text for Policy Bicester 1 and should be clarified or deleted.	The NPPF and NPPG refer to cultural wellbeing. Policy Bicester 1 requires the provision of public art. The SPD refers to the requirements of planning applications in terms of Cultural Wellbeing in DP4. The need for a Cultural Wellbeing Strategy should be clarified in DP4 and the subsequent development requirement DR4. Similarly, the delivery section sets out the requirement for a Cultural Strategy to accompany outline planning applications. The SPD should clarify the references to Cultural Wellbeing.	Insert reference to Cultural Wellbeing Strategies in the SPD in Development Principle 14 (paragraph 4.348) and in Section 6 under “Outline planning applications” (paragraph 6.15).
Peter Bateman – Framptons Planning	Infrastructure Provision Page 52 Head of Terms	The SPD lists a number of Head of Terms. Developer contributions should only be imposed if they are necessary to mitigate the impact of the development. The list on page 54 needs assessing against the tests of CIL Regulation 122. It is considered unlawful to make requests without development specific justification of need or without	Noted. The infrastructure provision section on page 52. The introductory paragraph of this section should include reference to CIL Regulation 122 after the need of residents as follows:	Section 6 Infrastructure provision (paragraph 6.9) include reference to CIL Regulation 122 after “the need of residents” in first

		infrastructure being included on an adopted Regulation 123 list following examination.	<p><i>“to meet the needs of residents and compliant with CIL Regulation 123.”</i></p> <p>A CIL schedule is being prepared with a report to the Council’s Executive in February 2016. The list on page 54 is intended as a guide to developers and will be assessed the CIL requirements.</p>	<p>paragraph as follows:</p> <p>“and compliant with CIL Regulation 122.”</p>
Raakhee Patel – Sport England	DR9 - Sports Pitches page 42	Sport England along with Public Health England launched ‘Active Design Guidance’ in October 2015 ( <a href="http://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a> ). Sport England believes that being active should be an intrinsic part of everyone’s life pattern.	Noted. The update is welcomed and the SPD should be amended accordingly.	<p>Include reference to guidance and insert hyperlink under DR9 (d) (paragraph 4.278) as follows:</p> <p>“Sport England along with Public Health England launched ‘Active Design Guidance’ in October 2015 (<a href="http://www.sportengland.org/activedesign">www.sportengland.org/activedesign</a>). Sport England believes that being active should be an intrinsic part of everyone’s life pattern.”</p>
Lisa Michelson –	Howes Lane realignment –	Especial care will be needed to manage speeds and ensure a high standard of provision for	Noted. This has been considered as part of the masterplanning in	No change.

Oxfordshire County Council	page 31	pedestrians and cyclists on the higher tier roads, and in particular on the diverted urbanised A4095. Such road environments often have quite a high accident rate unless speeds are well controlled, cyclists are segregated from general traffic and convenient crossings for both pedestrians and cyclists are provided. Very careful consideration must also be given to loading and parking provision to minimise accident risks.	consultation with the highways authority and the detailed design submitted as a planning application (reference: 14/01968/F) will be determined in early 2016.	
Lisa Michelson – Oxfordshire County Council	DR8 – Local Services (Schools) page 36	The SPD should include pupil drop off requirements and refer to OCC's drop off standards (draft document attached; the guidance is expected to be finalised early in 2016)	The requirements of the proposed schools have been considered as part of the masterplanning of the site. More detailed guidance is contained in the delivery section of the SPD and Appendix IV. For completeness the Draft Drop off standards should be included in the SPD. Applicants will be required to liaise with OCC in submitting proposals for school developments and should refer to the OCC guidance, "Drop-off standards for new primary schools built as part of a larger development"	Under Development Requirement 8 (paragraph 4.214), refer to the Draft Drop off standards for schools after reference to Appendix IV on page 36 as follows:  "Applicants will be required to liaise with OCC in submitting proposals for school developments and should refer to the OCC guidance, "Drop-off standards for new primary schools built as part of a larger development".

