



Banbury Vision & Masterplan

**Consultation Statement
December 2016**

CONSULTATION STATEMENT

BANBURY MASTERPLAN & VISION SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

Prepared under Regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

1. Purpose and background

- 1.1 This Consultation Statement has been prepared in line with Regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, which states that, before a council adopts a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), it must produce a statement setting out:
 - i. The persons the local planning authority consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document;
 - ii. A summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - iii. How those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document.
- 1.2 The Banbury Vision & Masterplan was prepared in accordance with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (2006), which was updated in July 2016. This can be viewed on the Council's website at: <http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=9648>.
- 1.3 Legislation and guidance sets out the requirements for preparing SPDs as part of the planning system. This enables SPDs to be prepared to expand upon existing planning policy. The adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 together with the Banbury Vision & Masterplan establishes the long-term vision for the town and identifies the projects and initiatives to support growth. The SPD will contribute towards the delivery of the Cherwell Local Plan.
- 1.4 The Banbury Vision & Masterplan SPD is formed from six inter-connecting strategic objectives that will:
 - i. Promote Banbury as the regional service centre of choice for the wider region;
 - ii. Establish a strong economy;
 - iii. Reduce congestion and improve accessibility;
 - iv. Create a vibrant and attractive town centre;
 - v. Create a high quality environment and distinctive place to live and work; and,
 - vi. Promote opportunities for local people.
- 1.5 The SPD does not create new policy. The Local Plan sets the planning framework up to 2031 with the Banbury Vision & Masterplan providing a further level of detail to guide development proposals and help inform the preparation of Local Plan Part 2 and the implementation of the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4) published by Oxfordshire County Council.

1.6 The SPD will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications alongside the Local Plan and other planning policies.

2. Consultation undertaken during early preparation of the draft SPD

2.1 Details of key consultations undertaken during the early development of the draft Banbury Vision & Masterplan are provided in the table below. A list of stakeholders that were consulted through meetings and workshops is included in Appendix 1.

Table 1: Summary of consultations during development of the draft Banbury Vision & Masterplan SPD.

Persons consulted	Method	When	Main issues raised	How addressed in SPD
Various stakeholders, including developers and their agents, government agencies and business associations	Workshop	02.2013	Workshop to test the emerging vision, discuss potential development sites and regeneration strategy for the town centre	Suggestions and comments by stakeholders used to refine initial ideas
Various stakeholders, including developers and their agents, government agencies and business associations (eg. Banbury Old Town Association) and transport operators (eg. Stagecoach)	Workshop	22.07.2014	Workshop to test the emerging vision, discuss potential development sites and regeneration strategy for the town centre	Suggestions and comments by stakeholders used to refine initial ideas and develop the vision and masterplan strategy
Banbury Working Group	Meeting	20.10.2014	Meeting to inform members of the emerging vision and masterplan strategy	The Group confirmed that they were happy with the emerging vision and masterplan strategy
Cherwell District Council (CDC) Officers	Workshop	03.11.2014	Workshop to ensure the emerging vision and masterplan strategy complied with the Local Plan and to incorporate the views of officers into the emerging document	SPD was drafted to ensure compliance with the Local Plan. Suggestions from officers were incorporated into the document
Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) Officers	Workshop	17.08.2015	Workshop to discuss transport and education issues and ensure the masterplan strategy aligned with OCC's LTP4	SPD incorporated ideas and suggestions from OCC Officers and drafted to ensure it aligned with the LTP4
South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership	Meeting	09.09.2015	Meeting to ensure the SPD aligned with the emerging economic strategy of the LEP	SPD was drafted to ensure it responded to the emerging economic strategy of the LEP
Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership	Meeting	09.09.2015	Meeting to ensure the SPD aligned with the emerging economic strategy of the LEP	SPD was drafted to ensure it responded to the emerging economic strategy of the LEP
Town Centre Manager	Meeting	25.09.2015	Meeting to understand current town centre issues and potential solutions	SPD reflected suggestions of the town centre manager
Oxfordshire County Council Members	Meeting	09.11.2015	Meeting to inform members of the emerging vision and masterplan strategy	Members confirmed that they were happy with the emerging vision and masterplan strategy

Banbury Chamber of Commerce	Meeting	06.04.2016	Meeting to present the draft Masterplan	Comments reflected in final Masterplan
Banbury Town Council	Meeting	06.04.2016	Meeting to present the draft Masterplan	Comments reflected in final Masterplan

2.2 Key stakeholders were directly and informally briefed about the purpose of the SPD, its coverage, and were invited to make representations. They include:

- Oxfordshire County Council
- Banbury Chamber of Commerce
- Banbury Town Council
- South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership (SEMLEP)
- Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP)

2.3 A range of Cherwell District Council Officers and Members were consulted, and their comments have informed the preparation of the SPD.

3. Formal consultation on the draft SPD

3.1 Formal public consultation on the draft SPD was undertaken from Monday 14th March 2016 to Wednesday 13th April 2016. A number of methods were used to seek responses as follows:

- **Mail out:** information was sent to all persons registered on the Council's consultation database including specific, general and prescribed bodies. This was undertaken via e-mail or letter.
- **Website:** the SPD was published on the Council's website
- **Hard copies:** the SPD was available in hard copy at the locations in Appendix II
- **Public Notices:** notices were placed in the Banbury Guardian, Oxford Mail and Bicester Advertiser newspapers
- **Social Media:** public notifications were issued
- **Public exhibition:** a one-day exhibition was held in the Castle Quay Shopping Centre on Saturday 2nd April 2016 from 10am to 4pm
- **Meetings:** meetings were held with the Banbury Chamber of Commerce and Banbury Town Council on Wednesday 6th April 2016, at which the draft SPD was presented.

4. Responses

4.1 The public exhibition was well attended with over 250 people estimated to have visited the event. Attendees included the general public, town centre business owners and local councillors. Comments/themes arising from discussions with attendees of the exhibition included matters relating to traffic and congestion, Canalside, a new motorway junction, improving bus services, the threat to Banbury town centre, improving the environment and concerns over delivery of the masterplan. All matters have been addressed in the revised masterplan and/or in the following responses.

4.2 All representations received on the draft Banbury Vision & Masterplan were recorded, analysed and recommendations made, including how the issues are addressed in the Masterplan. This is presented in Table 1 and in the following Chapter. Changes included changes to the maps and diagrams in the Masterplan. All representations are available on the Council's website.

<http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/index.cfm?articleid=11547>

The final SPD will be presented to the Council's Executive, and if approved, presented to Council for formal adoption.

5. Conclusion

5.1 The production of the Banbury Vision & Masterplan SPD has involved wide ranging stakeholder consultation. This has directly influenced both early development and later refinement of the document. Public consultation has taken place in accordance with statutory regulations.

PART 1

SUMMARY BY QUESTION

Question 1

Do you support the principle of preparing a vision and masterplan to guide the long term growth of Banbury?

There is general support for the principle of preparing a vision and masterplan document. However, some respondents said that they supported the principle, but with reservations.

Issue/comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
<p>There is no timing, realisation strategy or resources identified in the document that could properly be called a 'plan' – except some specifics which are 'dropped in' without apparent justification or careful thought. It is felt that the document should be re-titled to more accurately reflect the 'visionary' aspect eg. 'The Vision for Banbury: Potential Developments in Banbury to 2031 and Beyond', 'The Vision for Banbury: A contextual outline for potential development', 'The Vision for Banbury: an holistic framework for development'</p>	<p>The document covers a wide range of matters and the title is considered appropriate. The Masterplan contains a Chapter titled Delivering the Masterplan and an Action Plan at Appendix II which have been updated.</p>
<p>Where very specific proposals are made these should be removed eg. 'The potential for the Mill to be included as part of the mixed use development'. Alternatively, such specifics should be explained and justified in significant extra detail. As it stands, the document could be open to abuse by unscrupulous developers</p>	<p>The Masterplan has been changed to provide more flexibility in terms of where retail and other uses should be provided including at Spiceball. Design principles for sites have been expanded to determine priorities and guide development.</p>
<p>Much of the supplementary detail within the draft document is not in accordance with local plan policy. The value the document has in relation to the masterplanning of strategic sites, such as Banbury 17, is questioned</p>	<p>The document is in line with the Local Plan Part 1 and does not apply supplementary design guidance for the strategic housing sites.</p>
<p>The document does not provide further advice or guidance to the policies contained in the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 or the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4 and the need for the document is questionable</p>	<p>The Masterplan adds a further level of detail, especially in terms of proposals for the town centre and the key redevelopment / regeneration areas. Design principles for sites have been expanded to determine priorities and guide development. The Masterplan also outlines how the vision can be delivered.</p>
<p>The masterplan, as drafted, does not respond to the commercial realities of development nor reflect market conditions. The overall vision to create an entertainment, cultural and leisure quarter at Spiceball will not be delivered without other retail developments, including uses with A3 and A1 as proposed in the outline scheme</p>	<p>The Masterplan has been changed to provide more flexibility in terms of where retail and other uses should be provided including at Spiceball. The Masterplan allows for the development of a supermarket on the Spiceball site.</p>

<p>In respect of Banbury’s heritage – it is essential that the document carries a general ‘health warning’ at the outset, such as: ‘Developments suggested in this document are illustrative and provide a general framework in which future development can take place. For the avoidance of doubt, this document, even where it is not explicitly stated, places great emphasis on all developments being in keeping with Banbury’s architectural heritage and the local vernacular’ or similar</p>	<p>Further reference has been made in the Masterplan to conserving and enhancing Banbury’s heritage</p>
<p>As a masterplan it raises expectations it cannot deliver as there are no specific resources identified and the timetable is very indeterminate</p>	<p>Appendix II of the Masterplan identifies key actions required to deliver the six strategic objectives, the broad timescales for delivery and the provider</p>
<p>In a time of budget constraints the masterplan should prioritise what should be achieved first</p>	<p>Appendix II of the document sets out timescales for projects and initiatives to be delivered</p>
<p>The plan alone is not sufficient. Public investment is also required</p>	<p>The Masterplan states that the public sector will take the lead using targeted funding to secure maximum benefit and lay the foundations for economic growth delivered through private sector investment</p>

Question 2

Do you support the six strategic objectives?

- Promote Banbury as the regional service centre of choice for the wider region
- Establish a strong economy
- Reduce traffic congestion and improve accessibility
- Create a vibrant and attractive town centre
- Create a high quality environment and distinctive character to live and work
- Promote opportunities for local people

There is general support for the six strategic objectives.

Issue/comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
Reference is made to 'Premier regional centre', 'regional service centre of choice' and 'the powerhouse of the region' – the region needs to be defined	Minor changes have been made to the text of the Masterplan.
It is noted from the Council's own evidence base that Banbury is already identified as fulfilling the role of a regional centre	The aim is for Banbury to be a centre of choice, with people choosing to visit Banbury rather than other competing centres e.g. Milton Keynes
Need an additional objective covering Banbury's cultural, entertainment and sporting life	Strategic objective one 'promote Banbury as the regional service centre of choice for the wider region' refers to the need for a full range of retail, leisure, cultural, sporting and social activities
There is too much emphasis on retail	The masterplan states that Banbury needs a full range of retail, leisure, cultural, sporting and social activities
There should not be over emphasis on one sector. A broad economy is more resilient	The masterplan states the need for a range of employment opportunities
Emphasis on a fast growing economy won't necessarily make Banbury a more pleasant place in which to live	The vision comprises six strategic objectives, of which establishing a strong economy is just one. Other objectives focus on quality of life / quality of place
An additional objective to 'conserve and enhance Banbury's Heritage Assets and Historic Environment' should be added	Reference is made to conserving and enhancing Banbury's heritage within the strategic objectives. Listed and locally listed buildings are protected wherever possible.
There should be more emphasis on the town's cultural and historical heritage, allied with leisure and non-commercial opportunities	Greater emphasis has been placed on conserving and enhancing Banbury's cultural and heritage assets in the revised Masterplan
There is an underlying suggestion of a completely redeveloped town centre at Objective 4. The objective should be reworded to provide a more accurate impression to readers	It is not the intention of the document to suggest a completely redeveloped town centre. Actions are needed for Banbury town centre and Objective 4 reflects this.

<p>A seventh objective – retention of a ‘Banbury’ image to ensure that the ‘feel’ of the historic core is maintained – should be added.</p> <p>The word ‘comprehensive’ in connection with any development proposals should be deleted as this is incompatible with the retention of heritage and streetscape</p>	<p>Reference is made to conserving and enhancing Banbury’s heritage within the strategic objectives and for sites in the Masterplan.</p> <p>Use of the word ‘comprehensive’ has been reviewed and deleted as appropriate</p>
<p>The strategic environmental objective should be changed to reflect a desire to reverse the decline of the natural and semi-natural habitat in and around Banbury, ‘Create a high quality environment, establish a coherent ecological network, and achieve a net gain in biodiversity’</p>	<p>The strategic environment objective is about the built and natural environment. The wording of this objective has been reviewed to clarify this. In terms of the natural and semi-natural environment, the need for a coherent ecological network and a net gain in biodiversity has been emphasised</p>
<p>There should be an objective that explicitly signals that the private sector is responsible for contributing to a high-quality environment within Banbury and there should be greater reference in the document to ‘high-quality investment’ being sought for Banbury</p>	<p>The objectives are intended to be strategic in nature and the Masterplan should allow for private sector investment in all areas.</p>
<p>Education standards need to rise</p>	<p>The masterplan emphasises the need for investment in apprenticeships, training and education</p>

Question 3

Do you support the initiatives that support the concept masterplan?

- Locations for housing to deliver Cherwell Local Plan housing requirements to 2031
- A range of employment opportunities that will reinforce the role of Banbury in the regional economy
- A transport and movement strategy that addresses congestion and assists in delivering sustainable growth
- A Town Centre Action Area to manage a co-ordinated and comprehensive redevelopment and improvement of Banbury town centre
- A 'green lung' to the town created from the enhancement of the canal and riverfront area together with a network of open spaces to improve the setting of the town and to address the shortfall of public open space, amenity and sports facilities

There is general support for the five key initiatives that underpin the masterplan.

