

| Rep No.   | First Name           | Surname           | Organisation                 |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------------|------------------------------|
| PR-B-0002 | Kerry                | Wilce             |                              |
| PR-B-0003 | Robert               | Armstrong         |                              |
| PR-B-0004 | Cathy                | Fleet             | Lower Heyford Parish Council |
| PR-B-0005 | Peter                | Jay               |                              |
| PR-B-0006 | Ian                  | East              |                              |
| PR-B-0007 | James                | Philpott          |                              |
| PR-B-0008 | Bilham               | Woods             |                              |
| PR-B-0009 | Colin and Gillian    | Watts             |                              |
| PR-B-0010 | Tina                 | Davies            |                              |
| PR-B-0011 | Simon                | Marsh             | The Battlefields Trust       |
| PR-B-0012 | Alan                 | Joy               |                              |
| PR-B-0013 | Bernadette           | Evans             |                              |
| PR-B-0014 | Rev George           | Fryer             |                              |
| PR-B-0015 | Moira                | Speakman          |                              |
| PR-B-0016 | Anne                 | Hine              |                              |
| PR-B-0017 | Fay                  | Plumb             |                              |
| PR-B-0018 | Anumod               | Gujral            |                              |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward               | Dowler            | Middle Aston Parish Meeting  |
| PR-B-0020 | Dr Bridget and Mr    | Atkins and Clarke |                              |
| PR-B-0021 | Kenneth              | Porter            | Cropredy Parish Council      |
| PR-B-0022 | L                    | Brennan           |                              |
| PR-B-0023 | Frances              | Cotton            |                              |
| PR-B-0024 | Carolyn and Benjamin | Capel             |                              |
| PR-B-0025 | P F                  | Green             |                              |
| PR-B-0026 | Mr and Mrs A         | Drury             |                              |
| PR-B-0027 | Shirley              | Steventon         |                              |
| PR-B-0029 | Sonia                | Morgan            |                              |
| PR-B-0030 | Mr and Mrs M         | Pearce            |                              |
| PR-B-0031 | Todd                 | Huffman           |                              |
| PR-B-0032 | Damian and Sharon    | Hill              |                              |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry                | Munday            |                              |
| PR-B-0034 | Mark                 | Ashe              |                              |
| PR-B-0035 | Victoria             | Sayell            |                              |
| PR-B-0036 | David                | Blowers           |                              |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford             | Jones             |                              |
| PR-B-0038 | Ernest               | Edgar             |                              |
| PR-B-0039 | Susan                | Cooper            |                              |
| PR-B-0040 | Karl                 | Bushell           |                              |
| PR-B-0041 | David                | Pratt             |                              |
| PR-B-0042 | Vivien               | Armstrong         |                              |
| PR-B-0043 | Simon                | Dacombe           | Thames Valley Police         |
| PR-B-0044 | Janet                | Moore             |                              |
| PR-B-0045 | Mark                 | Ford-Langstaff    |                              |
| PR-B-0046 | Caroline             | Thompson          |                              |
| PR-B-0047 | Steve and Julia      | Cross and Taylor  |                              |
| PR-B-0048 | C L                  | Goldsworthy       |                              |
| PR-B-0049 | John                 | Mildenhall        |                              |
| PR-B-0050 | Anne                 | Prince            |                              |
| PR-B-0051 | A M                  | George            |                              |
| PR-B-0052 | S                    | Kerry             |                              |
| PR-B-0053 | Joan                 | Arthur            |                              |
| PR-B-0054 | John                 | Penny             |                              |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia              | Hall              |                              |
| PR-B-0056 | S                    | Virrill           |                              |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew              | Taylor            | Aitchison Rafferty           |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony              | Hall              |                              |
| PR-B-0059 | Celia                | Walton            |                              |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue                  | Mackrell          | Bicester Town Council        |
| PR-B-0061 | Mr and Mrs R         | Gynes             |                              |
| PR-B-0062 | S                    | Fisher            |                              |
| PR-B-0063 | Mr and Mrs P         | Duffy             |                              |
| PR-B-0064 | Mrs P S              | Rice              |                              |
| PR-B-0065 | Kathryn              | Gould             |                              |
| PR-B-0066 | Ros                  | Avery             |                              |
| PR-B-0067 | M                    | Beesley           |                              |
| PR-B-0068 | Anne                 | Pearce            |                              |
| PR-B-0069 | Richard L            | Eddy              |                              |
| PR-B-0070 | Sheila               | Nichols           |                              |
| PR-B-0071 | Norma                | Stallard          |                              |
| PR-B-0072 | G                    | Tasker            |                              |
| PR-B-0073 | Mrs M                | Sammons           |                              |
| PR-B-0074 | Dr S                 | Bhandare          |                              |
| PR-B-0075 | Philip V F           | Kavanagh          |                              |

| Rep No.   | First Name           | Surname             | Organisation |
|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| PR-B-0076 | Melanie              | Green               |              |
| PR-B-0077 | Mrs                  | Patten              |              |
| PR-B-0078 | Anthony              | Churchill           |              |
| PR-B-0079 | David and Susan      | Cantwell            |              |
| PR-B-0080 | Lee                  | Hewlett             |              |
| PR-B-0081 | Linda                | Beattie             |              |
| PR-B-0082 | Felicity             | Emptage             |              |
| PR-B-0084 | Mrs B                | Wright              |              |
| PR-B-0085 | Denise               | Greenspan           |              |
| PR-B-0086 | Richard and Stephen  | Danbury             |              |
| PR-B-0087 | Danby and Sandy      | Bloch               |              |
| PR-B-0088 | Dr M A               | Fraser              |              |
| PR-B-0089 | John and Sue         | Jenkins             |              |
| PR-B-0090 | Louise               | Gregory             |              |
| PR-B-0091 | Eleanor              | Mace                |              |
| PR-B-0092 | Allen                | Souch               |              |
| PR-B-0093 | Mr and Mrs           | Guest               |              |
| PR-B-0094 | Tatiana              | Iseborn             |              |
| PR-B-0095 | Rachael              | McTegart            |              |
| PR-B-0096 | Philip P             | Skipp               |              |
| PR-B-0097 | M                    | Eastley             |              |
| PR-B-0098 | Mr and Mrs D M       | Steffens            |              |
| PR-B-0099 | Jane                 | Wilson              |              |
| PR-B-0101 | A                    | Pigram              |              |
| PR-B-0102 | Lucy                 | Moore               |              |
| PR-B-0103 | Kelly                | Williams            |              |
| PR-B-0104 | Terence G            | Denton              |              |
| PR-B-0105 | Mr and Mrs           | Grant               |              |
| PR-B-0106 | Vassilis             | Karatzios           |              |
| PR-B-0108 | Nikrouz              | Soheili             |              |
| PR-B-0109 | Edwin                | Southern            |              |
| PR-B-0110 | Drs Victoria and Guy | Slater and Harrison |              |
| PR-B-0111 | Mrs J                | Hall                |              |
| PR-B-0114 | Sandra               | Whitfield           |              |
| PR-B-0115 | Helen and David      | Allen               |              |
| PR-B-0116 | D                    | Ives                |              |
| PR-B-0117 | Mrs L                | Ives                |              |
| PR-B-0118 | A J                  | Cooper              |              |
| PR-B-0119 | C A                  | McCall              |              |
| PR-B-0120 | E                    | Tonkin              |              |
| PR-B-0122 | A                    | Dyer                |              |
| PR-B-0123 | Alison               | Ingram              |              |
| PR-B-0124 | Mary and Paul        | Layland             |              |
| PR-B-0125 | Mr and Mrs           | Dixon               |              |
| PR-B-0126 | Michael              | Gardner             |              |
| PR-B-0127 | D                    | Richens             |              |
| PR-B-0128 | Mr and Mrs A         | McMullen            |              |
| PR-B-0129 | R and J              | Morgan              |              |
| PR-B-0130 | James                | Walton              |              |
| PR-B-0131 | S                    | Mason               |              |
| PR-B-0132 | D J and M J          | Pretty and Brind    |              |
| PR-B-0133 | Miss L E             | Jackson             |              |
| PR-B-0134 | V N                  | Smith               |              |
| PR-B-0135 | CG and RW            | Lewis               |              |
| PR-B-0136 | Matthew and Anne     | McNeile             |              |
| PR-B-0137 | Katie                | Butler              |              |
| PR-B-0138 | Mrs Denise           | Buick               |              |
| PR-B-0139 | K and P              | McCarthy            |              |
| PR-B-0140 | Jan and Andy         | Hodgson             |              |
| PR-B-0141 | A                    | Hadaway             |              |
| PR-B-0142 | Michael C            | Warmington          |              |
| PR-B-0143 | Mrs C                | Wilkins             |              |
| PR-B-0144 | M and J              | Dabney              |              |
| PR-B-0145 | Jo and Giles         | Charrington         |              |
| PR-B-0146 | Craig                | Williams            |              |
| PR-B-0147 | Carl G L             | Smith               |              |
| PR-B-0148 | Mrs J E              | Stedman             |              |
| PR-B-0149 | Linda and Derek      | Foster              |              |
| PR-B-0150 | Patrick and Julia    | Marcks              |              |
| PR-B-0151 | Prof John            | Batchelor           |              |
| PR-B-0152 | Henrietta            | Batchelor           |              |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul                 | Goulding QC         |              |
| PR-B-0154 | Hannah               | Hale                |              |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname          | Organisation  |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------|---|
| PR-B-0156 | Val                    | Colby            | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                    |
| PR-B-0157 | Jon                    | Waite            | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Newcore Capital Management LLP |
| PR-B-0158 | Jon                    | Waite            | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Mewslade (Eastern) Ltd         |
| PR-B-0159 | Jon                    | Waite            | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Sheehan Group of Companies     |
| PR-B-0160 | Dr Matthew             | Cheetham         | Summertown Health Centre                                  |
| PR-B-0162 | Robert                 | Lawrence         | South Newington Parish Council                            |
| PR-B-0163 | Wendy and John         | Castle           |   |
| PR-B-0165 | Stuart                 | Dunlop           |   |
| PR-B-0166 | Mark                   | Webb             |   |
| PR-B-0167 | Francis                | Josephs          |   |
| PR-B-0168 | Paula                  | Staples          |   |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin                  | Carrit           |   |
| PR-B-0170 | Andrea                 | Johnson          |   |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter                  | Worth            |   |
| PR-B-0172 | A                      | Platt            |   |
| PR-B-0173 | Janet                  | Persson          |   |
| PR-B-0175 | Mr D and Mrs S         | Rudd             |   |
| PR-B-0176 | Robert                 | McGurrin         | Woodstock Action Group                                    |
| PR-B-0177 | Nick                   | McEwen           |   |
| PR-B-0178 | Craig and Melanie      | Carter           |   |
| PR-B-0179 | Mr and Mrs             | Pickard          |   |
| PR-B-0180 | Dr Ben                 | Allen            |   |
| PR-B-0181 | Diane and Darryl       | Bates-Brownsword |   |
| PR-B-0182 | Jon                    | Spinage          |   |
| PR-B-0183 | Cathy                  | Spinage          |   |
| PR-B-0184 | Roger                  | Prince           |   |
| PR-B-0185 | Terrence               | Yeatman          |   |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                   | Walker           | Oxford Bus Company  |
| PR-B-0187 | Christine              | Brooks           |   |
| PR-B-0188 | Hilary and Gordon      | Lord             |   |
| PR-B-0189 | Sarah                  | Baughan          |   |
| PR-B-0190 | Mr and Mrs             | Dowler           |   |
| PR-B-0191 | Xiaohui                | Wu               |   |
| PR-B-0192 | Christopher and Shirle | Jarvis           |   |
| PR-B-0193 | D J                    | Wintersgill      |   |
| PR-B-0194 | Philip                 | Hine             |   |
| PR-B-0196 | Christopher            | Jarvis           |   |
| PR-B-0197 | Dr Margaret            | Barrett          |   |
| PR-B-0198 | Trevor                 | Cusi             |   |
| PR-B-0199 | Anne                   | Davies           | Piddington Parish Council                                 |
| PR-B-0200 | John and Elizabeth     | Gittings         |   |
| PR-B-0201 | Dr Catherine           | Grebenik         |   |
| PR-B-0202 | Ian                    | Gordon           |   |
| PR-B-0203 | John                   | Hayes            |   |
| PR-B-0204 | Peter                  | Beasley          |   |
| PR-B-0206 | Andrew                 | McCallum         |   |
| PR-B-0207 | Susan                  | Robertson        |   |
| PR-B-0208 | David                  | Wintersgill      |   |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia      | Jennings         |   |
| PR-B-0210 | Catherine              | Henderson        |   |
| PR-B-0213 | Linda                  | Browning         |   |
| PR-B-0214 | Dr Michael and Mrs     | Foster           |   |