<p>Lisa Michelson – Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>Appendix IV (page 67)</p>	<p>Contains errors and omissions for example on noise requirements and the secondary school frontage, please refer to the site integrated design principles.</p>	<p>The masterplanning of the site has considered the OCC school integration requirements and been designed accordingly. The Delivery Section of the SPD makes reference to schools provision in terms of infrastructure (page 52) and delivery (page 55).Appendix IV takes the key elements of Design Principles required by OCC and uses them in the context of the masterplanning of the North Wet Bicester site. The detailed design of the school will address the requirements. None of the proposed schools shown on the masterplan are located near the railway, major roads or energy centres and reference to these should be deleted from the design principles.</p>	<p>Correct reference to noise levels in Appendix IV as follows:  “The noise level on the boundary of the school playing field should not exceed 50 dB LAeq, 30 min”  Delete reference to “For example, proximity to the railway, major roads, energy centres etc. should be avoided” in Appendix IV.</p>
<p>Lisa Michelson – Oxfordshire County Council</p>	<p>Appendix IV</p>	<p>Contains errors and omissions for example on noise requirements and the secondary school frontage, please refer to the site integrated design principles.</p>	<p>The masterplan establishes the siting of schools and was prepared through an iterative process, including extensive consultation with CDC and OCC. All planning applications should be brought forward in accordance with this</p>	<p>Delete reference to “For example, proximity to the railway, major roads, energy centres etc. should be avoided” in Appendix IV.</p>

			plan. The reference to the location of schools near railway, major roads energy centres etc. should be removed. This detail is too specific for the SPD.	
Lisa Michelson – Oxfordshire County Council	DR8 page 36	Statement: ‘ school dropping off/picking up points should be agreed with OCC and CDC’ should be replaced with:  ‘Primary school dropping off/picking up shall be in accordance with OCC’s <i>‘Drop-off standards for new primary schools’</i> for 2FE Primary Schools. Secondary school dropping off/picking up shall be as agreed with OCC for a 1,200 place Secondary School.”	School drop off /pick up points have been considered in the masterplanning of the site. More detailed design proposals should be agreed with OCC and CDC at the detailed planning application stage.	No change
Lisa Michelson – Oxfordshire County Council	Appendix 4	This appendix should fully reflect all the site integration requirements below. Currently it partially repeats OCC’s comment below but with errors and omissions.	The requirements of the proposed schools have been considered as part of the masterplanning of the site. More detailed guidance is contained in the delivery section of the SPD and Appendix IV. For completeness the Draft Drop off standards should be referred to in the SPD.	Under Development Requirement 8 (paragraph 4.214), fourth paragraph, refer to the Draft Drop off standards for schools after reference to Appendix IV on page 36 as follows:  “Applicants will be required to liaise with OCC in submitting proposals for school developments and

				should refer to the OCC guidance, "Drop-off standards for new primary schools built as part of a larger development".
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	General comment – NW Bicester	Support the allocation of land at North West Bicester and welcome the preparation of the SPD.	Support is welcomed	No change
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	General – Eco-towns PPS	PPS1 Supplement remains a statement of Government policy and requires the preparation of a masterplan. The SPD provides the vehicle for the masterplan to be enshrined into policy.	Noted	No change
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Masterplanning	The SPD should clearly set the status of the SPD in relation to the PPS1 Supplement requirement for a masterplan and how the 'masterplan' submitted on behalf of A2D has been carried over into the SPD. Is the intention for the SPD to constitute the masterplan for the purposes of the PPS1 Supplement? If so, what is the status or what weight does the masterplan submitted on behalf of A2D carry in terms of its inclusion in the SPD?	Policy Bicester 1 requires planning applications for proposals at North West Bicester to be determined " <i>in accordance with a comprehensive masterplan for the whole area to be approved by the Council as part of a North West Bicester supplementary planning document</i> ". The status of the SPD in relation to the Eco-towns PPS has been clarified. The SPD includes the North West Bicester masterplan as the approved masterplan for the site and this is recognised in the SPD. The	No change.