Issue / comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
The rate of house buildings needs to be matched by road/infrastructure improvements and additional services	The Masterplan makes recommendations for improving road infrastructure
Too much emphasis on retail	The Masterplan states that Banbury needs a full range of retail, leisure, cultural, sporting and social activities
With suitable and deliverable employment land in short supply a review needs to be undertaken before making land use choices. The outcomes of this work may influence the areas identified for canal and river enhancement on the Masterplan	Land use allocations are set out in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. The Masterplan is in line with the Local Plan
Further work needs to be undertaken to understand the quantum of the stated open space deficiency and examine the potential or otherwise for public access to such space	This will be carried out as part of the preparation of the Local Plan Part 2
There is an underlying suggestion of a completely redeveloped town centre at Objective 4. The objective should be reworded to provide a more accurate impression to readers	The phrase 'comprehensive development' has been changed to 'comprehensive regeneration'
The masterplan document should make clear that the link road through Banbury 17 will be delivered as part of the phased implementation of the development sites that comprise BAN 17 allocation. The text should be amended to read <i>'working with developers to deliver the spine road from the A361 to A4260 alongside the phased implementation of development of Banbury 17'</i> .	Changed wording to reflect process for implementation of the relief road.

<p>Reduce and improve transport links so that goods and people can move freely – these are the life blood of the town and there will be no successful future unless the current situation is rectified</p>	<p>The Masterplan shows the main proposals for the town. Oxfordshire County Council is the highways authority and the transport strategy for Banbury is contained in the Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4).</p>
<p>Our cultural and social lives are missing from these initiatives.</p>	<p>Strategic objective 6 ‘Promote opportunities for local people’ refers to social and community facilities. Changed Objective 6 to refer to cultural facilities.</p>

Question 4

Are there any other employment or housing issues that need to be addressed?

Issue/comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
Less greenfield development. More 'in town' and brownfield needs to be considered	The masterplan is in line with the Local Plan, which allocates sites for housing and employment in the town.
Recreation is lagging behind housing at current levels. Work and homes are important, but recreation gives quality to where you live	The Environmental Masterplan identifies core principles for the enhanced connectivity of the existing green infrastructure of the town alongside the development of new assets. Further work on open space provision will be undertaken as part of Local Plan Part 2
Need for a proportion of houses which will serve the needs of local people as opposed to commuters	It is beyond the scope of the Masterplan to stipulate that a certain proportion of housing should be for local people
Although a very creative and imaginative plan the proposal to redevelop the Bolton Road site should be changed. There is no need for any more shops especially in or near the town centre	It will be important for new buildings to have 'active' ground floor uses. This doesn't necessarily need to be retail. The design principles allow for mixed use proposals
There is no mention of tourism. Banbury museum has considerable plans for new exhibition space and Banbury could benefit from some other tourist initiatives	Many of the proposals in the Masterplan will lead to increased tourism but a reference has been added to emphasis its importance.
There is a need to get the health sector involved in planning to make sure we have the right infrastructure for Banbury. Housing needs to be affordable so local people can purchase their own home. Prices should reflect our local wages	Cherwell District Council has specific planning policies on health and affordable homes within the Cherwell Local Plan.
Have reservations about using Banbury 15 for employment as it is the 'wrong' side of the M40	Banbury 15 is allocated in the Local Plan. The Masterplan is in line with the Local Plan
The presumption of growth in the retail sector is wrong. The town centre retail provision is likely to shrink, not grow, as per national trends. A smaller, more vibrant town centre is required	The town centre boundary will be reviewed as part of the Local Plan Part 2
The masterplan and employment/housing diagrams should include the implemented industrial development at the former Spital Farm Allotment site	The Masterplan shows the strategic employment allocations
The masterplan and employment and housing plan should be updated to show Banbury 16 as a committed housing allocation following the granting of outline planning permission. The committed site is also larger than the local plan allocation	The boundary of Banbury 16 has been revised

<p>If the SE Relief Road is a serious proposition and is ever to be realised this would be more likely to be achieved (in the longer term) if the 36 hectares of land to the east of the A361 and north east of junction 11 (i.e. the original Banbury 15) is referred to as an ambition of the Masterplan document and allocated in an early and future review of the Local Plan. Contributions could then be sought from this and other relevant developments served by the Relief Road, which in addition to public funding through the Local Transport Plan, could help deliver this strategic transport route</p>	<p>The masterplan needs to be in line with the adopted Local Plan and reflect the current land-use allocations</p>
<p>It is unfortunate that Banbury 15 is situated to the west of the M40, but we are aware of a prior industrial consent on this site. Nevertheless, we would not wish to see any further expansion here</p>	<p>Banbury 15 is allocated in the Local Plan</p>
<p>In creating housing consider where those people have to go and make the routes safe and pleasant – cycle tracks and public transport. Employment in the town is not likely for many so make routes to other places fast and safe. M40 links and the station need much consideration</p>	<p>An action listed in Appendix II is to audit existing routes and prepare an improvement strategy as part of Local Plan Part 2</p>
<p>Wish to see a specific commitment to 40% of affordable housing. Most current house building is taking place on the edge of Banbury and we would encourage town centre housing as a strong contribution to sustainable and attractive communities. Businesses should be required to be environmentally sustainable and businesses focusing on green technology should be actively encouraged. Increased business and a growing population will require management of greater quantities of waste and we would like to see tangible steps in the plan to deal with this, as we would with water management</p>	<p>Affordable housing is addressed in the Local Plan, as is sustainability</p>
<p>Whilst it is noted that this is a Masterplan and Vision for Banbury, it is important to note that the affordability of housing is not just endemic to Banbury; it is a district wide problem. With anticipated additional need arising out of Oxford City, it is important that housing is distributed not just within Banbury but also the wider rural area to improve affordability and provide vital economic and social benefits to existing rural communities</p>	<p>Housing sites within the rural areas of the district will be identified as part of the Local Plan making process</p>

<p>If the town is made sufficiently attractive as a destination for leisure and residential purposes these will help to ensure a vibrant town with high employment</p>	<p>This is covered in the strategic objectives</p>
<p>The employment sites are large parcels of land. If one of these is held up for any reason it would have a significant impact. Therefore, efforts should be made to also identify smaller new employment sites of 1-3 hectares still capable of forming useful additional employment creating development for small businesses</p>	<p>The quantum of employment land required was reviewed as part of the Local Plan preparation. Smaller employment sites are likely to come forward as part of the redevelopment of existing vacant sites eg. former Hella site and/or in Local Plan Part 2.</p>
<p>B8 uses can result in large building footprints with very few full-time employees. Employment figures in the Local Plan Part I will only be achieved if more employment intensive use types are expressly sought by development plans</p>	<p>Land use allocations are set out in the Local Plan. The Masterplan must be in line with the Local Plan</p>
<p>There is too much emphasis on motorsport – better to concentrate on high tech, light engineering</p>	<p>Motor sport is mentioned as just one area that could be targeted for growth</p>

Question 5

Are there any other strategic transport issues that need to be considered?

Issue / comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
Better cycle routes from Hanwell Fields all the way into the town centre. More cycle maps available for all cycling routes available in Banbury town	An action listed in Appendix II is to audit existing pedestrian and cycle routes and prepare an improvement strategy as part of Local Plan Part 2
Easier and better ways to get from M40 to all sides of town to reduce congestion in town	Improvements to the road network are set out in Chapter 5 of the document
Fully integrated cycle paths throughout the town, extend bus services and a lot of free parking.	An action listed in Appendix II is to audit existing pedestrian and cycle routes and prepare an improvement strategy as part of Local Plan Part 2. Periods of free parking have been suggested in the Masterplan
The road from Banbury Rugby Club to Tesco needs to become a dual carriageway as soon as practicable. If impossible a by-pass should be considered. The proposal to improve the junction at Bridge Street is very welcome and should be tabled soon	Making the A4260 a dual carriageway is not physically viable. South East Relief Road options are set out in the Masterplan
As pensioners we need transport now (non drivers) not having our bus withdrawn. Without public transport now the town centre will be dead. We were supposed to have less cars on the roads re: carbon emissions. Banbury is already congested enough.	Oxfordshire County Council is the highways authority responsible for the provision of bus services in partnership with bus operators
Do not agree with the proposal to put a bridge across the canal as part of canalside. There is a need for a footbridge between Spiceball Park and Grimsbury for residents of roads such as Fowler Road and West Street	A new bridge across the canal as part of Canalside is to improve access to Canalside and the town centre from the railway station. The physical separation of the Grimsbury community from the town centre is acknowledged. However, the railway line poses a significant physical barrier
The new developments need to have public transport and money from new developments should go towards paying for bus services. We should be encouraging more people to use public transport and avoid having more cars on the road	Contributions from new developments can be sought for public transport. These decisions are made at the planning application stage
Concerned that every ring road and link road would skirt Bankside and come down the proposed link road across the A361. This would bring a considerable amount of traffic into Bodicote, very close to the extremely busy primary school, which in turn would bring pollution and safety problems for the children. P.15 talks about increasing public transport patronage - at the same time as the County Council is withdrawing bus subsidies with the	The route options for a new strategic route between the east and west of the town were consulted upon as part of LTP4. The Masterplan needs to be in line with LPT4. The Masterplan sets out a strategy for dealing with traffic congestion

<p>result that many of the existing village buses will no longer run.</p> <p>As far as the southern part of Banbury and Bodicote itself are concerned, we do not think this document provides a clear vision. It has not addressed what will happen south of Bankside when all the traffic is brought along this route.</p>	
<p>The building of a south-east relief road is essential to relieve congestion in the Cherwell Street/Bridge Street area and the Oxford Road. Providing a direct traffic-free pedestrian route between the town centre and the station is also essential</p>	Both issues are addressed in the Masterplan
<p>We would consider the East/West crossing of the railway, river and canal to be helpful , but routes B and C would be preferable to route A to avoid the visual intrusion of this elevated road in the Cherwell Valley</p>	Further testing of the route options will be carried out prior to any implementation of this route
<p>Increase public transport patronage. When was this plan conceived? For 18 months we have been told subsidised buses are being stopped</p>	The Masterplan is a long term document. The cuts in services has been recognised
<p>Access to Grimsbury is deeply compromised. Further pedestrian and vehicular access across the river, canal and railway, whatever the cost, is essential in linking this suburb to the town centre</p>	The physical separation of Grimsbury from the town centre is acknowledged. Improvements to Bridge Street and the junction with Cherwell Street will help improve access
<p>The biggest weakness of this report is the scant attention given to cyclists and pedestrians – the most that cyclists and pedestrians are promised is an ‘audit’ at a later date</p>	The Masterplan deals with detailed routes as part of key redevelopment areas. It is beyond the scope of the Masterplan to deal with pedestrian and cycle routes in detail across the entire town. This will be developed as part of Local Plan Part 2.
<p>If/when the bus station is relocated, an important consideration should be a transport hub where people can move quickly and easily from train to bus</p>	The Masterplan aims to provide integration between different modes of movement and allows for bus services to serve the railway station.
<p>Much residential development is taking place in south Banbury and villages such as Bloxham, Adderbury and Deddington which lie to the south of the town. Yet, out-of-town retail is to the north of Banbury. It is important to ensure good road links between these</p>	Strategic road improvements are set out in the Masterplan
<p>More houses will cause these congested roads to be impassable, build better links across the town – stop forcing everyone down the same road</p>	Strategic road improvements are set out in the Masterplan
<p>A strategic route between east and west of the town would be better achieved in the provision of a Banbury South junction to the M40. Action should be to engage with the Department of Transport (DfT) to promote a Banbury South</p>	Comments noted. This is beyond the scope of the Masterplan

M40 junction within the DfT Road Investment Strategy	
All road improvements should incorporate first class provision for cyclists; there are few good facilities for cyclists in Banbury .	This is encourages in the document. The County Council will determine where these should be provided.
An improved route from east to west would be of great value to business , but also because it could enable residents in Grimsbury to access the west side of town more easily, and also will help those who live on the west side of Banbury and work to the east of the town.	Options are set out in the Masterplan.
With regard to the alternative routes A, B and C it is unclear whether the alternative routes have been considered in terms of the varying potential impact on the Oxford Canal Conservation Area or what mitigation for any negative impact would be required.	The impact of all reasonable options for a route will be assessed in detail by the County Council.
p. 14. The Banbury 16 'existing development area' shown in white should be extended westwards to reflect the committed development	The plan has been amended accordingly
Page 3 para 3 – the Great Central Railway opened a branch line from Culworth Junction to Banbury	Text amended to: 'In 1900 the Great Central Railway opened a branch line to Banbury from Culworth Junction on their main line'
Page 3 para 6 – the train operators should be listed with Chiltern Railways followed by Cross Country and First Great Western as Banbury is a Chiltern Railways managed station. The station also connects Banbury with Oxford, Reading and Didcot. There are also longer journeys to the north and south	Text amended
The station is not visible from the town centre and we would welcome improvements in the relationship between the town centre and the railway station. We are particularly supportive of the proposal to open up access through Tramway to the station	Comments noted. The proposals for Canalside aim to achieve this.
Relocation of the bus station. The bus station should have a clear link to the railway station. Passengers will be reluctant to transfer from one of public transport to another if we don't make it easy for them. One option could be to have a bus departure at the railway station and train departure board at the bus station. The distance between the two should be reduced to a short walk with clear signage and safe walking/cycling route	The Masterplan aims to provide integration between different modes of transport and allows for buses to serve the railway station.