| PR-B-0215 | Neil                   | Roberts          |   |
| PR-B-0216 | Mrs Patricia           | Yendle           |   |
| PR-B-0217 | Synetta                | Robinson         |   |
| PR-B-0218 | Mrs Barbara            | Sharlott         |   |
| PR-B-0219 | V                      | Masey            |   |
| PR-B-0220 | Joy                    | Barrett          |   |
| PR-B-0221 | J V                    | Barber           |   |
| PR-B-0222 | Malcolm                | Axtell           |   |
| PR-B-0223 | P M                    | Vandermin        |   |
| PR-B-0224 | Rev Peter              | Hewis            |   |
| PR-B-0226 | Melanie                | Dempster         |   |
| PR-B-0227 | M J                    | Moore            |   |
| PR-B-0228 | S                      | Newell           |   |
| PR-B-0229 | Julia                  | Long             |   |
| PR-B-0230 | Colin                  | Goodgame         |   |
| PR-B-0231 | Mr and Mrs             | Nutbrown         |   |
| PR-B-0232 | Mrs Marjorie           | Kilby            |   |
| PR-B-0234 | Prof Roger             | Davies           |   |
| PR-B-0235 | Bruce                  | Tremayne         |   |
| PR-B-0236 | R                      | Hearn            |   |
| PR-B-0237 | J A                    | Burt             |   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname              | Organisation |
|-----------|---------------------|----------------------|--------------|
| PR-B-0238 | D A                 | Burt                 |              |
| PR-B-0239 | Mrs P R             | Buls                 |              |
| PR-B-0240 | Mrs Carole          | Walton               |              |
| PR-B-0241 | Richard             | Walton               |              |
| PR-B-0243 | Michael             | Harris               |              |
| PR-B-0244 | Steve               | Taberner             |              |
| PR-B-0245 | Mr R                | Sawala               |              |
| PR-B-0246 | Fiona               | Gibson               |              |
| PR-B-0247 | E                   | Lewis                |              |
| PR-B-0248 | Liam                | King                 |              |
| PR-B-0249 | S                   | Jones                |              |
| PR-B-0250 | Mr and Mrs R        | Wheeler              |              |
| PR-B-0251 | Kevin               | Bezant               |              |
| PR-B-0252 | Amanda              | Platt                |              |
| PR-B-0253 | Harry               | Platt                |              |
| PR-B-0254 | Samantha            | Keates               |              |
| PR-B-0255 | Andrew              | Platt                |              |
| PR-B-0256 | Mrs Anne            | Sharp                |              |
| PR-B-0257 | J C                 | Webb                 |              |
| PR-B-0259 | Andrew and Andrea   | West                 |              |
| PR-B-0260 | Chris               | Pack                 |              |
| PR-B-0262 | Peter and Christine | Stevenson            |              |
| PR-B-0264 | Prof Adrian and Mrs | Sutton and White     |              |
| PR-B-0265 | Susan               | Ganter               |              |
| PR-B-0266 | J M                 | Titchmarsh           |              |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole              | Pack                 |              |
| PR-B-0268 | Mrs Margaret        | Seume                |              |
| PR-B-0270 | Patricia            | Cove                 |              |
| PR-B-0271 | Katrin              | Magorrian            |              |
| PR-B-0272 | Charlotte           | Evans                |              |
| PR-B-0273 | Julia               | Middleton            |              |
| PR-B-0274 | Rob                 | Chambers             |              |
| PR-B-0275 | Mr and Mrs PB       | Jeffreys             |              |
| PR-B-0276 | D                   | Bloomer              |              |
| PR-B-0277 | Alison              | Weston               |              |
| PR-B-0278 | Colin               | Fisher               |              |
| PR-B-0279 | Anne                | Todd                 |              |
| PR-B-0280 | John                | Weston               |              |
| PR-B-0281 | Sandra A            | Taylor               |              |
| PR-B-0282 | Richard             | Taylor               |              |
| PR-B-0284 | Marilyn             | Marshall             |              |
| PR-B-0285 | Michael             | De Selincourt        |              |
| PR-B-0286 | A                   | Mayes-Baker          |              |
| PR-B-0287 | Peggy               | Edgington            |              |
| PR-B-0289 | David               | Wells                |              |
| PR-B-0292 | Kim Wah             | Lee                  |              |
| PR-B-0293 | N                   | Blake                |              |
| PR-B-0294 | KP                  | Lloyd                |              |
| PR-B-0296 | Patricia            | Campbell-Meikle John |              |
| PR-B-0297 | SJ                  | Wickson              |              |
| PR-B-0298 | John                | Wakefield            |              |
| PR-B-0299 | John                | Sullivan             |              |
| PR-B-0300 | B                   | Eastgate             |              |
| PR-B-0301 | B                   | Pickard              |              |
| PR-B-0302 | Beth                | Morgan               |              |
| PR-B-0303 | Mark                | Butler               |              |
| PR-B-0304 | Sherene             | Butler               |              |
| PR-B-0305 | A                   | Eastgate             |              |
| PR-B-0306 | C                   | Mills                |              |
| PR-B-0307 | L                   | Brooks               |              |
| PR-B-0308 | Kasey               | Butler               |              |
| PR-B-0309 | Simon and Sue       | Parker               |              |
| PR-B-0310 | David               | Surman               |              |
| PR-B-0311 | John                | Edwards              |              |
| PR-B-0312 | Imran               | Rahman               |              |
| PR-B-0313 | Paul                | Davies               |              |
| PR-B-0314 | Claire              | Brandon              |              |
| PR-B-0315 | LP                  | Passant              |              |
| PR-B-0316 |                     | Holt                 |              |
| PR-B-0317 | Tom                 | Daggitt              |              |
| PR-B-0318 | S                   | Ward                 |              |
| PR-B-0319 | AC                  | Marchant             |              |
| PR-B-0320 | E                   | Holdak               |              |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname     | Organisation |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------|--------------|
| PR-B-0321 | Adrian             | White       |              |
| PR-B-0322 | Amy                | White       |              |
| PR-B-0323 | Martin             | Long        |              |
| PR-B-0324 | Kim                | Taplin      |              |
| PR-B-0325 | Arthur Jeremy      | Hilton      |              |
| PR-B-0326 | D                  | Nolan       |              |
| PR-B-0327 | June               | Hackney     |              |
| PR-B-0329 | E                  | Mason       |              |
| PR-B-0330 | Wendy              | Manners     |              |
| PR-B-0331 | Margaret           | Duffield    |              |
| PR-B-0332 | SG                 | Warburton   |              |
| PR-B-0333 | David and Joanne   | Phillips    |              |
| PR-B-0334 | J                  | Watts       |              |
| PR-B-0335 | June               | Simnett     |              |
| PR-B-0336 | JB                 | Weston      |              |
| PR-B-0337 | P                  | Abraham     |              |
| PR-B-0338 | Susan              | Hooker      |              |
| PR-B-0339 | David E            | Sawyer      |              |
| PR-B-0340 | Susan              | Booker      |              |
| PR-B-0341 | S and P            | Cranfield   |              |
| PR-B-0342 | E                  | Hughes      |              |
| PR-B-0343 | RC                 | Brown       |              |
| PR-B-0344 | Mr and Mrs Anthony | Stewart     |              |
| PR-B-0345 | R                  | Norrie      |              |
| PR-B-0346 | Grace              | Sim         |              |
| PR-B-0347 | Peter              | Mackintosh  |              |
| PR-B-0348 | Rosalind           | Franklin    |              |
| PR-B-0349 | C                  | Ripps       |              |
| PR-B-0350 | Malcolm            | Cook        |              |
| PR-B-0351 | Barbara            | Cook        |              |
| PR-B-0352 | Alan A             | Green       |              |
| PR-B-0354 | Kieran             | Brooks      |              |
| PR-B-0355 | John               | Warland     |              |
| PR-B-0356 | M                  | Sims        |              |
| PR-B-0357 | Mrs Y              | Amner       |              |
| PR-B-0358 | GP                 | Goddard     |              |
| PR-B-0359 | JE                 | Goddard     |              |
| PR-B-0360 | Philippa           | Burrell     |              |
| PR-B-0361 | M and V            | Pratley     |              |
| PR-B-0362 | Maura              | Cordell     |              |
| PR-B-0363 | Mr and Mrs BV      | Port        |              |
| PR-B-0364 | LG                 | Kennell     |              |
| PR-B-0365 | Gillian            | Thurling    |              |
| PR-B-0366 | J                  | Franklin    |              |
| PR-B-0367 | Jennifer           | Colegrove   |              |
| PR-B-0368 | S                  | Willoughby  |              |
| PR-B-0369 | B                  | May         |              |
| PR-B-0370 | Robin and Wendy    | Cowley      |              |
| PR-B-0371 | David              | Thurling    |              |
| PR-B-0372 | Joanne             | Collett     |              |
| PR-B-0373 | Michael            | Crowther    |              |
| PR-B-0374 | Mr and Mrs E       | Varney      |              |
| PR-B-0375 | Mr and Mrs C       | Hodgkins    |              |
| PR-B-0376 | Christine          | Howard      |              |
| PR-B-0377 | MJ                 | Kelly       |              |
| PR-B-0378 | Karen              | Keene       |              |
| PR-B-0379 | George             | Wakefield   |              |
| PR-B-0380 | C                  | Shenton     |              |
| PR-B-0382 | S                  | Shenton     |              |
| PR-B-0383 | Mrs M G            | Kibby       |              |
| PR-B-0384 | AJ                 | Andrews     |              |
| PR-B-0385 | N                  | Payne       |              |
| PR-B-0386 | Annabel            | Kastiek     |              |
| PR-B-0387 | Heather            | Bishop      |              |
| PR-B-0388 | PW                 | Harvey      |              |
| PR-B-0389 | Paul               | Mackilligin |              |
| PR-B-0390 | Lee                | Pickard     |              |
| PR-B-0391 | L                  | Boodell     |              |
| PR-B-0392 | MR                 | Ryan        |              |
| PR-B-0393 | R                  | Quinnell    |              |
| PR-B-0394 | Marie              | Griffin     | ;            |
| PR-B-0396 | Annabelle          | Mundy       |              |
| PR-B-0398 | Michael            | Darke       |              |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname             | Organisation |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| PR-B-0399 | Harry               | Mundy               |              |
| PR-B-0401 | Chris               | Digweed             |              |
| PR-B-0402 | Alison              | Digweed             |              |
| PR-B-0403 | Lindsay             | Gregory             |              |
| PR-B-0404 | Caroline            | Gregory             |              |
| PR-B-0405 | Philip              | Kilby               |              |
| PR-B-0406 | FA                  | Williams            |              |
| PR-B-0407 | Helen               | Newman              |              |
| PR-B-0408 | Ian                 | Howdill             |              |
| PR-B-0409 | Emma                | Mundy               |              |
| PR-B-0412 | Stephen             | Youngman            |              |
| PR-B-0413 | Mary                | Merrills            |              |
| PR-B-0418 | HW                  | Mitchell            |              |
| PR-B-0419 | BM                  | Brown               |              |
| PR-B-0420 | B                   | Haxton              |              |
| PR-B-0422 | Ruth                | Davies              |              |
| PR-B-0423 | J                   | Davies              |              |
| PR-B-0424 | Danny               | Griffin             |              |
| PR-B-0425 | L                   | Sullivan            |              |
| PR-B-0426 | Ash V               | Smith               |              |
| PR-B-0427 | Philip A            | Rawlins             |              |
| PR-B-0428 | Yvonne              | Bunn                |              |
| PR-B-0429 | C                   | Andrews             |              |
| PR-B-0430 | Peter               | Clayton             |              |
| PR-B-0431 | Gary                | Bateman             |              |
| PR-B-0432 | I                   | Andrews             |              |
| PR-B-0434 | R                   | Hardwick            |              |
| PR-B-0435 | PB                  | Johnson             |              |
| PR-B-0436 | Elaine              | Simonds             |              |
| PR-B-0437 | AP                  | Applegarth          |              |
| PR-B-0440 | N                   | Carr                |              |
| PR-B-0441 | Roy                 | Furniss             |              |
| PR-B-0442 | Irina               | Bystron             |              |
| PR-B-0443 | Mr P J              | Ibson               |              |
| PR-B-0444 | David               | Norris              |              |
| PR-B-0445 | V                   | Truby               |              |
| PR-B-0446 | M                   | Truby               |              |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright          |              |
| PR-B-0448 | Mr and Mrs A        | Thompson            |              |
| PR-B-0449 | E and N             | Morris              |              |
| PR-B-0450 | R and B             | Davies and Fenemore |              |
| PR-B-0451 | M and C             | Orr                 |              |
| PR-B-0452 | MI                  | Reed                |              |
| PR-B-0453 | Marion J            | Wakeling            |              |
| PR-B-0454 | Roger               | Panaman             |              |
| PR-B-0455 | Michael John        | Wilton              |              |
| PR-B-0456 | DJC                 | Lyke                |              |
| PR-B-0458 | Laurance and Faith  | McKeever            |              |
| PR-B-0459 | H and C             | Wardrop             |              |
| PR-B-0460 | Paul                | Spokes              |              |
| PR-B-0461 | Mr and Mrs J S      | Holland             |              |
| PR-B-0462 | Mr and Mrs R        | Bullock             |              |
| PR-B-0463 | Mary                | Lunn                |              |
| PR-B-0464 | Simon               | Hedges              |              |
| PR-B-0465 | Howard and Joan     | James               |              |
| PR-B-0466 | David               | Smith               |              |
| PR-B-0467 | NT and R            | Simpson             |              |
| PR-B-0469 | Paula               | Hastings            |              |
| PR-B-0471 | N                   | Carrier             |              |
| PR-B-0472 | Harry               | Carrier             |              |
| PR-B-0473 | Ken                 | Marsland            |              |
| PR-B-0474 | John                | Grain               |              |
| PR-B-0475 | Keith               | Nicholson           |              |