			masterplan will have the status of Council planning policy once the SPD is adopted.	
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Appendix I	<p>When referring to the masterplan and its supporting documents, Appendix I should list the following and where these can be accessed:</p> <p>Access and Travel Strategy</p> <p>Community Involvement and Governance</p> <p>Energy Strategy</p> <p>Flood Risk Assessment</p> <p>Economic Baseline</p> <p>Economic Strategy</p> <p>BIMP6 01 NW Bicester Masterplan Framework Rev B</p> <p>BIMP6 02 NW Bicester Masterplan Framework Green Infrastructure Framework Rev A</p> <p>BIMP6 03 NW Bicester Masterplan Movement and Access Framework Rev A</p> <p>GI and Landscape Strategy</p> <p>Residential Strategy</p> <p>Statement of Community Involvement</p>	The documents referred to are already publicly available. They will be added to the Council's website as supporting documents to the SPD. For clarification, add where the supporting documents can be accessed to the Appendix I supporting text	<p>Add at end of Appendix I:</p> <p>Copies of the above documents can be found at: <a href="http://www.cherwell.gov.uk">www.cherwell.gov.uk</a></p>

		<p>Strategic Environmental Report</p> <p>Social and Community Facilities and Services Strategy</p> <p>Transport Strategy</p> <p>Vision and objectives document</p> <p>Water Strategy</p>		
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	<p>Masterplanning and comprehensive development</p> <p>DP1 and DR1</p>	<p>The SPD should be clear that applications should be consistent with the Framework Plan (Drawing BIMP6 01 NW Bicester Masterplan Framework Rev B) and the various strategies supporting it.</p>	<p>There are various references to the need for comprehensive development and consistency of development proposals with the masterplan framework set out in the Figure 10. However, for clarity the wording of the SPD should be emphasised to ensure that applications are consistent with the Framework masterplan. Figure 10 becomes Figure 9 in the final SPD as Figure 9 in the Final Draft SPD is deleted.</p>	<p>Amend DR1 (paragraph 4.15)as follows:</p> <p>Planning applications will be:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Determined in accordance with the masterplan framework in Figure 9 of the SPD;</li> </ul>
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Background	<p>Request the first paragraph is replaced by:</p> <p><i>“The Planning Policy Statement: Eco-towns – Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 identified four potential locations for eco-towns. This included land at NW Bicester. The PPS1 Supplement sets out a range of criteria to which eco-town developments should respond and which</i></p>	<p>It is considered that the paragraph referred should not be replaced in its entirety although elements of the suggested wording should be incorporated into an amended paragraph to better reflect the current position and provide clarity</p>	<p>In the Introduction to the SPD under “Background” (paragraphs 1.4-1.6) amend as follows:</p> <p>“In 2009, the site at North West Bicester</p>

		<p><i>aim for eco-towns to be exemplars in good practice and provide a showcase for sustainable living.</i></p> <p><i>The Council promoted the site and was supportive of the principle of bringing forward an eco-town in this location. Policy Bicester 1 of the Cherwell Local Plan (adopted 2015) has identified NW Bicester as a strategic allocation for up to 6,000 new homes.</i></p> <p><i>In April 2014, the Government published its 'Locally-led Garden City Prospectus' which led to Bicester being named a Garden City.</i></p> <p><i>On 5<sup>th</sup> March 2015, the Minister for Housing and Planning announced in a Ministerial Statement that the Eco-town PPS 1 Supplement had been cancelled for all areas except NW Bicester. It is anticipated in time that the PPS1 will be cancelled in its entirety.'</i></p>	<p>as follows:</p> <p>“The Planning Policy Statement: Eco-towns – Supplement to Planning Policy Statement 1 identified four potential locations for eco-towns. This included land at NW Bicester. The PPS1 Supplement sets out a range of criteria to which eco-town developments should respond and which aim for eco-towns to be exemplars in good practice and provide a showcase for sustainable living.</p> <p>The Council promoted the site and was supportive of the principle of bringing forward an eco-town in this location. Policy Bicester 1 of the Cherwell Local Plan (adopted 2015) has identified NW Bicester as a strategic allocation for up to 6,000 new homes.</p> <p>In April 2014, the Government published its 'Locally-led Garden City Prospectus' which led to Bicester being named a Garden Town.</p> <p>On 5th March 2015, the Minister for</p>	<p>was identified as having potential as an eco-town location in the Planning Policy Statement (PPS): Eco-towns a supplement to PPS1. The Eco-towns PPS sets out a range of criteria to which eco-town developments should respond and which aim for eco-towns to be exemplars in good practice and provide a showcase for sustainable living. The Council promoted the site and was supportive of the principle of bringing forward an eco-town in this location. It was subsequently included in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1) as Policy Bicester 1, a strategic allocation for up to 6,000 new homes.</p> <p>In April 2014, the</p>
--	--	--	---	---