p. 36 Appendix 1. There may be an opportunity to work with Network Rail to replace the Bridge Street bridge but only if it is too low to accommodate the electrified lines	Comments noted
The shared surface model depicted on page 15 would not be suitable to Banbury given the width and topography of many town centre streets, but we are pleased to see the plan address one of Banbury's air quality management areas, between Southam Road and Oxford Road	The illustration of the shared surface has been removed from the Masterplan
Certain through routes the plan has identified would not be deliverable owing to land ownership constraints and rights of way issues eg. the fields to the west of Warwick Road identified in the Environmental Masterplan as a possible 'enhancement of east-west connection from country park to Wroxton Abbey' have no public right of way	The arrows show conceptual routes only. However, the arrows have been amended to more accurately reflect ownership constraints
It is disappointing in a document purporting to be a masterplan and vision, no possible 'Western Bypass' for the town was identified	The document must be in line with LTP4, which does not identify a 'western' bypass for the town
Schemes listed within the Masterplan align with those mentioned within Oxfordshire County Council's LTP4. However, the capacity improvement schemes below have not been listed and consideration should be taken of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bloxham Road (A361) and South Bar Street junction • Warwick Road (B4100) roundabout junctions with the A422 Ruscombe Avenue and Orchard Way • Bloxham Road (A361) junction with Queensway and Springfield Avenue • A361 Southam Road junction with Castle Street and Warwick Road 	Capacity improvement schemes have been added into the Masterplan
Whilst still aspirational in that funding is yet to be secured, improvements to Hennef Way are a strategic priority for OCC	The Masterplan highlights Hennef Way as receiving 'road network improvements'
p. 15 & p. 23 – a pedestrian and cycling improvement strategy is unlikely to be completed by the Local Plan Part 2 review. However, when the time comes to start such work, OCC welcomes the opportunity to collaborate with CDC	Comments noted
p. 15, para 1 – 'Identify a new strategic route between the east and west of the town' – consider adding that whilst identification of the route will be in this Local Plan period up to 2031, delivery is unlikely to be, due to the sequential	Noted. No change as timings may change.

provision of improvements on Hennef Way, and East of M40 Link Road	
p. 14 map/image – consider changing the title from ‘Transport Solutions’ to ‘Road Solutions’ as it does not show any other solutions for cycling, walking etc...	Title amended
With major house building and big projects like HS2, a new link road from Bankside is needed or at least a new junction off the M40 linking to Banbury, roads like Queensway to Bloxham Road need a roundabout or a reconfiguration of traffic lights or Banbury will face congestion gridlock	A new motorway junction would be implemented by the Highways Agency.
The potential development of town centre sites identified in the plan could result in a net loss of car parking for the town centre. This would undermine the efforts at re-vitalisation proposed. The parking strategy needs to go further than proposed to also identify additional parking spaces	The Masterplan identifies the preparation of a car parking strategy as a key action and the design principles for the sites identify the opportunity for car parking to be provided. It is beyond the scope of the Masterplan to establish a detailed parking strategy.
The importance of the South East Link road means that it should be specifically mentioned in Strategic Objective 3 on Page 7	The implementation of a SE link road is one of many potential priorities.
Page 15 Column 1 bullet 2 (at bottom of page): add ‘through’ Tramway	The Masterplan provides the option for a through route from Bridge Street to Tramway for buses.
p. 13 more detail is required on improvements to Hennef Way, junction of Cherwell Street and Bridge Street, South Bar and Horsefair (and others)	Further information is provided in the Local Transport Plan and will be as part of any detailed proposals/planning applications by the County Council.
There is no mention of HS2 movements. The plan should describe the interim measures which will be taken to alleviate the traffic issues caused by HS2	The Masterplan now makes reference to HS2
Greater use of the Cherwell Street route for traffic is not compatible with the objective of improving linkages between the western sector of the town, the retail and commercial core with Grimsbury and the railway station	As part of the scheme to widen Cherwell Street, improvements to the junction with Bridge Street will be made to make it more pedestrian friendly
With regard to the footbridges which appear to be proposed to create linkages, it is suggested that there should be more detail to indicate how and where access for these will be provided	More detail will be outlined in the Canalside SPD
The document refers in a number of instances to new uses being located on the sites of existing car parks but no alternative locations or policies are identified for car parking. There is reference to ‘develop a parking strategy’ but no indication of a route to this end	The Masterplan identifies the preparation of a car parking strategy as a key action and the design principles for the sites identify the opportunity for car parking to be provided. It is beyond the scope of the Masterplan to establish a detailed parking strategy.

<p>The utilisation of Tramway as a through route has not been recognised</p>	<p>The Masterplan refers to the opening up of Tramway. The Masterplan provides the option for a through route from Bridge Street to Tramway for buses.</p>
<p>There is an opportunity to link the town centre to the railway station by providing a new road between Cherwell Street and a new plaza in front of the railway station</p>	<p>Tramway Road will provide the main access to the site. The masterplan identifies pedestrian and cycle routes and public spaces in this area</p>

Question 6

Do you support the key town centre initiatives?

Issue / comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
Worried about the diversity of independent traders with the current business rate levels	Comments noted
Maybe necessary to switch from retail to residential emphasis in some parts of the centre eg. High Street/Bolton Road – must be links to High Street	The town centre boundaries will be reviewed for Local Plan Part 2. The Masterplan encourages residential development in the town centre.
The town would benefit from a ‘modern cinema’ which could also be used to stage shows. Many families go elsewhere for the cinema and/or the theatre	The Masterplan allows for leisure facilities in a number of locations.
Do not agree that canalside should be opened up for retail and housing – I do not expect any shops there to be successful and this would make the town centre even more	The aim is to create mixed use areas containing residential, office, commercial and retail uses. Retail is unlikely to be a significant element of the overall mix.
There is too much emphasis on retail and its expansion. Hasn’t retail peaked? I think the footprint for retail should become less disjointed and spread out. The retail footprint should be reduced	The town centre boundaries will be reviewed for Local Plan Part 2. The Masterplan encourages a range of uses in the town centre.
As a business operator in the Bolton Road area, I am astonished that no mention is made as to how businesses currently operating in that area (and thriving) are to be relocated and compensated	The aim is not to displace existing businesses
Do not want to see an extension of the town centre shopping area because I believe that an enlarged shopping area would not be sustainable in the face of out-of-town retail, internet shopping and other towns	The town centre boundaries will be reviewed for Local Plan Part 2. The Masterplan encourages a range of uses in the town centre.
The cost of parking for the town centre is a significant disincentive to go there. Most needs can be fulfilled out of town while greater scope for shopping is met by other centres such as Milton Keynes	A key action identified in the Masterplan is to establish a car parking strategy. A number of car parks are privately owned and CDC cannot influence the pricing policy of these car parks
The Banbury Masterplan appears to have no provision for culture, other than a poorly defined ‘cultural quarter’ in Spiceball that may (or may not) include the Mill – but that does allow for a multiplex cinema plus cafes and bars. This looks like leisure, not culture	Greater emphasis has been given to the provision of cultural uses within the town centre in the revised Masterplan
Creating great places within the centre is critical. Currently it is a poor experience. There are pedestrian zones with no clear purpose	The document indicates where key public realm improvements need to take place

Support improved connectivity between the town centre and other facilities such as the train station. Whilst there is no objection to the principle of new bridge crossings they should be discussed with the Trust who own and maintain the canal to ensure that the Council fully understand our position with regard to location, consent, design and on-going ownership and maintenance.	Comments noted. The Canalside SPD will consider this.
It is very difficult to support the demolition of existing structures that are physically sound and well used e.g. the demolition of the existing multi-storey car park in Bolton Road and the moving of the bus station	The multi-storey car park was constructed from concrete and had a limited life-span. It has been demolished.
For a town whose population is set to grow by 25,000 over the next 15 years, cultural provision is nil. There's a promise of a cultural quarter on the old Spiceball site, which ignores the fact that the site already has a live planning permission of a supermarket	The revised Masterplan gives greater emphasis to the provision of arts and culture (the provision of cultural facilities is referenced in the strategic objectives)
The first initiative proposes the town centre experience will be improved by 'removing congestion', a realistic approach may need to be taken, as free flow traffic conditions at all times are unlikely to be achieved. Consider changing to 'reduce congestion'	Text amended to 'reduce congestion' for this Initiative.
Please could clarification be given on whether it is called 'Market Square' or 'Market Place'	It is Market <i>Place</i> – text and plans have been amended accordingly
Emphasis on non-commercial/retail attractions will boost visitors and spin-off to retail benefit	The Masterplan refers to the need for a range of uses within the town centre
Public funding is required to facilitate many of the proposals. Research from other town centres tells us that an active local authority can be a positive catalyst to enable these types of proposals, but they will not take place on their own without this proactive work	Comments noted. This is set out in the Delivery Chapter and Action Plan
Page 17 – text suggests an over whelming scale of redevelopment. There is no mention of Banbury's heritage, and whilst it is understood that the developments are specifically described in page 27-29, at this junction it should be made clear that defined areas are subject to redevelopment and there will not be wholesale demolition and regeneration	The revised Masterplan emphasises the importance of the historic environment and the need to preserve and enhance it.
Some bullets should be rephrased to be more precise e.g. 'regenerating under-utilised sites and areas such as canalside' p.17. 'A leisure and cultural quarter on the Spiceball site' (p.19)	Design principles have been revised.

There is much ambivalence regarding the statistics concerning 'empty shops' in the existing retail area	Changes have been made to the Masterplan.
Spiceball – there appears to be 'woolly thinking' concerning the 'Arts and Cultural' area. What is meant by Cultural Quarter? Is the Mill to be part of this? What is to become of the General Foods SSC?	The proposals for Spiceball have been reviewed and revised design principles included in Appendix II.
Canalside – text refers loosely to 'significant buildings'. What is a significant building? Could the document be more specific?	'Significant' replaced with 'high-quality' and other terms where appropriate.
Continued reservations about the attempt to create linkage between railway station and town centre, all the time fighting with the divisive effect of a wider, busier Cherwell Street line with 'significant buildings'. We believe this is a self-defeating, contradictory strategy	The widening of Cherwell Street will also involve the remodelling of the junction with Bridge Street to make it more pedestrian friendly
Redevelopment of 67-75 Bridge Street – every effort should be made to retain these buildings and incorporate them into any new developments that may be proposed	The buildings currently contribute to the creation of a poor quality image at a key gateway into Banbury town centre. There could be several development options for this area.
Relocating the bus station to the Matalan car park would be a wasted opportunity	The Masterplan suggests here as one possible location
Bolton Road area – the second bullet point needs clarification, 'located next to the Cornhill' – suggests development will extend northward. How would this happen without demolition of three listed buildings which currently occupy that area?	Development next to the Cornhill will be on the site of the current multi-storey. An improved pedestrian link alongside the Cornhill is proposed. No demolition of the listed buildings is proposed
St. Mary's Church area – it is not clear what is proposed here 'redevelopment of White Lion Walk' is ambiguous. We seek reassurance that the character at the heart of the old town is retained. The row of Alms Houses at St. Mary's close need to be thoughtfully incorporated in any proposed development	Reference to preserving and enhancing the historic environment has been added in this section.
Develop housing above shops	Support for town centre living has been added into the document

Question 7

Do you support the proposals set out on the town centre plans?

Issue / comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
The viability of town centre shopping is questionable. I cannot see any future for city centres for retail. Leisure and entertainment perhaps	The town centre boundaries will be reviewed for Local Plan Part 2. The Masterplan encourages a range of uses in the town centre.
Church Lane has the potential to become Banbury's 'foodie street'. Please would the Council encourage this	Reference to the area potentially specialising in food related uses has been added.
The old town area should be improved and independent shops encouraged	The Masterplan aims to regenerate the old town centre.
Proposals to move the buses further into town will make traffic worse	Buses are likely to be along key routes only to promote east-west connectivity
Particularly concerned that the map on p.26 appears to place another building on the footprint of the Mill and we would fight any plan which threatened important historical buildings such as these. We do not want or recognise a cultural quarter which has no culture other than an multiplex cinema and American-style food chain outlets	The Mill is proposed to be retained and potentially expanded.
On the plans (notably that on p.26), the Mill is shown as a dotted line only. General Foods Social Club is not shown at all	The design principles for Spiceball have been revised.
With the Mill uncertain and GF gone, the only culture in the 'Cultural Quarter' is the museum and a 6-screen multiplex	The Mill is proposed to be retained and potentially expanded. General Foods Social Club is retained.
At page 29 and 41 – with regard to guidance within the SPD requiring the attention of listed buildings within the Bolton Road area, this should also require development to protect the contribution made by the settings of these buildings to their significance	The Masterplan has been revised to give greater emphasis to the protection and enhancement of the historic environment.
p. 26 – it is disappointing that the Council has not used the results of their programme of conservation area appraisals to identify those buildings, landmarks and spaces identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation areas	Listed buildings are identified and retained. The Masterplan emphasises that development proposals should protect and enhance the buildings and their settings.
p. 21 – improve the transport networks into and through the town centre 'Reduce congestion through a coordinated network strategy...' Is this LTP4? If so, please amend the text to specify this as it insinuates that there will be another document	The Masterplan sets out the main initiatives to reduce congestion many of which are informed by LTP 4.

<p>The existing town centre and thus the focus of the masterplan’s regeneration activities, in spatial terms, is closer to the SE of the town, and many of the Committed and Local Plan housing allocations range across the north to west peripheries of the town. We would like to have seen a greater focus on sites immediately to the north of the existing town centre.</p>	<p>The housing and employment sites are allocated as part of the Local Plan. The Masterplan is in line with the Local Plan.</p>
<p>Town Centre Transport Solutions Plan (p. 20): Why is there Traffic Management shown for Merton Street? This is not part of LTP4, is it a CDC scheme? A4260 Oxford Road/Upper Windsor Street junction is identified under ‘Junction Improvements’ LTP4 does not propose improvements here. It may be worth showing Bridge Street (west) as a black line arm from the Bridge Street junction towards the Town Hall as this junction looks like a T junction</p>	<p>Removed dotted line for Merton Street and junction improvements at A4260 Oxford Road/Upper Windsor Street junction</p>
<p>The plans could go further. The purchase or leasing of retail property in the town centre by the local authority should be considered in order to better control and manage parts of the area. This would then facilitate more pop-up shops and/or ensure A1 retail use in key locations</p>	<p>Reference added.</p>
<p>Town centre vitality (p. 18/19) – the town centre retail area as shown on the plan on p.18 is inconsistent with the Town Centre Shopping Area as set out in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan (5.3 key policies map) and should include the Spiceball site as a suitable location for retail, as well as other cultural/arts/leisure uses. The Town Centre Vitality Plan might usefully be amended to show ‘retail foodstore’ within the Spiceball area to reflect the Local Plan allocations and the outline scheme, which is subject to a resolution to grant planning permission</p>	<p>Town centre plans have been amended and those remaining are indicative. The Spiceball plan has been amended to indicate the potential for a supermarket.</p>
<p>Town Centre Buildings and Place p. 26/27 – the building blocks, and the key frontages shown within the Spiceball site do not reflect the development parameters for our client’s outline scheme. These items were the subject of extensive debate with officers and reflect a scheme that has a longstanding resolution to grant outline planning permission and therefore, the masterplan should reflect these principles as a robust and justified set of considered responses to these design-based matters</p>	<p>Proposals for Spiceball have been amended.</p>

<p>Town Centre Linkage and Spaces Plan (p.24) over emphasises (even if intended only conceptually) the potential for River Cherwell enhancements as noted in the key (and variously referred to as 'Green Lung' elsewhere). The Spiceball site is subject to a detailed parameter plan as part of the outline planning application, which has been thoroughly tested and confirms the extent of the green space adjacent to the canal. The concept envisaged by the Masterplan is supported in this context but it must take account of the parameters set by the scheme coming forward. The new pedestrian linkages shown on the plan are supported</p>	<p>The arrow is conceptual only and it is acknowledged that the treatment of the river corridor will vary along its length in response to adjacent development. The arrow/green lung will be reduced in width at Spiceball.</p>
<p>Image on p. 6 shows none of the locally listed buildings, which conflicts with the plan on p. 35</p>	<p>The artist's impression is conceptual. The text of the Masterplan will be revised to ensure retention of the listed building wherever possible.</p>

Question 8

Do you agree that the action areas identified should be the focus of regeneration activities?