| PR-B-0477 | RP                  | Nicholson           |              |
| PR-B-0478 | B                   | Seymour             |              |
| PR-B-0479 | M                   | Beaker              |              |
| PR-B-0480 | MC                  | Seymour             |              |
| PR-B-0481 | KI                  | Fong                |              |
| PR-B-0482 | DP                  | Hamill              |              |
| PR-B-0483 | Peter               | Venables            |              |
| PR-B-0484 | Graham              | Clark               |              |
| PR-B-0486 | Andrew and Jane     | Coggins             |              |
| PR-B-0487 | Lisa                | Barnwell            |              |

| Rep No.   | First Name            | Surname    | Organisation |
|-----------|-----------------------|------------|--------------|
| PR-B-0488 | Martin James          | Hastings   |              |
| PR-B-0489 | Brett                 | Barnwell   |              |
| PR-B-0490 | E A                   | Kane       |              |
| PR-B-0491 | Stephen               | Hewer      |              |
| PR-B-0492 | Mr and Mrs B          | Higgins    |              |
| PR-B-0494 | Ross                  | Poulter    |              |
| PR-B-0495 | S                     | Kenny      |              |
| PR-B-0496 | Robert                | Bruce      |              |
| PR-B-0497 | A                     | Womack     |              |
| PR-B-0498 | Ora                   | Sapir      |              |
| PR-B-0499 | KD and ML             | Cooke      |              |
| PR-B-0500 | David                 | Callicott  |              |
| PR-B-0501 | Fiona                 | Garratt    |              |
| PR-B-0502 | Robert B              | Sim        |              |
| PR-B-0503 | Edith                 | Sim        |              |
| PR-B-0504 | Ann                   | Martin     |              |
| PR-B-0505 | Kim                   | Martin     |              |
| PR-B-0506 | J                     | Nelson     |              |
| PR-B-0507 | WLH                   | Horlick    |              |
| PR-B-0508 | Tina                  | Callicott  |              |
| PR-B-0509 | Cllr Emilie           | Walton     |              |
| PR-B-0510 | VJ                    | Goodall    |              |
| PR-B-0511 | Patricia              | Shaw       |              |
| PR-B-0512 | Alan and Sylvia       | Osborn     |              |
| PR-B-0513 | Joan                  | Davies     |              |
| PR-B-0514 | MR                    | Cooper     |              |
| PR-B-0515 | P                     | Foyle      |              |
| PR-B-0516 | Douglas               | Roberts    |              |
| PR-B-0517 | Pamela M              | Cooper     |              |
| PR-B-0518 | Anthony               | Morris     |              |
| PR-B-0519 | Lucy                  | Loveridge  |              |
| PR-B-0520 | Dawn                  | Glatz      |              |
| PR-B-0521 | LJ                    | Holstead   |              |
| PR-B-0522 | F                     | Lambert    |              |
| PR-B-0523 | Peter                 | Druce      |              |
| PR-B-0525 | Ronald                | Phipps     |              |
| PR-B-0526 | MD                    | McLean     |              |
| PR-B-0527 | H                     | Steele     |              |
| PR-B-0528 | Anthony F             | Bennell    |              |
| PR-B-0529 | Karen                 | Brading    |              |
| PR-B-0530 | T                     | Blake      |              |
| PR-B-0531 | D                     | Burridge   |              |
| PR-B-0532 | Pat                   | Hawtin     |              |
| PR-B-0533 | Sara                  | Buck       |              |
| PR-B-0535 | Maureen               | Gale       |              |
| PR-B-0536 | Jane, Elizabeth, Kate | Rendle     |              |
| PR-B-0537 | Margaret              | Holstead   |              |
| PR-B-0538 | J                     | Fossey     |              |
| PR-B-0540 | Linda                 | Nicholls   |              |
| PR-B-0541 | Sheila                | Churchill  |              |
| PR-B-0542 | Helen                 | Bristow    |              |
| PR-B-0543 | Benito                | Wainwright |              |
| PR-B-0544 | Sally                 | Markham    |              |
| PR-B-0545 | Kelvin                | Markham    |              |
| PR-B-0546 | Trevor                | Campbell   |              |
| PR-B-0547 | Gwen                  | Young      |              |
| PR-B-0549 | William C             | Gills      |              |
| PR-B-0550 | Dawn                  | Williams   |              |
| PR-B-0552 | Mary-Louise           | Riley      |              |
| PR-B-0553 | P                     | Blackman   |              |
| PR-B-0554 | H                     | Williams   |              |
| PR-B-0555 | P                     | Wyatt      |              |
| PR-B-0556 | F                     | Salter     |              |
| PR-B-0557 | Mr and Mrs            | Bushnell   |              |
| PR-B-0558 | Mr and Mrs D          | Stuart     |              |
| PR-B-0559 | Nicholas              | Kubat      |              |
| PR-B-0560 | Mr and Mrs            | Nash       |              |
| PR-B-0561 | Margaret              | Bishop     |              |
| PR-B-0562 | Mr and Mrs            | Fennymore  |              |
| PR-B-0563 | Susan                 | Rivers     |              |
| PR-B-0564 | Maxine and Seamus     | Ryan       |              |
| PR-B-0565 | Amanda                | Roberts    |              |
| PR-B-0566 | J                     | Cook       |              |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname          | Organisation |
|-----------|--------------------|------------------|--------------|
| PR-B-0567 | Gerald             | Hunt             |              |
| PR-B-0568 | Malcolm            | Blackshaw        |              |
| PR-B-0569 | C                  | Williams         |              |
| PR-B-0570 | Roberta J          | Lailey           |              |
| PR-B-0571 | Carla              | Skinner          |              |
| PR-B-0572 | Christina          | Bailey           |              |
| PR-B-0573 | George A           | Lailey           |              |
| PR-B-0574 | Julia              | Wiseman          |              |
| PR-B-0575 | Matthew            | Keates           |              |
| PR-B-0576 | M                  | Jackson          |              |
| PR-B-0578 | J                  | Cooper           |              |
| PR-B-0580 | GM                 | Waddle           |              |
| PR-B-0581 | C                  | Fenn             |              |
| PR-B-0582 | Lee and Dawn       | Palmer and Young |              |
| PR-B-0583 | Marion             | Jones            |              |
| PR-B-0584 | Rita               | White            |              |
| PR-B-0585 | CD                 | Millward         |              |
| PR-B-0586 | Roger              | Pounds           |              |
| PR-B-0587 | P                  | Bennett          |              |
| PR-B-0589 | EA                 | Bristow          |              |
| PR-B-0590 | Clive A            | Bristow          |              |
| PR-B-0593 | G                  | Thomas           |              |
| PR-B-0594 | D                  | Thomas           |              |
| PR-B-0597 | N                  | Dresdon          |              |
| PR-B-0598 | EA                 | Dresden          |              |
| PR-B-0602 | Nadine             | Wyatt            |              |
| PR-B-0604 | Lucy               | Pilgrim          |              |
| PR-B-0605 | Diana              | Cinlott          |              |
| PR-B-0606 | P                  | Merrill          |              |
| PR-B-0607 | Tom                | Pilgrim          |              |
| PR-B-0608 | RH                 | Ryder            |              |
| PR-B-0609 | Philip             | Williams         |              |
| PR-B-0610 | Anne               | Lewis            |              |
| PR-B-0611 | Anne               | Clifton          |              |
| PR-B-0612 | Anthony            | Thompson         |              |
| PR-B-0613 | P                  | Bradley          |              |
| PR-B-0615 | Susan              | Pfinder          |              |
| PR-B-0616 | Rosemary           | Keen             |              |
| PR-B-0617 | Stephen            | Connolly         |              |
| PR-B-0618 | Elizabeth          | Solopova         |              |
| PR-B-0619 | J                  | Ashley           |              |
| PR-B-0621 | Annabel            | Henderson        |              |
| PR-B-0622 | Ian                | James            |              |
| PR-B-0623 | J                  | Casey            |              |
| PR-B-0624 | Stuart and Phyllis | Holcroft         |              |
| PR-B-0625 | Christopher        | Rogers           |              |
| PR-B-0626 | Mr and Mrs         | Taylor           |              |
| PR-B-0627 | Charles            | Isles            |              |
| PR-B-0628 | Anna               | Isles            |              |
| PR-B-0629 | Ann                | Crane            |              |
| PR-B-0631 | AT                 | Ryan             |              |
| PR-B-0634 | Graham             | Hillsdon         |              |
| PR-B-0635 | Julie              | Hillsdon         |              |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG     | Oldfield         |              |
| PR-B-0638 | HA                 | Downie           |              |
| PR-B-0639 | Diane              | Downie           |              |
| PR-B-0640 | Walter E           | Game             |              |
| PR-B-0641 | J                  | Willoughby       |              |
| PR-B-0643 | L                  | Allen            |              |
| PR-B-0645 | Stephanie          | White            |              |
| PR-B-0646 | Ruth M             | Sargent          |              |
| PR-B-0647 | Prof IL            | Sargent          |              |
| PR-B-0648 | Patricia           | Perisi           |              |
| PR-B-0651 | JL                 | Hall             |              |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter              | Webber           |              |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary     | Shirley          |              |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G             | Shirley          |              |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan              | Oldfield         |              |
| PR-B-0659 | PK                 | Cove             |              |
| PR-B-0660 | Denise             | Mckillop         |              |
| PR-B-0661 | Mr and Mrs         | Messenger        |              |
| PR-B-0662 | Stephen John and   | Bird             |              |
| PR-B-0663 | KD                 | Liversage        |              |



| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname             | Organisation   |
|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| PR-B-0664 | Maxine            | House               |  |
| PR-B-0665 | M                 | Thorne              |  |
| PR-B-0666 | Ann               | Chandler            |  |
| PR-B-0667 | Mrs P             | Webb                |  |
| PR-B-0668 | BJ and W          | Bower               |  |
| PR-B-0669 | John and Marion   | Dennis              |  |
| PR-B-0670 | Mary              | Phipps              |  |
| PR-B-0671 | David             | Phipps              |  |
| PR-B-0672 | Grace MM          | Kurn                |  |
| PR-B-0673 | Joyce M           | Morris              |  |
| PR-B-0674 | Rita E            | Ahern               |  |
| PR-B-0675 | Elaine            | Titchmarsh          |  |
| PR-B-0676 | John F            | Morris              |  |
| PR-B-0677 | Lesley E          | Sims                |  |
| PR-B-0678 | Mrs H G           | Kibby               |  |
| PR-B-0680 | Dr John           | Maddicott           |  |
| PR-B-0681 | Dr Hilary         | Maddicott           |  |
| PR-B-0682 | Felicity          | Peacock             |  |
| PR-B-0683 | Robert            | Perry               |  |
| PR-B-0684 | Rosemary A        | Phelps              |  |
| PR-B-0685 | Peter G           | Phelps              |  |
| PR-B-0686 | Chris H           | Adams               |  |
| PR-B-0687 | A                 | Johnston            |  |
| PR-B-0688 | Barbara           | Perry               |  |
| PR-B-0689 | Bernard E         | Braley              |  |
| PR-B-0692 | Rachel            | Watmough            |  |
| PR-B-0694 | John and Joyce    | Washburn            |  |
| PR-B-0695 | Mark              | Bale                |  |
| PR-B-0698 | Bob               | Watmough            |  |
| PR-B-0699 | Andrew            | Clark               |  |
| PR-B-0700 | Diana             | Clark               |  |
| PR-B-0701 | Ray and Janet     | Phipps              |  |
| PR-B-0702 | Nigel             | Clark               |  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                 | Kershaw             | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick              | Small               | Stagecoach   |
| PR-B-0706 | Edmund            | Smith               | Carter Jonas LLP   |
| PR-B-0707 | Susan             | Blackshaw           |  |
| PR-B-0708 | Robin Stafford    | Allen               |  |
| PR-B-0709 | Dr E J            | Williamson          |  |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn            | Phillips            |  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony           | Matthews            | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        |
| PR-B-0712 | Sonya             | Willoughby          |  |
| PR-B-0713 | Tim               | Baldwin             |  |
| PR-B-0715 | Wendy             | Manning             |  |
| PR-B-0718 | David             | Bird                |  |
| PR-B-0719 | Albert            | Prior               |  |
| PR-B-0720 | Mr and Mrs        | Head                |  |
| PR-B-0721 | Pauline           | Kearney             |  |
| PR-B-0722 | A                 | Mayes-Baker         |  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                | Humphreys           | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited |
| PR-B-0724 | Christine         | Daley               |  |
| PR-B-0725 | Andrew            | Cove                |  |
| PR-B-0728 | Verity            | Westgate            |  |
| PR-B-0729 | Tamara            | Lucas               |  |
| PR-B-0730 | Katherine         | Jones               | Savills on behalf of Thames Water plc                                |
| PR-B-0731 | Ioana             | Davies              |  |
| PR-B-0732 | Tony              | Lowe                |  |
| PR-B-0734 | David A           | Homer               |  |
| PR-B-0736 | Kieran            | Ward                |  |
| PR-B-0737 | Paul              | Clarke              |  |
| PR-B-0738 | Martin            | Smail               |  |
| PR-B-0739 | G                 | Gelder              |  |
| PR-B-0740 | Richard and Linda | Jurd                |  |
| PR-B-0741 | Jane              | Jackson             |  |
| PR-B-0742 | Keith and Hilary  | Prince              |  |
| PR-B-0743 | John              | Tremlett            |  |
| PR-B-0744 | Geoff             | Herbert             |  |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian            | Scargill            | Oxford Green Belt Network  |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian            | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories   |
| PR-B-0747 | George A          | Doucas              |  |
| PR-B-0748 | Marcus            | Bunning             |  |
| PR-B-0749 | Dr and Mrs M      | Wallace             |  |
| PR-B-0750 | Niels             | van Kuijk           |  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname      | Organisation  |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------|---|
| PR-B-0751 | Dr Katrin          | Kiessling    |   |
| PR-B-0752 | Keeley             | Middleditch  |   |
| PR-B-0753 | Laura              | Claridge     |   |
| PR-B-0754 | Philippa Jane      | Nelson       |   |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin             | Palmer       |   |