			<p>Housing and Planning announced in a Ministerial Statement that the Eco-town PPS 1 Supplement had been cancelled for all areas except NW Bicester. It is anticipated in time that the PPS1 will be cancelled in its entirety.'</p>	<p>"Locally-led Garden City Prospectus" (Department of Communities and Local Government) led to Bicester being awarded Garden Town status. On 5th March 2015, the Minister for Housing and Planning announced in a ministerial written statement that the Eco-towns PPS was cancelled for all areas except North West Bicester. As it is expected that the PPS Supplement will in time be cancelled in its entirety, the Eco-town standards have now been brought into this SPD (Appendix II).'</p>
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Appendix II	<p>The SPD sets out the Local Plan Policy Bicester 1 in its entirety. Furthermore Appendix 2 sets out most of the PPS1 Supplement. The SPD has been informed by the PPS1 Supplement, NW Bicester Masterplan and Local Plan. Design principles and standards are addressed throughout relevant</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy and PPS is included in the SPD for completeness and as easy reference for users of the SPD.</p>	No change

		<p>sections of the SPD.</p> <p>It is not considered necessary to include entire policy extracts from the Local Plan and PPS1 Supplement in Appendices 2 and 3. Propose that key objectives are summarised in Section 3.0 of the SPD entitled “<i>Vision and Objectives</i>”.</p>		
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Page 5	The SPD sets out the current status of the extant planning application submissions relating to NW Bicester. This information will soon become out of date and it is proposed that it is removed	Agreed.	Remove reference to planning applications.
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Masterplan framework	<p>Welcome inclusion of the following plans into the SPD:</p> <p>BIMP6 01 NW Bicester Masterplan Framework Rev B</p> <p>BIMP6 02 NW Bicester Masterplan Framework Green Infrastructure Framework Rev A</p> <p>BIMP6 03 NW Bicester Masterplan Movement and Access Framework Rev A</p>	Noted	No change
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Figure 1 – site location plan	The site boundary shown in Figure 1 does not reflect the site boundary in Figure 10. This should be updated to reflect the correct boundary as per the A2D submission	Figure 1 shows the site location and is taken from the North West Bicester eco-town site boundary. For completeness the Local Plan Inset Map for Policy Bicester 1 should be included with the Policy	Add Policy Bicester 1 Inset Map to Appendix II.

			Bicester 1 extract in Appendix II.	
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Plans – general	All plans should be consistent with the Masterplan Framework Drawings	<p>Various plans are used throughout the SPD. Masterplanning of the site has resulted in a larger site area than the strategic site allocation boundary in the Local Plan. Other plans in the SPD may differ slightly from the masterplan framework drawing</p> <p>Other plans such as Fig 1 are illustrative</p>	<p>Insert Policy Bicester 1 inset map in the introduction section.</p> <p>Refer to Figures 1 and Figure 8 as illustrative.</p>
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	DP9 (c) and DR9 9 (c)	Welcome the removal of the hedgerow buffer appendix to reflect the inclusion of BIMP6 02 NW Bicester Masterplan Framework Green Infrastructure Framework Rev A. All hedgerows buffers should be provided in accordance with the Green Infrastructure and Landscape Strategy (BIMP6 02 NW Bicester Masterplan Framework Green Infrastructure Framework Rev A).	Noted	No change
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Cultural Wellbeing Strategy	In the implementation section of the Cultural Wellbeing Strategy, it states that CDC will require each outline or full planning application on the site to include a Cultural Wellbeing Statement. Propose that this is dealt with in tandem with the submission of Reserved Matters. Propose that the draft SPD states that each outline approval for the site must be accompanied by a Section 106 Agreement which will require an overarching	The Council requires that all planning applications (outline and full applications) on the NW Bicester site must demonstrate how proposals to support cultural wellbeing will be incorporated into detailed development plans, by creating a Cultural Wellbeing Statement. The statement should	No change