- Canalside Development Area
- Spiceball Development Area
- Bolton Road Development Area

Issue / comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
The second part of Broad Street (opposite to Crofts) and George Street should be reviewed too	The Masterplan has been amended to refer to this area.
Include High Street	The Masterplan proposes that High Street receive public realm improvements
Regeneration must take account of former industrial buildings and structures	Buildings of architectural and/or historic significance will be retained and enhanced where ever possible.
Tree planting in Market Place, Cherwell Street, along the canal for example, all help to improve the townscape. The towpath throughout the centre (especially between the Mill and the Station) should be improved for use as a through pedestrian route to the railway station and other places	These proposals are set out on the Town Centre Linkages and Spaces Plan
The action areas seem appropriate, but care must be taken, especially relating to Canalside. We note the statement relating to the historical significance of existing buildings on p. 26 and 37, and would commend the 'Vision for the Regeneration of Canalside' statement published by the Banbury Civic Society	Comments noted
The task of developing these areas – Canalside in particular – may generate false expectations, given the enormous task of purchasing land from myriad owners in that area. Perhaps it would be better to channel energies into getting presently empty buildings back into use?	Both the Local Plan and Masterplan allow for the regeneration of Canalside as a long term project, including the re-use of buildings.
The action areas are poorly identified. They are reasonable for focus but what are the priorities?	The Masterplan sets out in the priorities for Canalside, Spiceball and Bolton Road.
Disagree with proposals for Swan Industrial Estate to be residential. We could clearly use it for parking for the station and for entertainment. Horsefair and St. Mary's Church area needs to be a focus for improvement and developed for more cultural events	A new multi-storey car park has recently been built to serve the station and there are further opportunities near to the railway station. Local Plan Part 2 will explore the potential of this site for redevelopment

Support the regeneration of the Canalside and Spiceball areas. We note that there is a desire to create a mooring basin within the town centre. We would suggest that the council discuss this further with the Canal & River Trust to properly understand the required processes, possible costs and land take implications before allocating land for a use which may not prove feasible	Comments noted
The initiatives and town centre plans are supported. Part of the success of any redevelopment and regeneration of sites such as Canalside will be in the effective relocation of existing businesses to suitable alternative sites, together with the retention of those people currently employed. This relies on a feasible scheme that is financially viable with all relevant landowners	CDC is working with existing businesses to relocate them to alternative locations
There should be greater exploration of sites to the north and west of the existing town centre, as currently there is a skewing of amenities in the (south and) east of the town with existing and future residential areas concentrated in the (north and) west. As such BTC would have liked the Masterplan to address retail opportunities as well as other regeneration opportunities in Banbury 10: Bretch Hill Regeneration Area for example	A reference to proposals for Banbury 10 has been added into the Masterplan
Key priority must be Canalside and improving access between the rail station and centre, currently unattractive and cut-off by road and physical (canal, river) barriers. Need to improve walking and cycling routes	Improving access between the station and the town centre is a key priority. New linkages are indicated on the Town Centre Linkages and Spaces Plan
Bolton Road (Area 8) – this site has the potential to be a key influence for the revitalisation of the town. It's an important link to the 'old town'. The proposals shown are not imaginative enough. There is the opportunity to enhance and re-use some of the key historic buildings at the back of Parsons Street – this aspect is lost in the proposals as stated	The Masterplan allows for the re-use of buildings to the rear of Parsons Street. Text has been amended to clearly state that the historic environment will be retained and enhanced.

Question 9

Do you support the proposals set out in the Environmental Masterplan?

Issue / comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
Concept of central green swathe is good but there must be effective links to the town which tends towards concealment	The Masterplan sets out new linkages to and through the town centre
There is not enough emphasis on Banbury becoming a 'cycling town'	Additional work on pedestrian and cycle routes will be carried out as part of the Local Plan Part 2.
Green spaces are great, but it's a real disappointment that there is no mention of renewable energy, and only a nod towards biodiversity. Air quality is not mentioned either – any plan which risks making it worse should not be considered	Reference has been made to the Air Quality Management Areas and biodiversity.
Yes but what is the priority? Which would be most desirable and have the greatest impact at a reasonable cost? Is there enough room between Bodicote and Banbury for both a key green linkage and a new strategic link road?	The priorities are set out in Appendix II in terms of actions, timescale and providers
Greening of the environment is important for a rural market town. More needs to be done to have people walk or cycle. Salt Way is just being ruined by houses	Additional work on pedestrian and cycle routes will be carried out as part of the Local Plan Part 2.
The canal and river corridor green lung as shown on the various proposals maps does not actually include the canal. We suggest that the area is widened to include both the canal and river. The canal is a perfect example of multi-functional green infrastructure and such an allocation may help support requests for CIL or S106 payments to improve accessibility or environmental improvements	It may not be appropriate to 'green' the canal in many locations and, therefore, the maps should remain unchanged. However, the text in the Masteplan been revised to allow for this.
The 'green lung' could be directly linked to the ironstone railway walk and the Banbury Fringe Walk, as well as to the Salt Way. These are not very well publicised at present but they are good open spaces in the town with environmental benefits. Their signage and promotion could be achieved quickly at relatively little cost	Noted. The Environment masterplan shows how areas can link together.
There are several parks in Banbury. Changing the grounds maintenance contracts to turn away from simply maintaining what is there to modernising the planting would make an immediate improvement at very little cost	Changing maintenance contracts is beyond the scope of the Masterplan. Reference has been made to recognise the importance of enhancing Banbury's existing parks.

Put a much greater emphasis on increasing biodiversity. We would like to see an insistence on the use of British native trees and shrubs, where appropriate, in any new planting schemes together with the use of bird boxes and the use of species that can withstand drought. Fruit trees should be planted in public areas as much as possible	The Masterplan has been revised to emphasise the objective of improving biodiversity and require effective planting schemes for site proposals.
There should be the creation of at least one 'standout', stylish and modern planting scheme	The Masterplan has been revised to emphasise the objective of improving biodiversity and require effective planting schemes for site proposals.
There is no mention of the Community Orchard in Browning Road Park. CAG and local residents successfully planted over 60 fruit trees in 2014. This approach could be adopted at several other sites in Banbury. Similarly the Community Gardens at Bridge Street and BYHP have the potential to be copied across the town.	Reference has been made in the Masterplan to the importance of community gardens/orchards and locally sourced food, and the potential for new spaces to be created
Parks, such as Peoples Park, are not necessarily used as destinations in themselves but provide pleasant walking routes into the town centre. We think there is no need to create new hard landscaping or buildings in these parks	There is the potential for parks, such as Peoples Park, to become destinations as well as spaces to simply walk through
There are many parks in Banbury and, contrary to the observations in the report, these are well used and very much appreciated by the people of the town. We would ask that this point be noted in particular. However, there is a need to persuade people to become more active, and the parks are the ideal place for doing this	The Masterplan has been amended to emphasise the important role parks and green spaces already play
The 'Green Lung' mentioned appears on some maps as merely the River Cherwell with trees on the banks – we would support something more ambitious than this. Air quality should feature in the Masterplan. Micro-generation such as solar panels and heat pumps would make a substantial contribution to sustainability and should be promoted as part of the Masterplan. We would also like to see a specific commitment to protecting and increasing bio-diversity	The green lung will inevitably change in character along its length depending on adjacent uses. It can be wider and more substantial in some place than others. Reference has been made to the Air Quality Management Areas and biodiversity.
The masterplan should be more ambitious in identifying green spaces beyond those that already exist or are associated with development	Additional work will be carried out as part of Local Plan Part 2 to assess the current deficiencies in open space provision.
The corridor to the south of Banbury would be an ideal location for creation of accessible natural greenspace. We would like to see the Masterplan indicating the potential creation of wetland habitats in this location by extending the strategic green space marked on the plan below the number 19, down to the M40	The revised Masterplan states that wetlands and nature reserves should be provided in appropriate locations.

Some of the areas already mapped as existing green spaces are not accessible (in private ownership)	Noted. Ownership and use can change. Some arrows indicating public access have been removed.
Support the establishment of the key green linkages shown in orange. What is needed in addition are areas of wildlife habitat so the linkages link together eg. land to the north of the Hanwell Fields housing development. We would like to see this area allocated as strategic green space with the Masterplan	Local Plan part 2 will examine the potential for green space elsewhere in the town.
Banbury has no local nature reserve provision. Establishment of the country park north of town is an ideal opportunity for the first LNR in the Banbury area and for CDC to signal their commitment to biodiversity conservation in our local area	The revised Masterplan states that nature reserves should be provided in appropriate locations.
BOS work closely with CDC on a very successful swift conservation initiative. We would like to see the Masterplan promote opportunities to create nesting sites for birds and roosting sites for bats	Comments noted.
Object to the proposal to designate land off Waterworks Lane, north of Hennef Way as a 'potential key green linkage' as shown on the Environmental Masterplan at page 30	Plan amended to reflect there is no public access through this site. The text has been revised to explain that not all areas along the Green lung will be green
The locations identified for strategic green spaces and potential key green linkages should be amended to reflect the consent scheme 14/01188/OUT – identified, in part, as Local Plan allocation Banbury 16	The green spaces shown for Banbury 16 and other sites will be revised where necessary.
Gladman have proposed a car park and drop off zone and a MUGA within the strategic green space to the east of the Banbury 17 allocation, and this should be reflected on the Environment Masterplan	The Masterplan already identifies the green space here. Details for strategic housing sites are for the planning application process.
The SPD should not be used in decision making as a restrictive document and it should not predetermine what may be provided on the allocated sites	The Masterplan will not predetermine the uses on allocated sites but will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
There should be more consideration given to the role of green space in providing for biodiversity and ecological connectivity. There are a number of habitats that could be restored, enhanced or created to improve ecological linkage through the town and to tie in with current initiatives. A particular opportunity in the town centre to provide ecological linkage would be wildlife enhancements at 'The Triangle', the green space between Bridge Street and the A4260	The Masterplan will be revised to emphasise the objective of improving biodiversity and require effective planting schemes for site proposals. 'The Triangle' has been identified for improvements in the Masterplan

<p>It is felt that the District Council's publication of a CIL Regulation 123 list would aid the joined up approach to greenspace the Environmental Masterplan .</p>	<p>Comments noted</p>
<p>Acknowledgement should be made within the Environmental Masterplan of the Air Quality Management Areas declared on Hennef Way and North Bar/Horsefair/South Bar</p>	<p>These Air Quality Management areas are referenced in the revised Masterplan</p>
<p>Gallagher Estates strongly contend that the BAN 17 Strategic Green Open Space designation should be removed to ensure consistency with the Local Plan. P. 31 – reference is made to a new green linkage along the southern edge of Banbury 17. This masterplan aspiration does not conform with development plan policy Banbury 17 and should be deleted to allow such design responses to be determined at the detailed design stage and not through a town-wide strategy</p>	<p>The linkages are indicative. The Local Plan refers to the new connection along the southern boundary of the site, 'A new footpath bridleway to be provided running from east to west along the southern boundary of the development area, incorporating links with existing footpaths to form a circular route around the development linking back to Salt Way'</p>
<p>Need to consider greener transport options and potentially iconic and attractive canal based and Canalside transport bringing visitors and others from off the motorway without the need to drive into town</p>	<p>The Masterplan fully supports increased use of the canal</p>
<p>Green lung – this is generally welcomed but the reality will test the intention. There is disparity between the stated aim and the artist's impressions used as illustrations in the document</p>	<p>The character of the green lung will vary along its length depending on adjacent uses</p>

Question 10

Do you have any other comments on the Draft Banbury Vision & Masterplan?

Issue / comments	How the issue/comments have been addressed in the revised masterplan document
What will be visitor perceptions? At present owner neglect is leading to down at heel appearances – this damages the historic market town image of Banbury	The Masterplan proposes a series of public realm Improvements and the potential for a Business Improvement District. Added a reference to the initiatives to bring vacant units back into use and shop front improvements. The Council can, as a last resort, use CPO powers.
Timescales need to be set. Who will drive this? Less consultancy, more action please	Timescales are set out in Appendix II
Recreational provision is a concern. I run Banbury Boxing Club and would love to be able to work with the Council to find us a permanent home	Comments noted
Please renew and replace the public exercise equipment in Spiceball Park	Parks and improvement programs in Banbury are the responsibility of the Town and District.
Please, no new ‘canal basin’ – very expensive and this is out of kilter with the history of this part of the canal	CDC will assess the feasibility of a new canal basin and consult upon proposals as part of the Canalside SPD
I do not agree with the appointment of executive positions to deliver a masterplan. This work should be done as part of Banbury Town Council, Cherwell District Council and Oxfordshire County Councils normal roles. New appointments just add to the cost of delivery and create yet another layer of bureaucracy	The Council will determine the most effective approach, including consideration of costs, in determining how the Mastepplan initiatives will be delivered. Partners will remain involved.
The current plans contain no commitment to safeguard and develop the town’s only professional performance space, at The Mill Arts Centre. This is a very serious oversight. We urge the Council to look again at proposals for the Cultural Quarter, and seize the chance to make positive commitments both to the Mill and to performing arts in general	The Mill is currently too small as a venue for some activities/performances. The Mill is proposed to be retained and potentially expanded.
There is no indication that the new Banbury Task Force and its Chief Executive are to be politically accountable. This point should be clarified	The text is amended to explain that the Banbury Task force accountable to the Council and the public.
The masterplan must respect the history of Banbury and its unique character. This includes the narrow lanes near St. Mary’s Church, the Mill Arts Centre and Tooleys Boatyard	The need to protect and enhance Banbury’s historic character and heritage assets hasbeen emphasised
Appendix II identifies actions and categorises them as short, medium or long term. What are those timescales?	Timescales can change frequently on complex projects and more specific timescales may not be helpful.