| PR-B-0756 | Keith              | Dancey       |   |
| PR-B-0757 | Martin             | Palmer       |   |
| PR-B-0758 | Stephen            | Anderson     |   |
| PR-B-0759 | R L                | Davies       |   |
| PR-B-0760 | Dr K N             | Robinson     |   |
| PR-B-0761 | Nick               | Trendell     |   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth          | Moore        |   |
| PR-B-0763 | Giles and Rachel   | Woodforde    |   |
| PR-B-0764 | Steven             | Daggitt      |   |
| PR-B-0765 | Layla              | Vidal-Martin | NLP Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Taylor Wimpey |
| PR-B-0766 |                    | Hutchinson   |   |
| PR-B-0767 | Sian               | Robbins      | Kilner Planning   |
| PR-B-0768 | Jane               | Leech        |   |
| PR-B-0769 | Debbie             | Jones        | Bidwells on behalf of City of Oxford Charity                    |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve              | Pickles      | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                 |
| PR-B-0771 | Mr G R and Mrs J E | Thompson     |   |
| PR-B-0772 | Roger              | Howes        |   |
| PR-B-0773 | Annabelle          | Cummings     |   |
| PR-B-0775 | Yasmin             | Ramzan       |   |
| PR-B-0776 | Anthony            | East         |   |
| PR-B-0777 | Mark               | Longworth    | Ambrosden Parish Council  |
| PR-B-0778 | Alan               | Brown        |   |
| PR-B-0779 | David C            | Hinde        | Hinde Law Ltd   |
| PR-B-0780 | Paula              | Hastings     |   |
| PR-B-0781 | Lindsay            | Gregory      |   |
| PR-B-0782 | Andrew and Emma    | Mundy        |   |
| PR-B-0784 | Rosie              | Cotterill    | Turley on behalf of Bovis Homes                                 |
| PR-B-0785 | David              | Orman        |   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane               | Olds         | Caversfield Parish Council                                      |
| PR-B-0787 | Corinne            | Hill         | Shenington with Alkerton Parish Council                         |
| PR-B-0788 | Tom                | McCulloch    | Community First Oxfordshire                                     |
| PR-B-0789 | Lynne              | Whitley      | Yarnton Parish Council  |
| PR-B-0790 | RF                 | Kendal       |   |
| PR-B-0791 | Elizabeth          | Platts       |   |
| PR-B-0792 | Christine          | Lea          |   |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip             | Morley       | North Oxford Golf Club  |
| PR-B-0794 | Prof Michael       | Collins      |   |
| PR-B-0795 | David and Sonia    | Simmons      |   |
| PR-B-0796 | David              | Tighe        |   |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive              | Booth        | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                             |
| PR-B-0798 | Sue                | Holmes       | Oxford Brookes University                                       |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian                | Sheppard     |   |
| PR-B-0801 | Janet              | Stott        |   |
| PR-B-0802 | Peter J            | Frampton     | Framptons on behalf of db Symmetry                              |
| PR-B-0803 | Andy               | Carey        |   |
| PR-B-0804 | Barrie and Linda   | Teasdale     |   |
| PR-B-0805 | Tamara             | Frishberg    |   |
| PR-B-0807 | Justin             | Scroggie     |   |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris              | Robbins      |   |
| PR-B-0809 | Karen              | Selway       |   |
| PR-B-0810 | Jane E             | Curran       |   |
| PR-B-0811 | Laurence           | Carey        |   |
| PR-B-0812 | Tim                | Stott        |   |
| PR-B-0814 | Andrew             | Evans        |   |
| PR-B-0815 | Daniel             | Whitley      |   |
| PR-B-0816 | Lynne              | Whitley      |   |
| PR-B-0818 | Robin              | Grimston     |   |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim                | Green        | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association                      |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam               | Ryder        | Gladman Developments Ltd  |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne   | Mclvor       |   |
| PR-B-0822 | Nikki              | Lewis        |   |
| PR-B-0824 | Judith             | Skipp        |   |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon              | Joyce        | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire                 |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan               | Dobson       |   |
| PR-B-0827 | Paul               | Staniforth   |   |
| PR-B-0828 | Roger              | Smith        | Savills on behalf of Croudace Homes                             |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus             | Campbell     | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group                        |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel              | Buttler      |   |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname            | Organisation   |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------|--|
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha                | Eliot              | Oxford Preservation Trust  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard                | Hills              |  |
| PR-B-0833 | Cas                    | Lester             |  |
| PR-B-0834 | Eleanor                | Williamson         |  |
| PR-B-0835 | EJ                     | Williamson         |  |
| PR-B-0836 | Alan                   | Graham             |  |
| PR-B-0837 | David                  | Jackson            | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP                       |
| PR-B-0838 | David                  | Jackson            | Savills on behalf of University of Oxford, Christ Church, Exeter, Magdalen, Merton and St John's |
| PR-B-0839 | Mark                   | Rose               | Define on behalf of William Davies Ltd   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike                   | Gilbert            | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren                 | Bell               | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd                                    |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex                   | Wilson             | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd   |
| PR-B-0843 | Chris                  | Skinner            |  |
| PR-B-0844 | Peter J                | Frampton           | Framptons on behalf of EP Barrus   |
| PR-B-0845 | David                  | Stalder            |  |
| PR-B-0846 | James C                | Bridon             |  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler             | Bloombridge LLP  |
| PR-B-0848 | Rob                    | McLennan           | Rob McLennan Planning on behalf of Mr RF Kendall   |
| PR-B-0849 | Caroline               | Briden             |  |
| PR-B-0850 | Wendy                  | Smith              |  |
| PR-B-0853 | Lorna                  | Bennett            |  |
| PR-B-0854 | Jan                    | Stalder            |  |
| PR-B-0856 | David                  | Smith              |  |
| PR-B-0857 | Mark                   | Christodoulou      |  |
| PR-B-0858 | John and Barbara       | Redfern and Burton |  |
| PR-B-0859 | Gary                   | Page               |  |
| PR-B-0860 | David W                | Stewart            |  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins            | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC   |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter                  | Nicholson          |  |
| PR-B-0863 | David and Dawn         | White              |  |
| PR-B-0864 | Clive and Annie        | Bristow            |  |
| PR-B-0865 | J and D                | Burford            |  |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt                   | Todd               |  |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer               | McFadden           |  |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter                  | Hainsworth         |  |
| PR-B-0870 | Stewart                | Patience           | Anglian Water Services Ltd   |
| PR-B-0871 | Patricia               | Redpath            |  |
| PR-B-0872 | Pat and Nigel          | Waters             |  |
| PR-B-0873 | Jenyth                 | Worsley            |  |
| PR-B-0875 | Gavin and Sarah        | Smith              |  |
| PR-B-0876 | David                  | Heathfield         | Chiltern Railways  |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin             | Oxfordshire County Council   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds               | Wendlebury Parish Council  |
| PR-B-0879 | Francis W              | Kirkham            | JW Kirkham Will Trust  |
| PR-B-0880 | Rhiannon               | Davies             |  |
| PR-B-0881 | James Kenneth          | Jutton             |  |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia                  | Trowles            |  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter                  | Trowles            |  |
| PR-B-0885 | Margaret C             | Williamson         |  |
| PR-B-0886 | Ivor                   | Davies             |  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley            |  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun                | Breith             | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust   |
| PR-B-0889 | Helen                  | Priestley          |  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks              |  |
| PR-B-0891 | Katherine              | Simpson            |  |
| PR-B-0892 | Richard                | Simpson            |  |
| PR-B-0893 | Louis                  | Borucki            |  |
| PR-B-0894 | Wendy                  | Price              |  |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street             |  |
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard       | Miles              |  |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence           |  |
| PR-B-0898 | Trevor and Helen       | Langrish           |  |
| PR-B-0899 | Julia                  | Cameron            |  |
| PR-B-0900 | Rachel                 | Woods              |  |
| PR-B-0901 | Caroline               | Steel              |  |
| PR-B-0902 | Vanessa                | Pinder             |  |
| PR-B-0903 | Josephine              | Allen              | Upper Heyford Parish Council   |
| PR-B-0904 | Jill                   | Grain              |  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss               | Bloxham Parish Council   |
| PR-B-0906 | Steve and Anne         | Handsley           |  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar             |  |
| PR-B-0908 | Mark                   | Limbrick           | Defence Infrastructure Organisation  |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark                   | Lowen              |  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname                  | Organisation   |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton                   |  |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew                 | Smith                    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                 |
| PR-B-0912 | David                  | Mason                    |  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall                 | CPRE Oxfordshire   |
| PR-B-0915 | Michelle and Anthony   | Tallack                  |  |
| PR-B-0916 | Helen                  | Newman                   |  |
| PR-B-0917 | Omattage G Kumar       | Perera                   |  |
| PR-B-0918 | Casey                  | Orman                    |  |
| PR-B-0919 | Prof Daphne            | Hampson                  |  |
| PR-B-0920 | Audrey                 | Fairgrieve               |  |
| PR-B-0921 | Paul                   | Weston                   |  |
| PR-B-0922 | Sarah                  | Smith                    | Rapleys LLP on behalf of Pandora Trading Ltd                         |
| PR-B-0923 | Keerpa                 | Patel                    | South Oxfordshire District Council                                   |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux                 | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd |
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric                | Sidebottom               |  |
| PR-B-0927 | Dr Hilary              | Bridge                   |  |
| PR-B-0928 | Stephanie              | White                    |  |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie                  | Lodwick                  |  |
| PR-B-0930 | Philip                 | Marsh                    | Knights on behalf of Philip King Homes and Oxford City Charity       |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane                   | Olds                     | Fringford Parish Council   |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter                  | Bateman                  | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                             |
| PR-B-0934 | Chris                  | Gaskell                  | Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks                           |
| PR-B-0935 | David                  | Lock                     | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates                 |
| PR-B-0936 | Tim                    | del Nevo                 | Friends of Cutteslowe and Sunnymead Park                             |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip                 | Rawle                    | Greenlight Developments  |
| PR-B-0938 | H John                 | East                     |  |
| PR-B-0939 | Lynne                  | Tighe                    |  |
| PR-B-0941 | Valerie                | Wells                    |  |
| PR-B-0942 | Freda                  | Horne                    |  |
| PR-B-0943 | Christopher            | Perry                    |  |
| PR-B-0944 | David                  | Stone                    |  |
| PR-B-0945 | Helen                  | Manias                   |  |
| PR-B-0946 | Sarah                  | Karatzios                |  |
| PR-B-0947 | Norman                 | Davies                   |  |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim                    | del Nevo                 |  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter                  | Monk                     | Banbury Civic Society  |
| PR-B-0950 | Mr S and Mrs T         | Lloyd and Atley          |  |
| PR-B-0951 | Dennis                 | Price                    |  |
| PR-B-0952 | Cllr Carmen            | Griffiths                |  |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark                   | Recchia                  | Banbury Town Council   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                 | Small                    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      |
| PR-B-0958 | Richard                | Meadows                  | Easington Sports Football Club                                       |
| PR-B-0959 | Cllrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |  |
| PR-B-0960 | M                      | O'Mahoney                |  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A            | Webb                     |  |
| PR-B-0963 | Mr and Mrs             | Shepherd                 |  |
| PR-B-0964 | Vickesh                | Rathod                   | Carter Jones LLP on behalf of Mr Henry Teare                         |
| PR-B-0966 | E                      | Nicholson                |  |
| PR-B-0967 | Eileen                 | Bloomer                  |  |
| PR-B-0968 | Susan D                | Stock                    |  |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken                    | Martin                   | Noke Parish Meeting  |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan               | Harbottle                | Land and Partners Ltd  |