		Cultural Wellbeing Statement to be submitted and approved in writing prior to the submission of Reserved Matters.	be prepared and implemented by a public art consultant/curator or artist and should contain detailed proposals to support the cultural enrichment of the site. It should demonstrate that the proposals are realistic and achievable and can be funded as a necessary part of the site development costs, though the council is willing to discuss other funding options for particularly ambitious or innovative proposals.	
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	CSH reference – general	Following the technical housing standards review, the Government issues a written Ministerial Statement withdrawing the Code for Sustainable Homes (CSH) aside from the management of legacy cases. CSH is referred to throughout the Draft SPD. Development at NW Bicester will strive to achieve CSH Level 5 performance standards, however, certificates will not be sort. The SPD should reflect this.	The local plan refers to CSH levels and the SPD picks up on this reference. Local Plan Part 2 will provide further detail following the withdrawal of the CSH.	No change
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Page 23	It should be clear that CSH Certificates will not be sort in referring to neighbourhood water recycling and water consumption requirements.	It is recognised that the CSH references are no longer Government policy, however, they provide fundamental principles to guide the proposed development and remain relevant for NW Bicester as set out in Policy	Under “Homes” (paragraph 4.66) amend to read: “Neighbourhood water recycling should be implemented as a means to deliver reduced water consumption

			Bicester 1	requirements, rather than house by house scale water recycling which may be expensive.”
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	DR4 – Daylighting parameters	Sets out Average Daylight Factors. This level of detail should not be set out in the SPD.	Natural lighting is an important consideration in the design of development both in residential and commercial buildings and it is appropriate that the SPD sets out the requirements. It is proposed to amend the format of the development principle to include the detailed daylighting requirements in a footnote	Amend reference to ADF (Average Daylight Factors) in DR4 (paragraph 4.81) and include detail in a footnote.
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Pages 22, 24 and 43	Rainwater recycling and grey water recycling – The SPD should state “rainwater recycling, grey water recycling or other equivalent solutions” to allow other options to be explored.	The SPD is based on the documents supporting the masterplan which in terms of water promote rainwater and greywater recycling. The supporting text on Water (page 43 refers to the <b>options</b> for providing non-potable water to dwelling It should also refer to other options may exist and should also be explored.	Amend text (paragraph 4.299) as follows:  “4.299. Other options may exist and should also be explored.”
Alex Wilson – Barton	Page 44	Water neutrality – The SPD should not stipulate how water neutrality is achieved. The method of	This was taken from the supporting information on water strategy	Paragraph 4.300 - Replace “will” with

Willmore		delivery should therefore be removed (the SPD states that local reclamation of surface water will be required to increase water neutrality further.	prepared as part of the masterplanning of the site. The SPD sets out the method of delivery as a statement but should recognise that there may be other solutions to deliver water neutrality therefore it is proposed that the wording is amended to replace “will” with “may” on page 44.	“may” in the penultimate sentence of the paragraph preceding Development Principle 10- Water on page 44.
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Appendix IV page 67 – Design Principles for primary and secondary school sites.	The masterplan establishes the siting of schools and was prepared through an iterative process, including extensive consultation with CDC and OCC. All planning applications should be brought forward in accordance with this plan. The reference to the location of schools near railway, major roads energy centres etc. should be removed. This detail is too specific for the SPD.	The wording of the Appendix IV is taken from suggested wording taken from the OCC response to the SPD. It is standard wording and should be amended to reflect the context of the masterplan site.	Delete reference to railways, major roads etc. in Appendix IV.
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Page 45 SUDS Manual, CIRIA C697	CIRIA C697 has been replaced by the CIRIA C753 “The SUDS Manual” in November 2015. The SPD should be updated accordingly.	Agreed and noted	Update SPD.
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Formatting	Request paragraph numbers are reintroduced for clarity	Agreed	Insert paragraph numbers.
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Page 9 – site area	The site area is incorrectly stated as being approximately 390 hectares. Masterplan BIMP6 001B (Figure 10) comprises 406.5 hectares. This should be updated to state approximately 400	The site area is based on the Local Plan strategic allocation and the masterplan area was based on	No change