It is vital to highlight that although The Mill is a characterful and well-loved building, the highly skilled management and staff team along with our robust operational management systems would ensure that the business could continue to thrive and develop in an alternative location should that be the most beneficial option for the people of Banbury and surrounding community	Comments noted. The Masterplan allows for expansion of the Mill on the current site but does not preclude a location elsewhere.
Banbury can have no convincing future as an expanding local centre without a thriving venue for live entertainment of all kinds	The revised Masterplan emphasises the need for arts and cultural/performance venues
Improve the town by developing empty and unloved buildings. The Grand Theatre, the huge building opposite Debenhams, Crouch Street etc. Celebrate our history, the horsefair, cattle market, the lovely old buildings – don't make flats from a theatre	The Masterplan with the Local Plans provides the Framework for determining the future of premises.
There is no big economic idea in the Vision – we believe that the time is ripe for another major employer to come to Banbury	The Local Plan allocates considerable land for employment to cater for this.
There is no mention at all of tourism. A Vision, properly wrought, should be one that advocates the use of the imagery, the legend and the facts about the Fine Lady upon a White Horse	Noted. Many of the proposals in the Masterplan will lead to increased tourism but a reference has been added to emphasise its importance.
It is not a vision of Banbury as such; it could be any town. The Masterplan appears to us to simply continue existing trends without putting its stamp upon where development should be and what shape it should take	The Masteplan is informed by Banbury's unique assets including the canal, river, Mill theatre, and St Mary's Church.
It is essential that, ultimately, decisions and the signing off of the document has to be under democratically elected Councillor control. We hope to see this view come forth strongly in the final document, following this consultation	The document will be 'signed off' for adoption by The Council.
The focus on 'people' could be strengthened by having an explicit commitment in the Masterplan to involving local people in plans going forward, so that their ideas and concerns can be recognised and acted upon. Strong leadership is mentioned in the document and is clearly important; strong community involvement would be a very beneficial addition	CDC is committed to involving local people in the projects and initiatives required to deliver the Masterplan
Further attention should be paid to who will be living in Banbury – both the very elderly and the very young may be represented in the future population of Banbury, and we would like to see the Masterplan explicitly	The Masterplan is aimed at improving skills, facilities and local services for people of all ages

anticipate and plan for the needs of such groups of people	
As a mother I would like to see more open green space and more cycle routes. I welcome more pedestrian areas and would prefer more cycle docks and cycle hire places rather than car parking spaces	The Masterplan provides for new open spaces. The preparation of a pedestrian and cycle strategy will be carried out as part of the Local Plan Part 2.
Given the possible scale of development in Banbury, Thames Water consider that there should be a section on 'Infrastructure and Utilities' in the Banbury Vision and Masterplan	The masterplan is a visionary, spatial strategy and a technical section on utilities would not be appropriate.
The plan is entirely silent on the matter of archaeological remains that would be expected to be found in a settlement of Banbury's age and despite the fact that the castle's location north of the town centre is identified in the conservation area appraisal and, indeed in local street names. We would recommend that the SPD give consideration to the protection of archaeological remains likely to be required for the archaeological features affected by proposals within the SPD area	Archaeology is covered in the Local Plan
Requests for infrastructure should be CIL compliant in line with the tests set out at Section 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy. Local Planning Authorities should only seek contributions directly related to the developments coming forward and should not use them as vehicles for delivering infrastructure that would not be required as a result of granting planning permission	Comments noted
The option for Spiceball included on p.39-40 should be amended to reflect the parameters established and the uses proposed. The outline scheme provides for the foodstore on the part of the site comprising the existing surface level car park and it is nonsensical for the masterplan to advocate an alternative location when this has already been tested and deemed acceptable	The proposals for Spiceball have been reviewed and the design principles amended/expanded to help determine priorities and guide development.
BTC would have liked greater consideration of Banbury's role as a sub-regional economic hub and further examination of transport solutions that could consolidate and expand this role. BTC also more generally have some concerns about the viability of the Masterplan moving forward, in the likely absence of sufficient funding to realise many of its proposals	Transport solutions set out in the Masterplan are in line with LPT4. The Masterplan can be used to secure funding from various sources eg. LEPs. It is important to identify projects and initiatives as a first step

Section 1. Introduction – map on page two doesn't have a heading or key	Title and key added
Section 2. Banbury today – paragraph 5 consider referring to the 'Banbury Area Strategy' as the <u>Banbury Area Transport Strategy</u>	Text amended
Section 3. Banbury Vision – the south-east relief road options are listed A-C on the masterplan map (p.8) but not discussed in the Masterplan text. These are mentioned on p.15 (Transport & Movement)	The key has been amended to refer to what the number 1-19 refer to and what the letters A-C refer to
Section 5. Transport & Movement – map/image (p. 14) consider changing the title from 'Transport Solutions' to 'Road Solutions' as it does not show any other solutions for cycling, walking etc	Text amended
Chapter 11. Appendix 2. The following Actions are joint responsibility with OCC and bus operators, particularly in light of removal of bus subsidies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide an accessible public transport network from surrounding villages • Increase public transport patronage • Improve bus services and access into the town centre 	Text amended
It is necessary to reconsider both the structure of the document and the presentation of the content, which is at times over descriptive and repetitive. It is unclear also that some of the proposals need to be readdressed and reconsidered. In doing so, the document should use more precise descriptions but at the same time be more considerate of Banbury's existing heritage	The structure has been reviewed and some sections revised eg. Buildings and Spaces and Appendix I. Greater emphasis has been given to the protection and enhancement of the historic environment
Spiceball/Cultural and Arts Centre – the document is very unclear regarding the intentions and disposition of the land uses. Existing establishments do not appear to have been taken into account and extant permissions are at variance with the illustrated intentions. More work is needed to clarify the proposals for this area but this should avoid being too prescriptive as requirements could change during the life of the 'Plan'	Reviewed what the masterplan proposes for Spiceball and expanded design principles to determine priorities and guide development.
The document makes some references to arts facilities and public art projects but could say more given the 'new' public art policy and strategy and what was included within Part 1 of the Local Plan and the NW Bicester SPD	The Masterplan emphasises the importance of arts and culture to Banbury

<p>Can we be assured that the Task Force, as envisaged, will have the muscle to bring the various stakeholders – especially OCC and Network Rail – into line. The improve to-date is that the County’s pre-occupation is elsewhere other than Banbury and more certainty is required regarding the resources to be allocated and the commitment of the non-LA stakeholders</p>	<p>The Council and partners will implement the proposals in the Masterplan and the Local Plans as soon as practicable. This will depend on landowner cooperation and funding.</p>
<p>Further work is required to ensure that the SPD properly complies with the Local Plan and the policy and strategy</p>	<p>The Masterplan has been reviewed to ensure it is consistent with the Local Plan</p>
<p>The tone contained in the document signals to developers that Banbury is desperate for any private sector investment at any cost and this is not the case</p>	<p>It is not the intention of the document to give this impression and all development will need to be consistent with Local Plan policies.</p>
<p>The masterplan should consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Programming and outreach to increase the use of outdoor areas and green space including the ‘left over’ green space that has been suggested might be available for communities to design and manage • Inclusion of dementia friendly outdoor spaces • Retail provision – exploring the possibility of restricting A5 usage/proximity to schools/parks etc and creating dementia friendly retail areas • Developing active travel plans for commuters • Exploring the feasibility of using the redeveloped buildings/sites that have been mentioned, for community use or co-located services • Exploring the feasibility of working with businesses to prioritise pedestrians and cyclists in their travel plans and encouraging their staff to travel actively 	<p>The Masterplan establishes a visionary strategy to guide future development of the town. These projects and initiatives are beyond the scope of the document, however the Masterplan does not preclude them being implemented.</p>
<p>It would be helpful if the main masterplan map on p. 8 could show existing secondary schools and the location of the potential new secondary school at Banbury 12. On p. 2, why does Banbury 12 have a redline around it?</p>	<p>Added secondary schools to the Masterplan map and removed the red line at Banbury 12.</p>
<p>It is vital for the town’s economic, cultural and social future that Banbury preserves, renovates and reopens the Grand Theatre as a matter of priority. Demolishing it in favour of 3 retail units and flats that seem to have no provision for parking or rubbish services would be a disastrous mistake</p>	<p>The Masterplan seeks to preserve the historic environment</p>

PART 2

SUMMARY BY RESPONDENT

List of respondents:

1. Marie Alfven – **BAN-A-001**
2. John Bolano – **BAN-A-002**
3. Mark Cooper – **BAN-A-003**
4. Natalie Boland – **BAN-A-004**
5. Tim Lambuscagne – **BAN-A-005**
6. Jonathan Lewis – **BAN-A-006**
7. Brian Little – **BAN-A-007**
8. V. N. Smith – **BAN-A-008**
9. Mr. & Mrs. D. Billyard – **BAN-A-009**
10. Jane Kilsby – **BAN-A-010**
11. Cllr. Surinder Dhese – **BAN-A-011**
12. Bodicote Parish Council – **BAN-A-012**
13. Mr. & Mrs. McCallum **BAN-A-013**–
14. Cherwell North District CPRE (C. Hone) –**BAN-A-014**
15. Mrs. Margaret Christer – **BAN-A-015**
16. Banbury Operatic Society – **BAN-A-016**
17. Cllr. Steve Kilsby – **BAN-A-017**
18. Christopher Manley – **BAN-A-018**
19. Robin Furneaux – **BAN-A-019**
20. Matthew Teller – **BAN-A-020**
21. The Mill Arts Centre Trust – **BAN-A-021**
22. Grondon Waste Management – **BAN-A-022**
23. Bruce Walton – **BAN-A-023**
24. Ms. Clare Haupt – **BAN-A-024**
25. The Canal & Rivers Trust – **BAN-A-025**
26. Framptons – Hallam Land – **BAN-A-026**
27. Banbury Community Action Group – **BAN-A-027**
28. Banbury Town Council Labour Party – **BAN-A-028**
29. North Oxfordshire Green Party – **BAN-A-029**
30. Neville, Redvers –Higgins – **BAN-A-030**
31. Sarah Wallis – **BAN-A-031**
32. Banbury Ornithological Society – **BAN-A-32**
33. Jonathan Rubery – **BAN-A-033**
34. Pierangela Manzetti – **BAN-A-034**
35. Thames Water – **BAN-A-035**
36. Historic England – **BAN-A-036**
37. Robinson & Hall – Swan Group – **BAN-A-037**
38. David Lock Associates (Mark Stroud) – **BAN-A-038**
39. Bidwells – Redrow Homes South Midlands – **BAN-A-039**
40. Chiltern Railways – **BAN-A-040**
41. Gladman – **BAN-A-041**
42. Turley – Aberdeen Asset Management – **BAN-A-042**
43. Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust –**BAN-A-043**
44. Banbury Town Council – **BAN-A-044**
45. David Lock Associates – **BAN-A-045**
46. Oxfordshire County Council – **BAN-A-046**
47. David Local Associates – Gallagher –**BAN-A-047**
48. Chris Farr – **BAN-A-048**
49. Neil Wild – **BAN-A-049**
50. Banbury Civic Society – **BAN-A-050**
51. Peter Monk – **BAN-A-051**
52. Natural England - **BAN-A-052**
53. Savills – Trinity College – **BAN-A-053**
54. Neil Wallis – **BAN-A-054**
55. The Environment Agency, Jack Moeran - **BAN-A-055**

Marie Alfven – **BAN-A-001**

- Better cycle routes from Hanwell Fields to the town centre and more cycle maps

John Bolano – **BAN-A-002**

- Less greenfield development, more brownfield development
- Easier and better ways to access the town centre from the M40
- Timescales for delivery

Mark Cooper – **BAN-A-003**

- More diverse recreational provision
- Delivery of infrastructure before additional housing
- Improve cycleways
- Regenerate the second part of Broad Street and George Street

Natalie Boland – **BAN-A-004**

- Supportive of masterplan proposals – no comments

Tim Lambuscagne – **BAN-A-005**

- Broadly supportive
- More cycle routes – Hanwell Fields to town centre

Jonathan Lewis – **BAN-A-006**

- More cycle routes
- 1 hour free parking in the town centre
- Extend bus services
- Regenerate High Street
- Timescales for delivery

Brian Little – **BAN-A-007**

- Improve access across the town
- Create a vibrant town centre
- Need for proportion of homes to serve local people as opposed to commuters
- May be necessary to switch from retail to residential emphasis in some parts of the centre
- Regeneration must take account of former industrial buildings and structures
- Must be effective links to the town which tends towards concealment
- Need to improve visitor perceptions

V. N. Smith – **BAN-A-008**

- Address congestion
- Bring empty properties back into use
- House building needs to be matched by improvements to infrastructure and services
- The Bolton Road site should not be redeveloped for new shops
- The road from the Banbury Rugby Club to Tesco needs to become a dual carriageway
- Needs to be a cinema that can also be used to stage shows
- Reduce the cost of town centre parking
- The viability of town centre shopping is questionable

Mr. & Mrs. D. Billyard – **BAN-A-009**

- More public transport is required
- Church Lane has more closed units than open ones

Jane Kilsby – **BAN-A-010**

- The wider region is not defined
- Too much emphasis on retail
- There is no mention of tourism
- There is a need for a footbridge between Spiceball Park and Grimsbury, rather than across the canal as part of Canalside
- Canalside should not be opened up for retail and housing
- Not enough emphasis on Banbury becoming a 'cycling town'
- Existing parks could be improved instantly and cheaply by changing the Council's grounds maintenance specification
- Peoples Park is not a destination in its own right
- Renew and place the public exercise equipment in Spiceball Park
- Native species should be used for new planting schemes
- Plant more fruit trees
- Demolition of the Bolton Road multi-storey car park is wasteful
- There is little mention in the Masterplan of Castle Quay 2
- Construct some proper steps and a safety rail along the canal bank at Station Approach
- No new canal basin – it is out of kilter with the history of this part of the canal
- Join the 'green lung' up with the ironstone railway path and Salt Way
- There is too much emphasis on motor sport – better to concentrate on high-tech, light engineering
- Church Lane has the potential to become Banbury's 'foodie street'
- Develop housing above shops
- Delivery of the masterplan should be through BTC, CDC and OCC

Cllr. Surinder Dhesi – **BAN-A-011**

- Education standards need to rise
- Need to tackle traffic congestion
- Need 2 hours free parking
- Need affordable housing that reflects local wages
- Encourage more people to use public transport and get contributions from new developments to pay for bus services
- Need a theatre
- Make more of the market
- Need to attract different types of shops and have lower rates of rent
- There are too many traffic lights on Oxford Road – we need to reduce them
- Where is the money going to come from for delivery?