| PR-B-0974 | Belinda                | Skinner                  |  |
| PR-B-0975 | Andrew                 | Lintott                  |  |
| PR-B-0976 | Nigel and Tracy        | Payne                    |  |
| PR-B-0977 | John                   | Amor                     |  |
| PR-B-0978 | JM                     | Parker                   |  |
| PR-B-0979 | Peter                  | Finbow                   |  |
| PR-B-0980 | John and Pamela        | Appleton                 |  |
| PR-B-0981 | Joyce                  | Ruiz                     |  |
| PR-B-0982 | Rosa                   | Cadd                     |  |
| PR-B-0983 | Suzanne                | Morris                   |  |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane                   | Burrett                  |  |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter                  | Collins                  | Islip Parish Council   |
| PR-B-0986 | Paul                   | Robinson                 |  |
| PR-B-0987 | Mr and Mrs             | Boyle                    |  |
| PR-B-0989 | Peter                  | Jeffreys                 |  |
| PR-B-0990 | Brenda                 | Purves                   |  |
| PR-B-0992 | Martin and Pamela      | Palmer                   |  |
| PR-B-0993 | Angela                 | Kelly                    |  |
| PR-B-0994 | Jamie                  | Smith                    |  |
| PR-B-0995 | Adam                   | Brightmore               |  |
| PR-B-0996 | Lucy                   | Smith                    |  |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname            | Organisation   |
|-----------|---------------------|--------------------|--|
| PR-B-0997 | George              | Thomas             |  |
| PR-B-0998 | Lisa                | Coulling           |  |
| PR-B-0999 | Steve               | McCurdy            |  |
| PR-B-1000 | Kim and Ann         | Martin             |  |
| PR-B-1001 | Margaret            | Draisey            |  |
| PR-B-1002 | Chris and Sue       | Beach              |  |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon               | Turner             | Launton Parish Council   |
| PR-B-1004 | Stephen N           | Skinner            |  |
| PR-B-1005 | SP and SA           | McQuillan          |  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth                | Powles             | Kirtlington Parish Council   |
| PR-B-1007 | Keith               | Watson             |  |
| PR-B-1008 | Patricia            | Watson             |  |
| PR-B-1009 | Gillian             | Forrest            |  |
| PR-B-1010 | Richard             | Pye                |  |
| PR-B-1012 | Calum               | Miller             |  |
| PR-B-1013 | Dominic             | Woodfield          | Bioscan (UK) Ltd   |
| PR-B-1014 | Norma               | Hunter             |  |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel              | Hatcher            | Rosconn Group  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben                 | Simpson            | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                                      |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver              | Burton-Taylor      | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   |
| PR-B-1018 | Jon                 | Waite              | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Woodstock Town Council                      |
| PR-B-1019 | Jon                 | Waite              | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Manor Oak Homes                             |
| PR-B-1020 | Jon                 | Waite              | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Manor Oak Homes                             |
| PR-B-1021 | Jon                 | Waite              | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Manor Oak Homes                             |
| PR-B-1022 | Jon                 | Waite              | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of W Lucy and Co.                              |
| PR-B-1023 | John                | Hunter             |  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew              | Hornsby-Smith      |  |
| PR-B-1025 | John and Margaret   | Braithwaite        |  |
| PR-B-1026 | Brian               | Simonds            |  |
| PR-B-1027 | Jonathan            | Porter             | Archstone Projects Ltd   |
| PR-B-1028 | Amanda and Michael  | Roberts and Graham |  |
| PR-B-1029 | Jane                | Verdon             |  |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan            | Harbottle          | Land and Partners Ltd  |
| PR-B-1031 | JF and MA           | Goodwin            |  |
| PR-B-1032 | David               | Burson             | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford          |
| PR-B-1033 | Matthew             | Symons             | Hollins Strategic Land   |
| PR-B-1034 | Anita               | Spencer            | Sibford Ferris Parish Council  |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert              | Davies             | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert              | Davies             | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford                     |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice               | Suttie             | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments        |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret        | Sidebottom         |  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri        | Dyson              |  |
| PR-B-1040 | Robert              | Dyson              |  |
| PR-B-1041 | Debbie              | Payne              |  |
| PR-B-1042 | Peter               | Robbins            |  |
| PR-B-1043 | Ruth                | Matthews           |  |
| PR-B-1045 | Nicole              | Evans              |  |
| PR-B-1046 | William             | Hodgson            |  |
| PR-B-1048 | Wasim               | Mohammad           |  |
| PR-B-1049 | Maria               | Page               |  |
| PR-B-1050 | James               | Wright             |  |
| PR-B-1051 | Michael and Kate    | Hopcraft           |  |
| PR-B-1052 | Andrew              | Mundy              |  |
| PR-B-1053 | David               | Hemingway          |  |
| PR-B-1054 | Bharat and Jankee   | Badiani            |  |
| PR-B-1055 | Philippa            | Mullineux          |  |
| PR-B-1056 | Simon               | Parker             |  |
| PR-B-1057 | Julie               | Walters            |  |
| PR-B-1058 | Kim                 | Bennell            |  |
| PR-B-1059 | Allan               | Anderson           |  |
| PR-B-1060 | Nicola A            | Forsythe           |  |
| PR-B-1061 | Eileen              | Anderson           |  |
| PR-B-1062 | Danielle            | Greenspan          |  |
| PR-B-1063 | Jeptha John Hammond | Rowan-Hull         |  |
| PR-B-1064 | Karen and Tony      | East               |  |
| PR-B-1065 | J                   | Bevis              |  |
| PR-B-1066 | AR                  | Currell            |  |
| PR-B-1067 | A                   | Ioannides          |  |
| PR-B-1068 | Louise              | Crone              |  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP                  | Lyes               |  |
| PR-B-1070 | Darren              | Rea                |  |
| PR-B-1071 | Rachel              | Rea                |  |
| PR-B-1072 | Peter               | Gaskell            |  |

| Rep No.   | First Name           | Surname     | Organisation  |
|-----------|----------------------|-------------|---|
| PR-B-1073 | Susan                | Simms       |   |
| PR-B-1074 | Donna                | Resek       |   |
| PR-B-1075 | Judith               | Kleinman    |   |
| PR-B-1076 | Jana                 | Gnappova    |   |
| PR-B-1077 | Alyson               | Bateman     |   |
| PR-B-1078 | Samantha             | Perera      |   |
| PR-B-1079 | JW                   | Fresen      |   |
| PR-B-1080 | Mr and Mrs           | Horne       |   |
| PR-B-1081 | Lynn                 | Pilgrim     |   |
| PR-B-1082 | Nicholas Edward      | Mullineux   |   |
| PR-B-1083 | Susan                | Knox        |   |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M              | Rugg        |   |
| PR-B-1086 | Clare                | Boddington  |   |
| PR-B-1087 | Colin                | Homans      |   |
| PR-B-1088 | Bryan                | Rugg        |   |
| PR-B-1089 | Dave                 | Bevis       |   |
| PR-B-1090 | Richard and Karen    | Walecki     |   |
| PR-B-1091 | Mark                 | Bailey      |   |
| PR-B-1093 | Christine            | Arthur      |   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F             | Hickman     | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val                  | Russell     | Bodicote Parish Council   |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg                 | Blaquiere   | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes   |
| PR-B-1097 | Caroline             | Hayes       |   |
| PR-B-1098 | Michael              | Bott        |   |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan                 | Storah      | Oxford City Council   |
| PR-B-1100 | Katherine            | Andrews     |   |
| PR-B-1101 | Catherine            | Dobson      |   |
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate       | Hamilton    |   |
| PR-B-1103 | Margaret             | Homans      |   |
| PR-B-1104 | Lawrence Michael     | Colvin      |   |
| PR-B-1105 | Norman and Janet     | Bates       |   |
| PR-B-1106 | Dr Anne              | Johnson     |   |
| PR-B-1107 | Susi                 | Peace       |   |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom                  | Hockaday    |   |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith                | Johnston    |   |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain                 | Johnson     |   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat                  | Clissold    |   |
| PR-B-1115 | Vicky                | Aston       | Sport England   |
| PR-B-1117 | Georgina             | Tibbs       | Barton Willmore on behalf of Bellway Homes Ltd and Archstone Projects Ltd |
| PR-B-1118 | Susan                | Doucas      |   |
| PR-B-1119 | Bob                  | Hessian     | Weston on the Green Parish Council  |
| PR-B-1120 | Dr Ben               | Knighton    |   |
| PR-B-1121 | Rebecca              | Micklethorp | Natural England   |
| PR-B-1122 | Paul and Anne        | Webb        |   |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul                 | Mayhook     |   |
| PR-B-1124 | Chris                | Thornton    | Ardley with Fewcott Parish Council  |
| PR-B-1125 | Bruce                | Cummings    |   |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie                | Lewis       | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                     |
| PR-B-1127 | David                | Betts       |   |
| PR-B-1128 | Tim                  | Edgington   |   |
| PR-B-1129 | Michael and Jo       | Collett     |   |
| PR-B-1130 | Mr and Mrs           | Bray        |   |
| PR-B-1131 | Gillian              | Hopcroft    |   |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda                | Ward        | Kidlington Development Watch  |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip               | Towler      |   |
| PR-B-1134 | Neil                 | McKendrick  |   |
| PR-B-1135 | Terence and Patricia | Moss        |   |
| PR-B-1136 | Giles                | Lewis       |   |
| PR-B-1137 | Jill                 | Drake       |   |
| PR-B-1138 | Rhian                | Pye         |   |
| PR-B-1139 | Ken                  | Martin      |   |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine            | Richenburg  |   |
| PR-B-1141 | Christopher          | Villiers    |   |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan                 | Lodwick     |   |
| PR-B-1143 | Dr Pamela            | Roberts     |   |
| PR-B-1144 | Martin               | Lipson      | Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum                                     |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard              | Bennett     |   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ                   | French      | Deddington Development Watch  |
| PR-B-1147 | Joan                 | Tossell     |   |
| PR-B-1148 | Terry                | Tossell     |   |
| PR-B-1149 | Charles              | King        |   |
| PR-B-1150 | Rob                  | Ellis       |   |
| PR-B-1152 | Helen                | Pattison    |   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname     | Organisation   |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------|--|
| PR-B-1153 | Roger              | Carter      |  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim                | Spencer     |  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey            | Wright      | Begbroke Parish Council                                      |
| PR-B-1156 | Robert             | de Newtown  | ENGAGE Oxford  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles   | Lewis       |  |
| PR-B-1158 | Elizabeth          | Leckie      |  |
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin             | Leckie      |  |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher        | Hardman     | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum                               |
| PR-B-1161 | Janet              | Warren      |  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger              | Bellamy     | Hornton Parish Council                                       |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine          | Arakelian   |  |
| PR-B-1164 | Ian                | Drury       |  |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline           | Johnson     |  |
| PR-B-1166 | Jane               | Hennell     | The Canal and River Trust                                    |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi               | Stokes      | Persimmon Homes Midlands                                     |
| PR-B-1168 | Gwyn               | Bevan       |  |
| PR-B-1169 | Simon              | Clark       |  |
| PR-B-1170 | Matthew            | Brock       |  |
| PR-B-1171 | Mark               | Rowan-Hull  |  |
| PR-B-1172 | Atul K             | Patel       |  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis              | Davies      |  |
| PR-B-1175 | Clare              | Cooper      |  |
| PR-B-1176 | Laura              | Pritchard   |  |
| PR-B-1177 | Sandra and Richard | Tyrrell     |  |
| PR-B-1178 | Bryony             | Thomas      |  |
| PR-B-1179 | Andrew             | Clark       |  |
| PR-B-1180 | RA                 | Humphreys   | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi              | Lancaster   |  |
| PR-B-1182 | Alison             | Noel        |  |
| PR-B-1183 | Annie              | Kotak       |  |
| PR-B-1184 | Noresh             | Kotak       |  |
| PR-B-1185 | Claire             | Blake       |  |
| PR-B-1186 | Christina          | Miskin      |  |
| PR-B-1187 | Nigel              | Homent      |  |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol              | Matheson    |  |
| PR-B-1189 | Bella              | Kotak       |  |
| PR-B-1190 | Fiona              | Thomas      |  |
| PR-B-1191 | Simon              | Eaton       |  |
| PR-B-1192 | Robert             | Selway      |  |
| PR-B-1193 | Lucy               | McCurdy     |  |
| PR-B-1194 | John               | Woodward    |  |
| PR-B-1195 | Laurence           | Clark       |  |
| PR-B-1196 | Elaine             | Fullard MBE |  |
| PR-B-1197 | George             | Purves      |  |
| PR-B-1199 | Nick               | King        |  |
| PR-B-1200 | Katie              | Holt        |  |
| PR-B-1201 | Nigel              | Timms       |  |
| PR-B-1202 | Gaynor             | Thorpe      |  |
| PR-B-1203 | Su                 | Cheetham    |  |
| PR-B-1204 | Ruth               | Smith       |  |
| PR-B-1205 | Karen              | Jackson     |  |
| PR-B-1206 | Carol              | Broadbent   |  |
| PR-B-1207 | Douglas and Louise | Lloyd       |  |
| PR-B-1208 | Hilary             | Hastings    |  |