		hectares as per the masterplan.	more detailed work.	
Alex Wilson – Barton Willmore	Page 15 – Figure 8	Figure 8 states that the site comprises approximately 397 hectares which does not accord with page 8 which states that the site area is approximately 390 hectares. This should be updated to accord with Masterplan BIMP 001B (Fig 10) which comprises 406.5 hectares. This should be updated to state approximately 400 hectares.	Figure 8 is an indicative diagram to show the key features of the site and is not intended to show the detailed site area.	No change.
Sue Mackrell – Bicester Town Council	Howes Lane realignment	Recognise and accept the response to original comments. Serious concerns with regard to the designation of the main spine road through the development, in that it is designed not only to take local circulatory traffic but will also push through traffic and heavy goods traffic through the centre of the built up residential areas. The realigned Howes Lane although intended to be of a “boulevard” design will effectively be a fast through route adjacent to adjacent residential retail and school facilities.	The proposed strategic link road that will realign Howes Lane is a fundamental feature of the masterplan. It has been designed to allow connectivity of the new development with the existing town and allow accessibility by all road users including cyclists and pedestrians. The proposed urban boulevard is a key design feature of the proposed new development	No change.
Georgia Erhmann	General	Highly supportive of the plans and principles set out in the SPD.	Support is welcomed	No change
Georgia Erhmann	General – accessibility to railway stations	Providing excellent connectivity to both railway stations in the town by car as well as more sustainable modes would not only better balance capacity on Chiltern Trains into London but also improve Bicester connectivity to Oxford and other locations via East West Rail.	Noted	No change

Georgia Erhmann – Chiltern Railways	Employment	Agree mixed employment opportunities will stimulate major growth in Bicester as a self-sustaining economic entity.	Noted	No change
Georgia Erhmann– Chiltern Railways	Employment	The SPD could place more emphasis on Bicester as an employment <u>destination</u> . Bicester has excellent connectivity particularly by rail being at the centre of a “golden cross” linking it to London, Birmingham, Oxford and eventually Milton Keynes. It has potential to attract employees from a catchment spanning wider Oxfordshire and beyond in synergy with Science Vale at the other end of the County’s “knowledge spine” This requires the targeting of suitable economic sectors for employment growth which includes pursuing the opportunities provided by a business park at Middleton Stoney Road and Howes Lane as well as the current Avonbury Business Park	Noted	No change
Georgia Erhmann– Chiltern Railways	General – railway stations	As gateways to the town, Bicester’s rail stations have a crucial role to play in determining the attractiveness of North West Bicester as a place to live and work. The SPD could do more to demonstrate this and further integrate access to the stations into it development plans.	The SPD recognises the importance of the railway stations in providing accessibility and sustainable transport links to the proposed new development.	No change
Mr VN Smith	Transport, Movement and Access	Walking and cycling as the first choice of travel will never happen whilst roads are so congested unless segregated cycle lanes and footpaths are provided.	Noted. A sustainable transport strategy for Bicester has been prepared which sets out proposals for comprehensive improvements	No change

	Modal shift		to the walking and cycling network.	
Mr VN Smith	Modal shift	Travel by non-car modes of transport will not increase if subsidies on buses are reduced.	The Council is looking for the developers to subsidise the provision of bus services to the development in the early phases. The SPD and Bicester Sustainable Transport Strategy encourage increased walking and cycling in the town which does not require direct subsidy.	No change
Mr VN Smith	Local services	It is a good idea to have local services within the development but it is impractical unless adequate parking is available and rents are economic. There must be plenty of parking to avoid queues for parking spaces.	Local services are an important element of the masterplan and designed to be easily accessible by local residents on foot, bike or public transport. Some car parking will be provided but it is not intended that cars will dominate the development.	No change
Mr VN Smith	Green infrastructure	Provision of allotments is supported but sites should be secure to prevent thefts and vandalism.	The SPD sets out the requirement for allotments but not the detail of the plots including security.	No change.
Mr VN Smith	Transport – modal shift	Car ownership will continue to grow so it will be vital to ensure sufficient car parking is provided off road for every house or there will be severe traffic congestion.	Noted	No change
Mr VN Smith	Water	It should be confirmed that Thames Water has	Thames Water has been involved throughout the masterplanning	No change

	capacity	sufficient capacity to supply water to new dwellings	process and as part of the preparation of the SPD. The development also seeks to ensure water neutrality	
Mr VN Smith	Sports Pitches	Provision of sports facilities is supported	Support is welcomed	No change
Mr VN Smith	Flooding issues	Building on land liable to flooding should not be permitted.	The masterplan does not propose any development in flood risk areas and seeks to reduce runoff from the site to reduce the risk of flooding downstream	No change
Mr VN Smith	Local services and community facilities	Community facilities should be viable and funded.	Noted	No change