Bodicote Parish Council – **BAN-A-012**

- The document does not provide a clear vision for the southern part of Banbury and Bodicote itself. It has not addressed what will happen south of Bankside when all the traffic is brought along this route
- P. 31 refers to a new green linkage along the southern edge of Banbury 17 – there is no mention that much of this is in Bodicote
- The town needs a theatre
- The masterplan talks about increasing public transport patronage – at the same time the County Council is withdrawing bus subsidies

Mr. & Mrs. McCallum – **BAN-A-013**

- Overall very supportive of the Masterplan
- Banbury 15 is on the 'wrong side' of the M40 which forms a logical eastern boundary for the town
- Building of a south-east relief road is essential to relieve congestion
- Providing a direct traffic-free pedestrian route between the town centre and the station is essential

Cherwell North District CPRE (C. Hone) – **BAN-A-014**

- Banbury 15 is situated to the east of the M40, we would not wish to see any further expansion here
- Relief road is helpful, but routes B and C would be preferable to route A to avoid the visual intrusion of this elevated road in the Cherwell valley
- The action areas seem appropriate, but care must be taken, especially relating to Canalside in terms of the historical significance of existing buildings

Mrs. Margaret Christer – **BAN-A-015**

- Increasing public transport patronage at odds with cuts to bus subsidies

Banbury Operatic Society – **BAN-A-016**

- There's inadequate provision for performing arts
- There's no commitment to safeguard and develop the town's only professional performance space at The Mill Arts Centre
- We urge the Council to look again at proposals for the Cultural Quarter, and seize the chance to make positive commitments to The Mill and to performing arts in general

Cllr. Steve Kilsby – **BAN-A-017**

- Disappointed there is no Neighbourhood Plan in Banbury to inform the Masterplan
- The presumption of growth in the retail sector is wrong. A smaller, more vibrant town centre is required
- Links to Grimsbury are required, whatever the cost
- There no mention as to how businesses currently operating in the Bolton Street area are to be relocated and compensated
- The task of developing areas, Canalside in particular, may generate false expectations
- Where is the political process that should guide the Vision? There is no indication that the new Banbury Task Force and its Chief Executive are to be politically accountable

Christopher Manley – **BAN-A-018**

- The biggest weakness of the report is the scant attention given to cyclists and pedestrians
- Green spaces are great, but it's a real disappointment that there is no mention of renewable energy, and only a nod towards biodiversity. Air quality if not mentioned either
- The Masterplan must respect the history of Banbury and its unique character

Robin Furneaux – **BAN-A-019**

- 'Premier regional centre', 'Regional service centre of choice', 'The powerhouse of the region' – Banbury's catchment region has not been adequately defined
- Much residential development is taking place in the south, yet out-of-town retail is to the north. It is important to ensure good road links between these
- When the bus station is relocated, an important consideration should be a transport hub where people can move quickly and easily from train to bus
- In general, the Banbury area lacks a diverse range of good restaurants
- The cost of parking in the town centre is a significant disincentive to go there
- Any retail on Cherwell Street and Canalside should be to serve the local needs only

- Is there enough room between Bodicote and Banbury for both a key green linkage and a new strategic link road?
- Green linkages should extend into the adjacent countryside to provide corridors for wildlife into and out of the town
- More detailed required on priorities and timescales

Matthew Teller – **BAN-A-020**

- The Banbury Masterplan appears to have no provision for culture, other than a poorly defined 'cultural quarter' in Spiceball that may (or may not) include The Mill – but that does allow for a multiplex cinema plus cafes and bars. This looks like leisure, not culture

The Mill Arts Centre Trust – **BAN-A-021**

- The Mill Arts Centre Trust hopes that the development of The Mill is something that will be given full and proper consideration and the Trust can work with CDC to make an active contribution to a thriving Banbury
- In terms of how we develop and grow the organisation we are close to operating at capacity and are actively reviewing how we increase this
- Although The Mill is a characterful and well-loved building, the highly skilled management and staff team along with our robust operational management systems would ensure that the business could continue to thrive and develop in an alternative location should that be the most beneficial option for the people of Banbury and surrounding community

Grundon Waste Management – **BAN-A-022**

- The Masterplan and Employment/Housing diagrams should include the implemented industrial development at the former Spital Farm Allotment site

Bruce Walton – **BAN-A-023**

- Development of better performing arts facilities is needed to match the thriving and growing local arts scene

Ms. Clare Haupt – **BAN-A-024**

- A further objective should be added. Banbury's cultural, entertainment and sporting life must also be reflected
- Improve access and movement, including cycle tracks, better public transport, M40 links, more access points to the station, better links across town
- Creating great places within the centre is critical
- Improve the old town and encourage independent shops
- Swan Industrial Estate could be used for parking or entertainment, not residential
- Protect green spaces and make parks better
- Improve the town by developing empty and unloved buildings eg. the Grand Theatre

The Canal & Rivers Trust – **BAN-A-025**

- New bridge crossings should be discussed with the Trust who own and maintain the canal to ensure that the council fully understand our position with regard to location, consent, design and on-going ownership and maintenance
- The desire to create a mooring basis should be discussed with the Trust to properly understand the required processes, possible costs and land take implications before allocating land for a use which may not prove feasible
- The canal and river corridor green lung as shown on the various proposals maps does not actually include the canal. The area should be widened to include both the canal and river

- The canal is a perfect example of multi-functional green infrastructure and such an allocation may help support requests for CIL or S106 payments to improve accessibility or environmental improvements

Framptons – Hallam Land – **BAN-A-026**

- A strategic route between east and west of the town would be better achieved with the provision of a Banbury South junction to the M40
- Action should be to engage with the Department of Transport (DfT) to promote a Banbury South M40 junction within the DfT Road Investment Strategy

Banbury Community Action Group – **BAN-A-027**

- Growth of Banbury and retail – it is possible for Banbury to be a strong service and economic centre without the need for a larger town centre footprint. Retail provision in the town centre is sufficient but disjointed and already too spread out. A smaller town centre could be busier but easier to manage
- Transport – we need to work on twenty first century solutions and sustainable, less polluting transport systems. A 'cycling culture' in Banbury should be strongly promoted
- Buildings – proposals to demolish existing buildings (eg. multi-storey car park and moving the bus station) would appear to be enormously wasteful of materials
- Environment – the 'green lung' could be directly linked to the ironstone railway walk and the Banbury Fringe Walk, as well as to the Salt Way. There needs to be greater emphasis on increasing biodiversity
- Parks – turn away from simply maintaining what is there to modernising. Create at least one 'standout', stylish and modern planting scheme. Promote community orchards/gardens. Parks such as Peoples Park are not necessarily used as destinations in themselves – there is no need to create new hard landscaping or buildings in these parks
- Bridges – we do not support a redevelopment of Canalside and, therefore, would not support a new bridge there. Improve access to north Grimsbury – pedestrian/cycling bridges
- Parking – new car parks are not required to serve new retail areas – place a greater emphasis on public transport and retention of the town's existing multi-storey car park

Banbury Town Council Labour Party – **BAN-A-028**

- The document appears not to recognise any kind of unique selling point that Banbury has and appears to portray it as a typical market town
- Growth of Banbury and retail – it is possible for Banbury to be a strong service and economic centre without the need for a larger town centre footprint. Canalside and Bolton Road developments should not necessarily become retail shopping areas. A smaller town centre could be busier but easier to manage
- Buildings – should be re-used wherever possible and housing and businesses should be on brownfield sites
- Parks – there are many parks in Banbury and, contrary to the observations in the report, these are well used and very much appreciated by the people of the town. This point should be noted
- Bridges – any pedestrian/cycling bridges for residents of Grimsbury would be of great benefit to the environment and would reduce car journey to work
- It is not a vision of Banbury as such, it could be any town
- Infrastructure must anticipate or at least run alongside new residential developments, and not follow them, or be neglected completely
- There is no big economic idea in the vision
- There is no mention of tourism. A Vision, properly wrought, should be one that advocates the use of the imagery, the legend and the facts about the Fine Lady upon a White Horse
- There is no mention of a political process that would guide the vision

North Oxfordshire Green Party – **BAN-A-029**

- Emphasis on a fast growing economy will not necessarily make Banbury a more pleasant place to live
- Should be a specific commitment to 40% affordable housing
- All new buildings should be required to meet the most rigorous environmental standards
- Increased businesses and a growing population will require management of greater quantities of waste
- Cycling and walking routes must be an essential component of any future planning
- The document pays scant attention to Banbury's architectural heritage
- Buildings should be renovated and reused rather than demolished and replaced, whenever feasible
- NOGP do not want or recognise a cultural quarter which has no culture other than a multiplex cinema and American-style food chain outlets
- NOGP is particularly concerned that the map on p. 26 appears to place another building on the footprint of The Mill
- The 'green lung' needs to be more ambitious than that shown in the Masterplan
- Air quality should feature in the Masterplan
- Micro-generation such as solar panels and heat pumps would make a substantial contribution to sustainability and should be promoted as part of the Masterplan
- NOGP would like a specific commitment to protecting and increasing biodiversity

Neville Redvers –Higgins – **BAN-A-030**

- With The Mill uncertain and Grand Theatre replaced with retail, the only culture in the 'Cultural Quarter' is the Museum and a 6-screen multiplex. If Banbury is to be the growing 'sub-regional centre' the masterplan aspires to more thought is needed to cultural well-being

Sarah Wallis – **BAN-A-031**

- Creative alternatives to car use need to be actively pursued
- There should be more open green spaces and more cycle routes

Banbury Ornithological Society – **BAN-A-32**

- BOS would like to see a commitment to creating a better Banbury for wildlife contained within the strategic objective covering the environment
- BOS strongly advocate a change to the strategic environmental objective to reflect a desire to reverse the long-term decline in nature: Create a high quality environment, establish a coherent ecological network, and achieve a net gain in biodiversity
- The Masterplan should be more ambitious in identifying areas beyond those that already exist or are associated with development
- Some of the areas already mapped as existing green spaces are not accessible (in private ownership)
- The corridor to the south of Banbury would be an ideal location for creation of accessible natural greenspace
- The area north of the Hanwell Fields housing development should be allocated as strategic green space within the Masterplan
- The establishment of the country park north of town is an ideal opportunity for the first local nature reserve in the Banbury area and for CDC to signal their commitment to biodiversity conservation in our local area
- BOS would like to see the Masterplan promote opportunities to create nesting sites for birds

Jonathan Rubery – **BAN-A-033**

- The promise of a Cultural Quarter on the old Spiceball site seems madly optimistic, given that the site already has planning permission for a supermarket. With The Mill uncertain and General Foods Social Club gone, the only culture in the 'Cultural Quarter' is the Museum and a six-screen multiplex
- The proposal to route even more traffic onto Cherwell Street is worrying

Pierangela Manzetti – **BAN-A-034**

- The promise of a Cultural Quarter on the old Spiceball site seems madly optimistic, given the site already has planning permission for a supermarket. If Banbury is to be growing 'sub-regional centre' the masterplan aspires to, the planners need to give more thought to cultural well-being than just a mainstream cinema

Thames Water – **BAN-A-035**

- Thames Water consider that there should be a section on 'Infrastructure and Utilities' in the Banbury Vision and Masterplan

Historic England – **BAN-A-036**

- The plan is relatively unambitious for the historic features of the town and EH would suggest that in places it falls short of the 'positive strategy' for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment that government policy suggests should be promoted through the Local Plan. E.g. the Banbury Conservation Area appraisal gives considerable attention to the town's medieval street pattern as a defining positive feature of the town's character, this is not mentioned in the SPD
- EH recommends an additional objective to 'Conserve and enhance Banbury's Heritage Assets and Historic Environment'
- General guidance for Canalside fails to identify how new development should respond to the character or appearance of the Oxford Canal Conservation Area
- South-east relief road – it is unclear whether the alternative routes (A, B and C) have been considered in terms of the varying potential impact on the Oxford Canal Conservation Area or what mitigation for any negative impacts would be required
- It is disappointing that the results of the conservation area appraisals have not been used to identify those buildings, landmarks and spaces identified as making a positive contribution to the conservation areas
- Bolton Road and Canalside – in addition to the retention of listed buildings, development should be required to protect the contribution made by the settings of listed buildings to their significance
- The plan is entirely silent on the matter of archaeological remains
- State that a sustainability appraisal (strategic environmental assessment) is not required for the SPD

Robinson & Hall – Swan Group – **BAN-A-037**

- The Swan Group site is located between Canal Street and Swan Close Road comprising a total area of 2.3 ha within five separate ownerships. Swan Group would be willing to work with other landowners in this parcel of land to help deliver the vision of the Masterplan