| PR-B-1209 | Rupert             | Page        |  |
| PR-B-1210 | Tina               | Merry       |  |
| PR-B-1211 | Natasha            | Smith       |  |
| PR-B-1212 | Penelope           | Henderson   |  |
| PR-B-1213 | Fleur              | Hodgson     |  |
| PR-B-1214 | Richard            | Arthur      |  |
| PR-B-1215 | Malini             | Perera      |  |
| PR-B-1216 | Christine          | Lodge       |  |
| PR-B-1218 | Maureen            | Rosenberg   |  |
| PR-B-1219 | SP                 | Weston      |  |
| PR-B-1220 | Heddwen            | Hewis       |  |
| PR-B-1221 | Martin             | Perisi      |  |
| PR-B-1222 | Alexis             | Livadeas    |  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith             | Johnson     | Environment Agency   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa            | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                                     |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul               | Butt        | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd        |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew             | Garraway    | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm          |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard            | Silvester   |  |
| PR-B-1228 | Juliet             | West        | ICOMOS-UK  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname             | Organisation  |
|-----------|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| PR-B-1229 | Henry              | Brougham            |   |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M              | Green               |   |
| PR-B-1231 | Prof J M           | Baker               |   |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark               | Schmull             | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon              | Gamage              | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    |
| PR-B-1234 | Hywel              | Morse               | Sworders on behalf of the Beecroft Family                               |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed                 | Barrett             | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard            | Boother             | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   |
| PR-B-1237 | Deborah            | Wright              |   |
| PR-B-1238 | Chris & Kathryn    | Rogers & Bryan      |   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne            | Willson-Higgins     |   |
| PR-B-1241 | Beverley           | Kwan                |   |
| PR-B-1242 | G                  | Thompson            |   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera          | Kantor              |   |
| PR-B-1245 | Jason and Petra    | Tyrell              |   |
| PR-B-1246 | Christine          | Kennell             |   |
| PR-B-1247 | Mark               | Turner              |   |
| PR-B-1248 | Christine          | Clark               |   |
| PR-B-1249 | Andy               | Cove                |   |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan              | Silvester           |   |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip             | Boxall              |   |
| PR-B-1253 | Jon and Michelle   | Mason               |   |
| PR-B-1254 | Philip             | Redpath             |   |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia              | Sheppard            |   |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola             | Mallows             | Gresswell Environmental Trust   |
| PR-B-1257 | Charles            | Fletcher            |   |
| PR-B-1258 | Hilary             | Fletcher            |   |
| PR-B-1259 | Mircea             | Popa                |   |
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth          | Sheppard            |   |
| PR-B-1261 | Sarah              | Pyne                | Indigo Planning on behalf of McKay Security Services PLC                |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew             | Gant                | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       |
| PR-B-1263 | Katie              | Silvester           |   |
| PR-B-1264 | Drs                | Slater and Harrison |   |
| PR-B-1265 | Kathleen           | Hayes               |   |
| PR-B-1266 | Linda              | Ward                |   |
| PR-B-1267 | Ian                | Hudspeth            |   |
| PR-B-1268 | Garry              | Lancaster           |   |
| PR-B-1272 | S G                | Wakeling            |   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre            | Wells               | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council |
| PR-B-1270 | P and H            | Stoddart            |   |
| PR-B-1271 | Rebecca            | Hodgson             |   |
| PR-B-1274 | Andrea             | Duffy               |   |
| PR-B-1275 | Dagmar             | Carr                |   |
| PR-B-1276 | John               | Carr                |   |
| PR-B-1277 | Roger and Eileen   | Henman              |   |
| PR-B-1278 | Helena             | Boyce               |   |
| PR-B-1279 | Neil               | Bennett             |   |
| PR-B-1280 | Peter              | Offord              | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers   |
| PR-B-1281 | G M J              | Taylor              |   |
| PR-B-1282 | John               | McArthur            |   |
| PR-B-1283 | Julian             | Philcox             | JP Planning Ltd on behalf of Mr N Wingfield                             |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon              | Barry               | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 |
| PR-B-1285 | Jeffrey            | Wright              |   |
| PR-B-1286 | Gary               | Crone               |   |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley             | Soanes              |   |
| PR-B-1288 | Maurice            | White               |   |
| PR-B-1289 | Berwyn             | Jones               |   |
| PR-B-1290 | John               | Perris              |   |
| PR-B-1291 | Kumudu             | Perera              |   |
| PR-B-1292 | Christine          | Bower               |   |
| PR-B-1293 | Diane              | Perry               |   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles              | Hughes              | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha            | Blackmore           | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family                    |
| PR-B-1296 | Graciela Inglesias | Rogers              |   |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon              | Handy               | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd                       |
| PR-B-1298 | James              | Jocelyn             |   |
| PR-B-1299 | Clive              | Sherriff            |   |
| PR-B-1300 | Julia              | Hammett             |   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel              | McGurk              | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        |
| PR-B-1302 | Clare              | Creese              |   |
| PR-B-1303 | Steve              | Gerrish             |   |
| PR-B-1304 | Tim                | Wakeman             |   |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly         | Foster              | Fritwell Parish Council   |



| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname               | Organisation   |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------------------|--|
| PR-B-1306 | Frank             | Vreede                |  |
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria          | Campbell              |  |
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric            | Rose                  |  |
| PR-B-1309 | Kate              | Miklaszewska-Gorczyca |  |
| PR-B-1310 | Tara              | Prayag                |  |
| PR-B-1311 | Keith E           | Stratford             |  |
| PR-B-1312 | Carl              | Parker                |  |
| PR-B-1313 | Helen             | Broxap                |  |
| PR-B-1314 | Nicole and Eugene | Brooks and Griffin    |  |
| PR-B-1315 | Joel              | Phipps                |  |
| PR-B-1316 | Christian         | Gilliam               |  |
| PR-B-1317 | Rachel            | Walton                |  |
| PR-B-1318 | Laura             | Walton                |  |
| PR-B-1319 | Mr and Mrs        | Unwin                 |  |
| PR-B-1320 | Vassilis          | Athanassoglou         |  |
| PR-B-1321 | Catherine R       | Mundell               |  |
| PR-B-1322 | Judy              | East                  |  |
| PR-B-1323 | Karen             | Suter                 |  |
| PR-B-1324 | Katie L           | Stratford             |  |
| PR-B-1325 | Richard           | Lodge                 |  |
| PR-B-1326 | Jan and Chris     | Lacey and Plant       |  |
| PR-B-1327 | John              | Pilgrim               |  |
| PR-B-1329 | Jaimie            | Pattison              |  |
| PR-B-1330 | N M               | O'Mahoney             |  |
| PR-B-1331 | Fred              | Jones                 |  |
| PR-B-1332 | Edward            | Bradley               |  |
| PR-B-1333 | Zoe               | Christodoulou         |  |
| PR-B-1334 | Jenny             | Betts                 |  |
| PR-B-1335 | Natalie           | Usher                 |  |
| PR-B-1336 | Patricia          | Stokes                |  |
| PR-B-1337 | Marcus            | Lloyd                 |  |
| PR-B-1338 | Philip            | Camp                  |  |
| PR-B-1339 | Dr Christopher    | Wedge                 |  |
| PR-B-1340 | Sophia            | Argyris               |  |
| PR-B-1341 | Olga Lascano      | Choperena             |  |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura             | Precious              | Quod on behalf of Albion Land                                  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun             | Richards              | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                 |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan          | Harbottle             | Land and Partners Ltd  |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick              | Alston                | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd        |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil              | Tiley                 | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                      |
| PR-B-1347 | Zahra             | Alrashed              | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of Kenley Holdings |
| PR-B-1348 | Prof Ephrat       | Tseëlon               |  |
| PR-B-1350 | Dr Autumn         | Rowan-Hull            |  |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz               | Boden                 | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                       |
| PR-B-1353 | P                 | White                 |  |
| PR-B-1354 | James             | Macnamara             | Lower Heyford Parish Council                                   |
| PR-B-1355 | James             | Macnamara             | Parish councillor/individual                                   |
| PR-B-1356 | Mrs Dee           | Bailey                |  |
| PR-B-1357 | Dianne            | Jones                 |  |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian               | Lough-Scott           | Upper Heyford Village Group                                    |
| PR-B-1359 | Kate              | Berney                |  |
| PR-B-1360 | Alexandra         | Berney-Stewart        |  |
| PR-B-1361 | Margaret and Alan | Crick and Trump       |  |
| PR-B-1362 | Mary              | Whitby                |  |
| PR-B-1363 | Nick              | Southern              |  |
| PR-B-1364 | Elaine            | Boswell               | North Newington Parish Council                                 |
| PR-B-1365 | John              | Wass                  |  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria   | Campbell |              | 1            | A                       |               | An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Am particularly concerned by Option A. Kidlington would almost double in size which is unsuitable and contrary to the Kidlington Master Plan. Traffic issues will increase, at peak times on public transport from Kidlington to Oxford can take up to an hour. Cycling is dangerous due to inadequate cycle lanes. Schools and health services become more stretched. It is difficult to get a doctors' appointment now, Kidlington does not have the services that it needs. GB sacrificed, walks and views that are precious to the residents will be lost, as there is no park in Kidlington these areas are used. Natural habitats will be lost. Flooding will increase with the loss of GB. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. GB allows pollution from the significant local traffic congestion to disperse to some extent. This would become concentrated if the Kidlington Gap is filled in.   |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone    |              | 1            | A, B                    |               | No, do not accept this as an appropriate figure for Cherwell's proportion to meet Oxford's unmet housing need. The number of houses mostly preferred by CDC on areas A and B is unsustainable and unsound. The inappropriate and unnecessary destruction of GB will result in destruction of wildlife habitats, leading to coalescence of Oxford and Kidlington, extensive urban sprawl and complete traffic gridlock. Excessive levels of pollution and traffic congestion exist in the area, and Oxfordshire County Council's new improved traffic options cannot be taken seriously given limited capacity constraints and increased demand. Oxford needs to find alternative means to accommodate students thus releasing affordable housing. Building to the north of Oxford will increase congestion and demand from commuters accessing London through Oxford Parkway. The figures produced are based on optimistic aspirations that take no account of Brexit. Additional planned developments, such as at Barton Park, Eynsham and at the Northern Gateway need to be taken into account. Oxford has almost full employment and there must be exponential constraints to realise a balanced community and a sensible sustainable future for the well being of all residents. Opportunities exist to capitalise in the northern and eastern areas of Cherwell in conjunction with developments for the Oxford – Cambridge Expressway to realise the new “Silicon Valley” to drive enterprise and employment uptake. |
| PR-B-1139 | Ken        | Martin   |              | 1            | A, B                    |               | No, the argument is flawed. If Oxford's unmet housing need is for affordable housing, that means all 4,400 in Cherwell. No developer will take on this project without substantial government subsidy. It has been widely stated in staffed exhibitions that only 35% will be affordable that would mean building 12,600 homes to create 4,400 affordable homes. If the main target areas are A and B then the new homes will satisfy London's housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip     | Towler   |              | 1            | A,B                     |               | No, it is far too high to be sustainable, particularly as areas A and B are favoured by CDC and are wholly or partially in GB. As Oxford City is only willing to commit to 4% of its housing needs it is failing to engage meaningfully with the planning process. It should bear more of the burden, prioritising brownfield sites within the city boundaries, thus reducing strain on the transport infrastructure. CDC should resist the demands and insist on GB preservation.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0723 | RA            | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 1            |                         |               | Consider that 4,400 homes is excessive housing requirement for CDC, this being the second highest in the county and requiring the potentially highly damaging release of Green Belt land. Whilst accept that Oxford is constrained by the Green Belt, Yarnton is also within the Green Belt. The preservation of the GB around Yarnton has been critical in maintaining their rural setting and preventing their coalescence into what would otherwise become a sprawling dormitory conurbation around the City of Oxford. Do not accept that the preservation of the GB immediately around Oxford should be achieved by sacrificing the preservation of open land within the GB around the surrounding rural settlements, which would be contrary to the GB as set out in the NPPF on the need to prevent settlements from merging into one another and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Want to preserve the historic setting of the listed Manor House and Gardens, This development would cause significant harm to the heritage assets, the protection of which must be accorded significant weight in the planning process. NPPF states that such harm should not be permitted unless there are substantial over-riding public benefits. The development of this site would prejudice the effective operation of their educational campus, which plays a significant role in supporting the educational and research functions of the City. Also concerned regarding flooding issues on Church Lane. |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter         | Nicholson |  | 1            |                         |               | Objects to the 4,400 apportionment to Cherwell. Has provided a detailed comment on the role of the OGB, LEP, SHMA and ONS in his representation.  |