David Lock Associates (Mark Stroud) – **BAN-A-038**

- Mr Mark Stroud, the owner of land at Waterworks Lane, Banbury, objects to the proposal to designate land off Waterworks Lane, north of Hennef Way as a 'potential key green linkage', as show on the Environmental Masterplan at p. 30. The land should more appropriately be promoted and used for industrial/commercial development falling within Use Classes B1/B2/B8
- On p.31 it is stated that the quantum of the green space deficiency is 'unknown' and, therefore, it is considered that there is no sound evidence base or planning justification for the location or quantum of the new open space assets that are proposed as part of the Masterplan

Bidwells – Redrow Homes South Midlands – **BAN-A-039**

- P. 8 Masterplan and p. 10 Employment & Housing Plan – should be amended to show Banbury 16 as a committed housing allocation on the plan following the granting of outline planning permission ref: 14/01188/OUT. The committed site is also larger than the Local Plan allocation and thus what is shown on the plan

- P.14 Transport & Movement – the Banbury 16 ‘existing development area’ shown in white should be extended westwards to reflect the committed development
- P.30 Environmental Masterplan – the locations identified for strategic green spaces and potential key green linkages should be amended to reflect the consented scheme

Chiltern Railways – **BAN-A-040**

- P. 3 para 3 – the Great Central Railway opened a branch line from Culworth Junction to Banbury
- P. 3 para 6 – the train operators should be listed with Chiltern Railways followed by Cross Country and First Great Western as Banbury is a Chiltern Railways managed station. The station also connects Banbury with Oxford, Reading and Didcot. There are also longer journeys to the north and the south
- P. 15 – the station is not visible from the town centre and we would welcome improvements in the relationship between the town centre and the railway station.
- P. 23 – relocation of the bus station. The bus station should have a clear link to the railway station
- We would welcome safe and improved walking and cycle routes to the railway station

Gladman – **BAN-A-041**

- Gladman Developments support the principle of preparing a vision and Masterplan to guide the long term growth of Banbury, but the necessity of the document is questioned. Gladman consider that the document does not provide further advice or guidance to the policies contained within the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 or the Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 4
- The document must not be used as a restrictive policy document which is used in the determination of sites coming forward in Banbury which have not been identified with the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1
- It is noted from the Council's own evidence base that Banbury is already identified as fulfilling the role of a regional centre
- Whilst Gladman note that this is a Masterplan and Vision for Banbury, it is important to note that the affordability of housing is not just endemic to Banbury; it is a district wide problem
- It should be noted in the Environment Masterplan that Gladman have proposed a car park and a drop off zone and a MUGA within the strategic green space to the east of the Banbury 17 allocation, and this should be reflected on the Environment Masterplan
- Whilst Gladman note the significant infrastructure cost associated with delivering the Vision and Masterplan, they would take the opportunity to ensure that requests for infrastructure are CIL compliant in line with the tests set out at Sections 122 and 123 of the Community Infrastructure Levy

Turley – Aberdeen Asset Management – **BAN-A-042**

- The Vision and Masterplan must respond to the commercial realities of development and reflect market conditions. The plan as drafted does not reflect these important considerations
- Town Centre Vitality (p. 18/19) – the town centre retail area is inconsistent with the Town Centre Shopping Area as set out in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and should include the Spiceball site as a suitable location for retail, as well as other cultural/arts/leisure uses. The Town Centre Vitality Plan might usefully be amended to show ‘retail foodstore’ within the Spiceball area to reflect the Local Plan allocations and the outline scheme, which is subject to a resolution to grant planning permission
- Town Centre Linkages and Spaces (p. 24/25) – over emphasises (even if intended only conceptually) the potential for River Cherwell enhancements as noted in the key (and variously referred to as ‘Green Lung’ elsewhere). The Spiceball site is subject to a detailed parameter plan as part of the outline planning application. The Masterplan must take account of the parameters set by the scheme coming forward
- Town Centre Buildings and Places (p. 26/27) – the building blocks, and the key frontages shown within the Spiceball site do not reflect the development parameters of the outline scheme. The masterplan must take account of the development parameters established by the outline scheme for Spiceball. The option for Spiceball included on p. 39-40 should be amended to reflect the parameters established and the uses proposed. Need to include the food retail element

- The Masterplan does not sufficiently reflect the current or future market. The overall vision to create 'an entertainment, cultural and leisure quarter at Spiceball' will not be delivered without other retail developments including uses within Class A3 and A1 as proposed in the outline scheme

Berks, Bucks & Oxon Wildlife Trust – **BAN-A-043**

- The Trust would like to see more consideration given to the role of green space in providing for biodiversity and ecological connectivity
- Much emphasis is given to the role of the canal, but the river also provides an important connecting habitat
- There are a number of habitats that could be restored, enhanced or created to improve ecological linkage through the town and to tie in with current initiatives
- A particular opportunity in the town centre to provide ecological linkage would be wildlife enhancements at 'The Triangle', the green space between Bridge Street and the A4260

Banbury Town Council – **BAN-A-044**

- BTC would like an objective that explicitly signals that the private sector is responsible for contributing to a high-quality environment. BTC would like to see greater reference in the document to 'high-quality investment' being sought for Banbury
- BTC is worried the tone contained in the document signals to developers that Banbury is desperate for any private sector investment at any cost and this is not the case
- B8 uses can result in large building footprints with very few full-time employees. Employment figures in the Local Plan Part 1 will only be achieved if more employment intensive use types are expressly sought by development plans
- BTC continue to have major concerns that the topography of Banbury and the inclination of residents to use cars as their principle mode of transport will hinder any potential modal, transport shift within the town
- Certain through-routes the plan has identified are not deliverable owing to land ownership constraints and rights of way issues, e.g. the fields to the west of Warwick Road identified in the Environmental Masterplan (p. 30) as a possible 'enhancement of East-West connection from country park to Wroxton Abbey' have no public right of way
- In a document purporting to be both a masterplan and a vision, it's disappointing that no possible 'Western Bypass' is identified for the town
- With regards the management of a 'Town Centre Action Area' by a 'Banbury Task Force', BTC would emphasise that it's 'Town Centre Partnership' formed 9 years ago, already draws from a wide range of stakeholders involved with the town centre – the issue for it remains how to be fully empowered
- BTC would like to see a greater exploration of strategies to achieve a strengthening of the town centre retail offer in a challenging retail environment
- BTC very much support the development of Banbury 8 at the northern edge of the town centre, but are conscious that in the longer term, the town risks becoming skewed with new residential areas concentrated in the north of the town – particularly if land between Banbury 5 and 2 is developed. BTC would like to have seen a greater focus on sites immediately to the north of the existing town centre
- BTC would have liked the Masterplan to address retail opportunities as well as other regeneration opportunities in Banbury 10: Bretch Hill Regeneration Area
- BTC would have liked greater consideration of Banbury's role as a sub-regional economic hub and further examination of transport solutions that could consolidate and expand this role
- BTC also more generally have some concerns about the viability of the Masterplan moving forward, in the likely absence of sufficient funding to realise many of its proposals

David Lock Associates – **BAN-A-045**

- If the SE Relief Road is a serious proposition and is ever to be realised this would be more likely to be achieved (in the longer term) if the 36 hectares of land to the east of the A361 and north east of junction 11 (i.e. the original Banbury 15) is referred to as an ambition of the Masterplan document and allocated in an early and future review of the Local Plan
- Contributions could then be sought from this and other relevant developments served by the Relief Road, which in addition to public funding through the Local Transport Plan, could help deliver this strategic transport route

Oxfordshire County Council – **BAN-A-046**

Comments from officers

- OCC supports the principle of preparing a vision and masterplan to guide the long term growth of Banbury
- OCC supports the strong statement on governance through the 'Banbury Task Force' and agree that committed joint working is crucial to the successful delivery of the Masterplan
- The transport infrastructure schemes listed within the Masterplan align with those in LTP4. However, the following capacity improvement schemes should also be included:
 - Bloxham Road (A361) and South Bar Street junction
 - Warwick Road (B4100) roundabout junctions with the A422 Ruscot Avenue and Orchard Way
 - Bloxham Road (A361) junction with Queensway and Springfield Avenue
 - A361 Southam Road junction with Castle Street and Warwick Road
- The Air Quality Management Areas on Hennef Way and North Bar/Horsefair/South Bar need acknowledgement in the Environment section
- A Pedestrian and Cycling Improvement Strategy is unlikely to be completed by the Local Plan Part 2 review. However, when the time comes to start such work, OCC welcomes the opportunity to collaborate with Cherwell District Council
- Whilst a new strategic route between east and west has been identified in this Local Plan period up to 2031, delivery is unlikely to be, due to the sequential provision of improvements on Hennef Way and East of M40 Link Road
- Public health – the Masterplan should consider a range of projects and initiatives to improve public health (programming and outreach to increase the use of outdoor areas, inclusion of dementia friendly outdoor spaces, dementia friendly retail areas, working with businesses to prioritise pedestrians and cyclists in their travel plans)
- Education – on the main masterplan consider showing existing secondary schools and the location of the potential new secondary school at Banbury 12. Why does Banbury 12 have a redline around it?

Cllr Mark Cherry (Banbury Calthorpe)

- Implementation of a relief road needs to take place as soon as possible
- Castle Quay 2 is required to bring people back into the town centre of Banbury
- The masterplan needs to start ASAP. Where is the money coming from with the budgetary pressures at OCC?
- Buses – how will they be funded going forward with the cut in subsidies?

David Local Associates – Gallagher – **BAN-A-047**

- Gallagher Estates questions the usefulness of such a broad document that appears to have a far larger remit than Banbury town centre development and regeneration aspirations, and seeks to retrospectively create new supplementary policy aspirations for strategic allocations at Banbury identified within the Local Plan

- Much of this supplementary detail within the draft document is not in accordance with Local Plan policy. To apply supplementary design guidance retrospectively, to schemes that are sufficiently progressed, would seem to undermine, and not support the planned delivery of growth at Banbury
- Reference to the link road through Banbury 17 should be amended to read 'working with developers to deliver the spine road from the A362 to A4260 alongside the phased implementation of development of Banbury 17'.
- The Environment Masterplan identifies a 'strategic green space' centrally within the Banbury 17 allocation. This is not identified within the Local Plan Policy Banbury 17
- Reference is made to a new green linkage along the southern edge of Banbury 17. Again, this masterplan aspiration does not conform with development plan policy Banbury 17

Chris Farr – **BAN-A-048**

- The arts, culture and entertainment needs of the town and its growing population are not well catered for in this plan
- Performance space in Banbury needs to increase to the norm for national touring theatre productions, national and international musicians and performers to see the town as a viable destination for them
- If The Mill were to expand and the Grand be restored and re-opened as a modern multi-functional venue then we would stand a chance of putting on the events Banbury deserves

Neil Wild – **BAN-A-049**

- It needs to be made more explicit that the implementation of the plan relies on the public sector to act as enabler or catalyst to encourage private sector investment
- The word 'redevelopment' should be replaced with an alternative one that does not imply a demolition of key heritage buildings
- Efforts should be made to identify smaller new employment sites of 1-3 ha
- A parking strategy is need – the potential development of town centre sites identified in the plan could result in a net loss of car parking for the town centre
- Public sector funding is required to facilitate many of the proposals
- The purchase or leasing of retail property in the town centre by the local authority should be considered in order to better control and manage parts of the town
- The proposals for Bolton Road are not imaginative enough – there is the opportunity to enhance and re-use some of the key historic buildings at the back of Parsons Street – this aspect is lost in the proposals as stated
- In the context of reduced County Council funding and possible local government restructuring, measures need to be adopted to ensure these changes will not delay the public sector role required

Banbury Civic Society – **BAN-A-050**

- The Civic Society supports the overall sentiment expressed in the document. The six objectives and many of the proposals, in a general sense, are indeed very welcome
- However, it is felt that the document is poorly constructed such that, on the one hand it is not easy to unearth specific proposals and yet on the other, there are some surprisingly detailed proposals
- There is no timing, realisation strategy or resources identified in the document that could properly be called a 'plan'. It is felt that the document should be re-titled to more accurately reflect the 'visionary' aspect
- Very specific proposals should be removed or explained and justified in significant extra detail
- In respect of Banbury's heritage, it is essential that the document carries a general 'health warning' at the outset
- Heritage – the strategic objectives listed on p. 7 should be expanded to include a seventh objective to incorporate heritage as a positive objective in its own right
- Vision – there is an underlying suggestion of a completely redeveloped town centre at objective 4. The objective should be reworded to provide a more accurate impression to the reader

- Green lung – is overstated, the image on p. 35 unfortunately suggests a more likely end result, in which the canal is limited to some bankside trees
- Locally listed buildings – the image on p. 6 shows none of the locally listed buildings, which conflicts with the image on p. 35
- Economy – references are made to Employment site 'Ban 15' at M40 junction 11. This was deleted from the District Local Plan and thus the two documents are contradictory
- Transport and movement – the solution which utilises Tramway as a through route has not been recognised. The importance of the SE link road means it should be specifically mentioned in Strategic Objective 3
- There is no mention of HS2 movements
- Greater use of Cherwell Street for traffic is not compatible with the objective of improving linkages between the western sector of the town, the retail and commercial core with Grimsbury and the railway station
- A parking strategy is required
- Town centre – there is much ambivalence regarding the statistics concerning empty shops
- The proposal that Market Place becomes a public space and performance area might seem an attractive idea but it would remove a parking facility that is very convenient and much appreciated by the public and traders
- Spiceball - there appears to be 'woolly thinking' concerning the 'arts and cultural area'. There is a great deal of concern regarding the precision of the projected land uses shown and described
- Canalside – the text refers loosely to 'Significant buildings'. What is a significant building?
- Redevelopment of 67-75 Bridge Street – every effort should be made to retain these buildings and incorporate them into new development
- Bolton Road area – proposals suggest that development will extend northward. How would this happen without demolition of three listed buildings?
- St. Mary's Church area – it is not clear what is proposed here 'redevelopment of White Lion Walk' is ambiguous

Peter Monk – **BAN-A-051**

- As a 'Masterplan' it raises expectations it cannot deliver as there are no specific resources identified and the timetable is very indeterminate
- A seventh objective should be added – retention of a 'Banbury' image to ensure that the 'feel' of the historic core is maintained
- 'Comprehensive' in connection with any development proposals should be deleted as this is incompatible with the retention of heritage and streetscape
- Resolve and improve transport links so that goods and people can move freely – these are the life blood of the town and there will be no successful future unless the current situation is rectified
- The utilisation of Tramway as a through route has not been recognised
- Greater use of Cherwell Street for traffic is not compatible with the objective of improving the linkage between the town and the railway station
- There is the opportunity to link the town centre to the railway station with a new road between Cherwell Street (approx. opposite George Street) and a new 'plaza' in front of the railway station
- 'Green lung' – there is disparity between the stated aim and the artist's impressions used in the document
- Spiceball – existing establishments do not appear to have been taken into account and extant permissions are at variance with the illustrated intentions
- A 'strategic policy' for car parking is vital across the town

Natural England – **BAN-A-052**

Natural England do not provide specific comments and provide general advise on:
the provision of green infrastructure, biodiversity enhancement, landscape enhancement and design.