| PR-B-0966 | E             | Nicholson |  | 1            |                         | A, B          | No it is not, it is utterly wrong for CDC to accept this scale of house building on behalf of Oxford City. It is based on theoretical predictions from the SHMA which are likely to be exaggerated and inaccurate. The report disagrees with official Government ONS statistics about housing need in Oxfordshire and has altered official statistics with bespoke methodology to produce high figures. This figures comes on top of 22,840 houses to be built in Cherwell by 2031 as stipulated in the Adopted Local Plan. This would come at a huge and dangerous cost to the landscape, transport infrastructure, wildlife and natural resources as well as increased flood risk. Many of the sites lie in the GB and it's unacceptable for Oxford City to allow quality of life for people outside their jurisdiction to be ruined.   |
| PR-B-1076 | Jana          | Gnappova  |  | 1            |                         | PR20, PR24    | No, the decision to build 4,400 homes on the GB is unacceptable and inappropriate. See general comments   |
| PR-B-0754 | Philippa Jane | Nelson    |  | 1            |                         | PR27, PR14    | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, leaving a small area between the banks of the Cherwell and Stratfield Bank. Increased risk of flooding. Natural habitats have already suffered. Sites PR27 and PR14 important sites for birds. Quality of life impacted. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. Relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. It is the residents of outlying areas who will pay the price.   |
| PR-B-1057 | Julie         | Walters   |  | 1            |                         | PR34          | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase the A34 at Peartree from Frieze Way and the A44 is dreadful. To build on site PR34 will only add to this. Schools and health services become more stretched, three weeks to get an appointment. GB sacrificed, walks, views behind The Moors would be lost. Habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. Retail in Kidlington is poor, need to develop its centre. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation                | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1058 | Kim        | Bennell  |                             | 1            |                         | PR34          | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase the A34 at Peartree from Frieze Way and the A44 are dreadful. To build on site PR34 will only add to this. Schools and health services become more stretched, three weeks to get an appointment. GB sacrificed, walks, views behind the Moors would be lost. Habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. Retail in Kidlington is poor, need to develop it's centre. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian        | Sheppard |                             | 1            |                         | PR38, PR50    | The rep has given reasons as to why sites PR38 and PR50 should not be proposed. Considerations have not been taken for GB, increased traffic, the current improvements to the area have not improved. Destroy the countryside and biodiversity. Flood plan to which development will greatly increase in this area and within North Oxford. No provision for additional amenities. The development will greatly affect the outlook and character of Cutteslowe Park, its needs protecting.  |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler   | Middle Aston Parish Meeting | 1            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0029 | Sonia      | Morgan   |                             | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 new houses is not sustainable as it will increase congestion, schools and health services will be further stretched and GB and open countryside, with views and walks, lost forever. The quality of life for residents of Kidlington will suffer with increased air, noise and light pollution. Development near the A34 is of particular concern with regards to particulate pollution which has serious health risks. The 4,400 number is based on questionable calculations.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday   |                             | 1            |                         |               | The figure of 550 houses apportioned to Oxford should be subtracted, then the balance divided equally between the 4 districts. Cherwell's figure would be 3,575 homes. Employment must be created in other districts to reduce traffic and the need for housing around Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0036 | David      | Blowers  |                             | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 homes is too many, it is not sustainable and traffic problems will increase. Services will be stretched and GB with its natural habitat and walks will be lost. Quality of life will suffer due to air, noise and light pollution.  |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford   | Jones    |                             | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 homes is not appropriate. Local infrastructure and services are already stretched, in particular schools and the health services. Congestion will be exacerbated, air, nose and light pollution will increase and the GB purposes will be breached. The calculations for this number rely on assumptions.   |
| PR-B-0039 | Susan      | Cooper   |                             | 1            |                         |               | The problem in Oxford is serious so this number sounds plausible.   |
| PR-B-0046 | Caroline   | Thompson |                             | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and I believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall     |                             | 1            |                         |               | The Oxford Times reported, December 2016, that 4,400 homes lie empty in the county, which should be utilised. There should be no building on GB.  |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor   | Aitchison Rafferty          | 1            |                         |               | Yes. Refers to URBEDs Wolfson Economic Prize winning report. The report's recommendation to expand satellite market towns of Bicester, Didcot and their surroundings is therefore reflected by the apportionment for housing for Cherwell and South Oxfordshire.  |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue        | Mackrell | Bicester Town Council       | 1            |                         |               | Given the considerable development already planned for southern part of the district, a further 4,400 appears to be excessive. If CDC have to accommodate such a number they should be built as close as possible to the City to avoid impact on the existing road network, especially the A34.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname     | Organisation                           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0078 | Anthony           | Churchill   |  | 1            |                         |               | No, an extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems will get worse and schools and health services stretched. GB will be destroyed along with walks, views and natural habitat. Quality of life will suffer as air, noise and light pollution increases. The 4,400 is based on criticised calculations and the A34 struggles with existing volumes.             |
| PR-B-0081 | Linda             | Beattie     |  | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and I believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-0082 | Felicity          | Emptage     |  | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and I believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A               | McCall      |  | 1            |                         |               | No, Oxford needs to demonstrate the real need for houses as services and infrastructure are under such pressure.   |
| PR-B-0120 | E                 | Tonkin      |  | 1            |                         |               | This is a heavy addition to the existing villages and object due to the increase in traffic on already busy roads especially into Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0122 | A                 | Dyer        |  | 1            |                         |               | No, zero should be the amount.   |
| PR-B-0150 | Patrick and Julia | Marcks      |  | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-0151 | Prof John         | Batchelor   |  | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-0152 | Henrietta         | Batchelor   |  | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believes the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul              | Goulding QC |  | 1            |                         |               | No. It is too high. The number for Cherwell is disproportionately high compared to other Oxfordshire Districts. There is a particular imbalance between Cherwell and Oxford. Cherwell's number should be lower, and Oxford's higher. 4,400 for Cherwell is unrealistic, unsustainable and would be to the serious detriment of the character of the District and damaging to the Green Belt. |
| PR-B-0154 | Hannah            | Hale        |  | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believes the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-0156 | Val               | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK | 1            |                         |               | Agree that a 'minimum' housing requirement of 4,400 is appropriate. This represents an additional 20% of Cherwell's housing needs. The further refined apportionment of the Growth Board work should be informed by the availability and suitability of deliverable sites.   |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin             | Carrit      |  | 1            |                         |               | Believe 4,400 homes is entirely appropriate for Cherwell, we are one County and one Community. We look to Oxford as our County town and the citizens of Oxford look to Cherwell and the other Districts for recreation and leisure. It is therefore essential that the wider Districts respect and observe the duty to cooperate with the City's housing need.                               |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter             | Worth       |  | 1            |                         |               | Have to trust that the work by the council officers is correct with regards to the number of homes required. House prices are ridiculously high due to a shortage so more homes are required.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname          | Organisation       | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0175 | Mr D and Mrs S    | Rudd             |                    | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believes the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-0181 | Diane and Darryl  | Bates-Brownsword |                    | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believes the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-0184 | Roger             | Prince           |                    | 1            |                         |               | No, the figure comes from the SHMA which was prepared without any public consultation and contains many questionable assumptions. They rely on predictions of unrealistically high jobs growth around Oxford and assumes that this will require a large influx of people into the county. As the SHMA was put together by private consultants working on behalf of property developers, it is reasonable to take the view that figures are likely to be biased in favour of the developers. The SHMA was not subjected to any independent validation although an independent planning expert has concluded that the estimated figures are likely to be "grossly overstated". Consequently, I cannot accept that the SHMA reflects the housing needs of either Oxford City or Cherwell or that the figure of 4400 is the appropriate requirement. |
| PR-B-0185 | Terrence          | Yeatman          |                    | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believes the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul              | Walker           | Oxford Bus Company | 1            |                         |               | Oxford Bus Company provides 95% of operated mileage in the district since Oxfordshire County Council withdrew all funding for services from July 2016. It is evident that the vast majority of travel demands arising from these sites to the city. Main desire is that new developments are serviceable by all transport modes including the bus, which can sustain viable commercial bus operation reducing reliance on public subsidy once 'kick-start' funding for new developments ceases.  |
| PR-B-0201 | Dr Catherine      | Grebenik         |                    | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia | Jennings         |                    | 1            |                         |               | No, this needs to be adequately substantiated before irreversible environmental damage (more traffic, pollution and to the greenbelt) is inflicted. Cherwell's proportion to support Oxford's needs should be lower. Your Partial Review document highlights that the majority of jobs and economic activity is in the Headington and Cowley area. In line with any strategy that seeks to minimize strain on roads, public transport and the environment it makes sense that a greater proportion of the homes should be located close to the areas, or with direct lines of access from the south and east of Oxford to where jobs are located.  |
| PR-B-0213 | Linda             | Browning         |                    | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems have already increased with the arrival of Water Eaton rail station. Schools and health services will be further stretched, made worse by the crisis in the NHS with shortage of doctors and nurses. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. With the new railway station the area will become a London suburb with high property prices.   |
| PR-B-0222 | Malcolm           | Axtell           |                    | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations which rely on high growth in jobs. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0234 | Prof Roger          | Davies     |              | 1            |                         |               | No, 4,400 new houses in Kidlington and Yarnton will radically alter the character of these communities and increase the population by 40%. Transport infrastructure and services which are already stretched will be overwhelmed.  |