Natural England state that:

- SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance. Natural England would, having looked at the screening document, have no dispute with the conclusions as made within Appendix 1 of the SEA screening document that the Banbury SPD does not require an SEA.

Savills – Trinity College – **BAN-A-053**

- Overall, Trinity College supports the principle, the aims and objectives and general content of the Masterplan

Neil Wallis – **BAN-A-054**

- Broadly supportive
- More emphasis needed on the town's cultural and historical heritage allied with leisure and non-commercial opportunities
- Consider new modes of transport and ownership
- A key priority must be Canalside and improving access between the railway station and town centre

The Environment Agency, Jack Moeran - **BAN-A-055**

- State that a sustainability appraisal (strategic environmental assessment) is not required for the SPD

APPENDIX I

Appendix I

Stakeholder list

- Cherwell District Council
- Oxfordshire County Council
- Banbury Town Council
- Local Parish Councils
- Chamber of Commerce
- Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership
- South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership
- Banbury Civic Society
- Old Town Association
- Banbury Town Partnership
- Town Centre Manager
- Canal and River Trust
- Thames Water
- Rapleys LLP
- David Lock Associates
- Chiltern Railways
- Historic England
- David J Stewart Associates
- CALA Group Limited
- Gleesons
- RPS Planning and Development
- Stagecoach
- White Commercial
- Boyer Planning
- Benfield Group Holdings Ltd.
- Pandora Trading Ltd.
- Hawkstone Properties
- AdaltaReal
- Turleys
- Savills
- Aberdeen Asset Management

APPENDIX II

Appendix II

Where and when documents were made available for inspection:

www.cherwell.gov.uk/policypublicconsultation

Hard copies at the locations below during opening hours:

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

8.45am - 5.15pm Monday –Friday

Banbury Town Council, the Town Hall, Bridge Street, Banbury, OX16 5QB

Monday to Thursday 9am- 4.45pm, Friday 9am- 4pm

Banbury Library, Marlborough Road, Banbury, OX16 5DB

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Copies will be available on the North, Central and West Mobile Library Services.

For details of locations and times of the mobile library visit www.oxfordshire.gov.uk or phone 01865 810240

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

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

Bicester LinkPoint, 38 Market Square, Bicester, Oxfordshire, OX26 6AL 8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

Kidlington LinkPoint, Exeter Hall, Oxford Road, Kidlington, Oxon, OX5 1AB 8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

APPENDIX III

BANBURY VISION & MASTERPLAN

1 Introduction

Cherwell District Council has commissioned WYG to prepare a Banbury Vision & Masterplan. The Masterplan identifies projects and initiatives to help shape the future of the town and which build upon policies in the Cherwell Local Plan (2011-2031).

In summary the report:

- Articulates a future role for the town;
- Identifies areas for economic improvement;
- Provides investment confidence;
- Supports the delivery of the Cherwell Local Plan;
- Identifies a way to deliver the Canalside development;
- Promotes an attractive town centre with a full range of facilities; and,
- Identifies a series of measures to address traffic congestion and improve accessibility.

Document Status

The draft Vision & Masterplan builds upon the Cherwell Local Plan (2011-2031) adopted on 20th July 2015. The result is a flexible, realistic and deliverable strategy for the long-term growth of Banbury, which sets the framework for Part 2 of the Local Plan and the infrastructure initiatives set out in Oxfordshire County Council's Local Transport Plan 4 (LTP4). The Vision & Masterplan will be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.



This Exhibition

The draft Banbury Vision & Masterplan is available for public comments from **Monday 14th March 2016** to **Wednesday 13th April 2016**.

We would like your views on the Masterplan and on how we should guide future development and the town's growth.

Question 1: Do you support the principle of preparing a vision and masterplan to guide the long-term growth of Banbury?



For further information:
www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk/policypublicconsultation
planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
01295 227985



BANBURY VISION & MASTERPLAN

2 Vision and Strategic Objectives


The Vision

The VISION for Banbury is a premier regional centre with a fast growing economy developed from the strengths of the area; and at its heart, a vibrant and attractive town centre, set in a high quality and distinctive environment with greater housing choice, improved accessibility and a reduction of traffic congestion.

Objectives

The vision is formed from six inter-connecting strategic objectives that will:

- Promote Banbury as the regional service centre of choice for the wider region;
- Establish a strong economy;
- Reduce congestion and improve accessibility;
- Create a vibrant and attractive town centre;
- Create a high quality environment and distinctive character to live and work; and
- Promote opportunities for local people.



Concept Masterplan

The concept masterplan identifies five key initiatives that underpin the Banbury Vision & Masterplan:

- Locations for housing to deliver Cherwell Local Plan housing requirements to 2031;
- A range of employment opportunities that will reinforce the role of Banbury in the regional economy;
- A transport and movement strategy that addresses congestion and assists in delivering sustainable growth;
- A Town Centre Action Area to manage a co-ordinated and comprehensive redevelopment and improvement of Banbury town centre; and
- A 'green lung' to the town created from the enhancement of the canal and the riverfront area together with a network of open spaces to improve the setting of the town.

Question 2: Do you support the six strategic objectives?



Question 3: Do you support the initiatives that underpin the Concept Masterplan?



For further information:
www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk/policypublicconsultation
planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
 01295 227985

BANBURY VISION & MASTERPLAN

3 Economy


Employment

The creation of a strong economy is central to the Banbury Vision & Masterplan. An improvement in economic activity is key to the long term sustainable development of Banbury. Economic growth will be promoted by: maintaining a strong manufacturing sector; diversifying into higher skilled and knowledge based opportunities; support for skills acquisition; and, by driving the engineering economy through the flagship sectors of motor sport and advanced engineering. This will be delivered on: two new allocated employment sites; renewal of the existing employment areas; and revitalisation of the town centre.

Housing

The Cherwell Local Plan sets a requirement of 7,319 new dwellings for Banbury between 2011 and 2031. Increased housing supply will improve affordability and support economic growth. The delivery of the new housing is well underway with a number of the allocated sites being developed with others in the detailed planning process. The majority of allocated sites are around the periphery of the town with the remainder forming part of the town centre development sites.

Question 4: Are there any other employment/housing issues that need to be addressed?



Employment and housing

Employment sites

- **Banbury 1:** Banbury Canalside - the redevelopment of the mixed use 26 hectares Canalside area located close to the town centre and railway station.
- **Banbury 6:** Employment land east of the M40 - a mixed use employment site of 35 hectares adjacent to existing employment areas with good links to the motorway.
- **Banbury 7:** Banbury Town Centre - the strengthening of the town centre.
- **Banbury 8:** Land at Bolton Road - the development of the Bolton Road site on the northern edge of the town centre alongside Castle Street.
- **Banbury 9:** Spiceball Development Area - the development of the Spiceball area located between the Spiceball Leisure Centre and the Castle Quay Shopping Centre.
- **Banbury 15:** Employment land east of the M40 - a new strategic employment site of 13 hectares located next to junction 11 of the M40 to deliver the planned growth in advanced engineering and knowledge based industries.
- **Existing employment areas** - will be reviewed to identify the potential for improvement and renewal through the designation of Employment Improvement Areas.



Artist's impression showing the potential long term redevelopment of Canalside

For further information:
www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk/policypublicconsultation
planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
 01295 227985


BANBURY VISION & MASTERPLAN

4 Transport and Movement

Consultation by Oxfordshire County Council during the preparation of the LTP4 identified traffic congestion as a major concern, which needs to be addressed together with transport solutions to manage the growth of the town.

The following strategic transport solutions are proposed:

- Improve the transport networks into and through the town - reduce congestion through a co-ordinated network strategy to improve junction capacity, signage and construct new roads in some locations;
- Identify a new strategic route between the east and west of the town - consider the options for a new viable and fundable crossing of the railway, canal and river to improve east-west access to the motorway;
- Strengthen the connection between the town centre and railway station;
- Increase public transport patronage;
- Increase pedestrian and cycle activity; and
- Establish a car parking strategy.



Artist's impression showing potential improvements to Cherwell Street and its junction with Bridge Street

Question 5: Are there any other strategic transport issues that need to be considered?



For further information:
www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk/policypublicconsultation
planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
 01295 227985




BANBURY VISION & MASTERPLAN

5 Town Centre Action Plan

Initiatives

The strategy plans identify the key initiatives that will deliver a vibrant and attractive town centre, which includes:

- Enhancing the town centre experience by: removing congestion; improving choice; increasing accessibility; creating great places; and entertaining visitors.
- Strengthening the town centre offer with new leisure, cultural, retail and social opportunities;
- Enabling the development of the two strategic town centre sites of Bolton Road and Spiceball;
- Regenerating underutilised sites and areas such as Canalside;
- Opening up vacant shops with temporary uses;
- Promoting a calendar of activities and events;
- Opening up the Oxford Canal to the town centre;
- Strengthening the connection between the railway station and the town centre;
- Improving bus services and access into and across the town centre; and
- Encouraging housing development on appropriate sites within the town centre.



Question 6: Do you support the key town centre initiatives?

Question 7: Do you support the proposals set out on the town centre plans?

For further information:
www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk/policypublicconsultation
planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
 01295 227985

BANBURY VISION & MASTERPLAN

6 Town Centre Action Plan

Action Areas

The Banbury Vision & Masterplan identifies a number of areas within the town centre where regeneration and renewal will be focused and sets out key urban design principles to guide redevelopment. These areas are:



- Canalside development area;
- Spiceball development area;
- Cherwell Street corridor;
- Bolton Road development area;
- Swan Industrial Estate;
- Calthorpe Street area; and
- St. Mary's Church area.

Masterplan

The Town Centre Masterplan provides an illustration of the range of buildings, spaces, roads and parks that could be developed over time.

Implementation

The six town centre plans provide a framework to guide the implementation of the planning policies set out in the Cherwell Local Plan.



Artist's impression showing the potential redevelopment of the Calthorpe Street area

Question 8: Do you agree that the action areas identified should be the focus of regeneration activities?

For further information:
www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk/policypublicconsultation
planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
 01295 227985


BANBURY VISION & MASTERPLAN

7 Environment

A good quality and attractive environment is essential to delivering the Banbury Vision and is the 'glue' that holds all the initiatives together. The quality of the environment needs to be improved by providing:

- A north-south green lung that improves access to the town centre and opens up the canal and river;
- New public spaces and green links connecting the neighbourhoods together;
- Attractive gateways into the town;
- A richer more diverse bio-environment; and
- New open space and amenity areas to serve the needs of residents.

The Environment Masterplan identifies core principles for the enhanced connectivity of the existing green infrastructure of the town alongside the development of new assets. A series of strategic environmental enhancements should be made, which could include integrated cycle and pedestrian networks.



Strategic Environmental Enhancements

- An improved interface between Spiceball Park and the canal/river green lung linking with the town centre.
- The continued development of the country park extending the green lung to the north of the town connecting the urban fringe with the urban hinterland beyond.
- Greening of the town centre improving east-west connectivity from People's Park to an enhanced green lung along the river/canal corridor.
- Greening of the primary north-south vehicular route along the South Bar Street/Horsefair corridor in conjunction with improved traffic solutions to ease traffic congestion in these areas.
- Development of a new green linkage along the south edge of Banbury 17 connecting new development and associated open space at Banbury 16 and Bankside Phase 1.
- Connection of Salt Way to the improved north-south green lung along the canal/river corridor.
- Improved cycling and walking routes should be provided radiating from the town centre to satellite settlements encouraging the adoption of alternative transport methods.
- Development and management of the existing east-west connection along the dismantled railway line to assist in the integration of the country park into the existing green network.



Question 9: Do you support the proposals set out in the Environment Masterplan?

For further information:
www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk/policypublicconsultation
planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
 01295 227985



BANBURY VISION & MASTERPLAN

8 Delivering the Masterplan

People

The public sector can provide the vision; the private sector the investment and entrepreneurship; and, the people of Banbury the energy to deliver the planned economic growth. However, local people need to be supported with improved skills, facilities and local services to enable them to play a full role. Areas of deprivation need to be continually addressed and life chances improved.

The Vision & Masterplan sets out ways to promote opportunities for local people, including:

- Increase housing choice and tenure;
- Improve access to apprenticeships, skills training and further education;
- Increase local employment opportunities;
- Reduce poverty, health inequalities and support the vulnerable;
- Access to health, social and community services;
- Provide a full range of sports, leisure and recreational facilities; and
- Invest in a network of attractive green spaces and parks for daily enjoyment.



Delivery

The strategic objectives of the masterplan will be delivered through a range of initiatives and projects, which together will deliver an enhanced regional role for the town.



Next Steps

Cherwell District Council will review the questionnaires and comments, and will then make appropriate changes to the draft Vision & Masterplan. Once the changes have been made, the Vision & Masterplan will be adopted by Cherwell District Council as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD).

The draft Masterplan report and questionnaire are available to download from the Council website. Hard copies are also available to view at all libraries within the District, at Linkpoints and at Council offices.

Question 10: Do you have any other comments?

Thank you for visiting this exhibition

For further information:
www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk/policypublicconsultation
planning.policy@cherwell-dc.gov.uk
01295 227985