| PR-B-0238 | D A                 | Burt       |              | 1            |                         |               | No, the figure of 4,400 homes is an estimate which has been heavily criticised as being unreliable. Roads into Oxford are already congested, extra traffic would add to this and increase air and noise pollution. There would be unsustainable pressure on schools and health services and walks which are essential for the health and well being of people would be lost.   |
| PR-B-0240 | Mrs Carole          | Walton     |              | 1            |                         |               | No, 4,400 houses is not appropriate in one village. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. Kidlington has already seen a rise in traffic since Water Eaton Park and Ride and Oxford Parkway were built. There is no mention of any new development being eco-friendly like that at Bicester.  |
| PR-B-0241 | Richard             | Walton     |              | 1            |                         |               | No, 4,400 houses is not appropriate in one village. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. Kidlington has already seen a rise in traffic since Water Eaton Park and Ride and Oxford Parkway were built. There is no mention of any new development being eco-friendly like that at Bicester.  |
| PR-B-0260 | Chris               | Pack       |              | 1            |                         |               | No, 4,400 houses is unsustainable. Education, health and social services will struggle to cope and traffic problems increase. Open countryside with walks and views will be lost along with natural habitats   |
| PR-B-0262 | Peter and Christine | Stevenson  |              | 1            |                         |               | If Oxford is unable to meet its housing requirements it needs to amend its plans for correlating employment and housing. Unless a requirement is imposed to create a significant proportion of starter homes it will simply provide homes for commuters and do little to alleviate housing needs.  |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole              | Pack       |              | 1            |                         |               | No, that amount of houses is not sustainable. It will have an enormous impact on services such as health, police and education and increase traffic problems whilst damaging the countryside.  |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | 1            |                         |               | No, it is an inflated figure produced by the development lobby in the form of the SHMA, with all its vested interests. The SHMA drawn up in 2014 needs revision following Brexit as it is likely to see fewer jobs, therefore demand for houses. The SHMA is not objective and is now discredited as an objective instrument to base housing projections.  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield   |              | 1            |                         |               | No, it is too high. Oxford City's figures are unrealistically high for Cherwell compared to their 550. Oxford should curtail its rampant growth and seek to disperse development to villages and towns outside the GB. There is no discussion of brownfield sites in Oxford or the number of unoccupied houses.  |
| PR-B-0641 | J                   | Willoughby |              | 1            |                         |               | No, It would seem an unfairly large proportion of overall need in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen      |              | 1            |                         |               | No. This rep has provided a detailed and lengthy objection to the allocation of this number of houses, and the accuracy of assumptions and information on which the consultation is based. It is critical of Oxford City's recent use of land and questions North Oxford as a suitable location when employment is centred to the east and south of the city. Transport infrastructure would be need to be in place as existing systems are inadequate and recent improvements had little effect. The time allowed for comment on this review was too short and the Christmas period unreasonable. |
| PR-B-0648 | Patricia            | Perisi     |              | 1            |                         |               | Object strongly to the proposed development of 4,400 houses on GB, which should be protected. Have lived in Kidlington 80 years and do not want to see my village joined to Oxford and lose its character. The development will destroy the countryside and wildlife and bring chaos to the area. Traffic is already heavy and the doctors surgery at capacity.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0653 | Peter          | Webber    |              | 1            |                         |               | Believe Oxford City needs to thoroughly explore all possibilities within Oxford to satisfy its own housing needs, before anything else. Attention is drawn to a recent planning application for 45 flats in William Morris Close that was rejected within its boundaries.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary | Shirley   |              | 1            |                         |               | No, far too many for a village this size.  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G         | Shirley   |              | 1            |                         |               | No, it is far too many for the area. Traffic gridlock would be created and the wildlife needs to be considered.  |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan          | Oldfield  |              | 1            |                         |               | No, it is not. Oxford city has scope for meeting its own housing needs within its boundaries. It could use brownfield sites, unoccupied buildings and build close to its ambitious industrial and business developments.   |
| PR-B-0670 | Mary           | Phipps    |              | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations which rely on high growth in jobs. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-0671 | David          | Phipps    |              | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations which rely on high growth in jobs. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-0673 | Joyce M        | Morris    |              | 1            |                         |               | Do not consider 4,400 homes sustainable as there are already considerable traffic problems on the A4166 through Kidlington and on roads leading to Oxford. It would result in the destruction of many walks and natural habitats that provide pleasure and health benefits to local people.  |
| PR-B-0676 | John F         | Morris    |              | 1            |                         |               | The assumption of a large growth of jobs in Oxford, as justification for extra housing, is not convincing. Am aware of the need to maintain the city's historic centre but there are many surrounding areas within the city which could be improved, where there is good bus services and short routes. Oxford needs to sort out its own housing problems as building outside the city will increase traffic and have a negative impact within Oxford. The GB which separates Kidlington and Oxford is an essential feature of the environment and must be maintained.   |
| PR-B-0680 | Dr John        | Maddicott |              | 1            |                         |               | No, this figure is much too high and based on dubious calculations and assumptions of job growth in Oxford .It would lead to a huge increase in the volume of traffic around Kidlington along with the Northern Gateway. This would bring with it pollution which is being linked to health issues for children. A large slice of GB would be lost with consequential damage to the environment, recreational facilities and wildlife. There is land within Oxford which could be developed such as Southfield golf course and brownfield sites.   |
| PR-B-0681 | Dr Hilary      | Maddicott |              | 1            |                         |               | No. The figure of 4,400 is derived from the SHMA who were not an independent organization but a group heavily involved with the developers. Its finding need proper scrutiny and should be challenged. Although everyone accepts that affordable housing is needed they are likely to go to London commuters. Oxford City's plans for the Northern Gateway and technology park off Langford Lane will increase pressure on housing it should therefore consider using Grenoble Road for housing rather than employment. The City Council needs to find areas for housing within the city to solve the problems created by its own policies. A development on this scale around Kidlington will increase congestion causing gridlock in the city and increase pollution. GB will be destroyed and vital agricultural land that can supply food for the future will be lost. |
| PR-B-0682 | Felicity       | Peacock   |              | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0695 | Mark       | Bale       |   | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and I believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J          | Kershaw    | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw | 1            |                         |               | Such a requirement would be approx a 20% increase in the number of houses required in the 2014 SHMA. Given the lack of infrastructure and the impact on the countryside, such additional houses would not be sustainable and therefore would run counter to the NPPF. The additional homes up to 2031 is based on assumptions of high jobs growth which, given the effects of BREXIT may be proven false. It would be prudent of the Council to retain its current number of homes for the Plan period and to undertake a review in five or six years. This should not put a halt on infrastructure projects which may be required as such investment is already required in order to ensure that the 22,840 homes are catered for. |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small      | Stagecoach  | 1            |                         |               | The evidence suggests that this is likely to be a broadly appropriate figure. However, the evidence is relatively high level and detailed testing of site capacity will be dependent on a number of factors, including urban design, dwelling mix, density and tenure. Given the difficulty of identifying deliverable potential within the City boundary, it would seem unreasonable and insufficiently well-evidenced to set this figure as an absolute cap.  |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn     | Phillips   |   | 1            |                         |               | It is questionable if Oxford and Oxfordshire have the same needs. Are mixing national requirements with local needs. Cherwell should not be providing housing at this level. Population growth is not a solution for demographic change.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony    | Matthews   | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council           | 1            |                         |               | Decision already taken and agreed with Oxford Growth Board - basis of agreement appears to be reasonable  |
| PR-B-0712 | Sonya      | Willoughby |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-0728 | Verity     | Westgate   |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-0729 | Tamara     | Lucas      |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Where is the data to support this. An extra 4400 houses north of the City is not sustainable and will mean that open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed; countryside walks and views will be lost; natural habitats will be destroyed; quality of life will suffer; noise and light pollution; traffic problems will get worse; schools and health services will be more stretched.   |
| PR-B-0731 | Ioana      | Davies     |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Far too great a number. Increased traffic and added pressure on schools and health centres would be terrible. GB will be damaged, views and walks destroyed. Increased pollution. Oxford need to meet their own unmet housing by utilising land that has been considered for commercial and business development.   |
| PR-B-0736 | Kieran     | Ward       |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. Relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname             | Organisation                 | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0739 | G                 | Gelder              |                              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed which can not be replaced. Walks, views and habitats lost. Dwindling wildlife and bird populations. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-0740 | Richard and Linda | Jurd                |                              | 1            |                         |               | No. Simply lead to traffic problems, look at Witney and Bicester with delays caused by building extra homes. Schools and health services become more stretched, it takes 2 weeks to see a doctor. GB sacrificed. Walks and views which is a major reason for living in Oxfordshire and habitats would be lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase.   |
| PR-B-0742 | Keith and Hilary  | Prince              |                              | 1            |                         |               | No. Excessive number of house for one region to absorb, where is the supporting evidence that there is a requirement for this. CDC already providing homes why take on another district's quota. Congestion will increase on already overloaded roads like at a "Garden Village" at Eynsham. The medical profession will be under more immense pressure. Kidlington's residents quality of life needs to be considered.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John              | Tremlett            |                              | 1            |                         |               | Yes. Strongly support the policy of building houses in the greater Oxford area to support its growing prosperity.   |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian            | Scargill            | Oxford Green Belt Network    | 1            |                         |               | Object to the SHMA figure of 4,400, which are hugely exaggerated based on high estimates of job growth put forward by Ox LEP to support their bid for funding. CDC should wait to see if the forecast materialises before destroying GB or other areas of countryside. Also consider that it will not be possible to build all these additional houses. Problems related to the capacity of the building industry and market saturation are likely to occur. Think that in addition to being unnecessary and undesirable, the proposed levels of house building are undeliverable. Furthermore, it is based on increasing employment in Oxford, therefore fundamentally unsustainable and damaging to Oxford as an attractive location. It will also be damaging to the environment and quality of life of the communities in the OGB. Oxfordshire authorities should continue with their previous approach of actively encouraging further employment and housing growth away from Oxford. |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian            | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories | 1            |                         |               | Do not agree that 4,400 is an appropriate additional housing requirement for Cherwell to meet Oxford's needs for reasons set out in their representation in detail.   |
| PR-B-0749 | Dr and Mrs M      | Wallace             |                              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-0750 | Niels             | van Kuijk           |                              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. Relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-0751 | Dr Katrin         | Kiessling           |                              | 1            |                         |               | No hard data provided to support 4,400 homes. Oxford could do more to meet their specific needs. Go higher, use brownfield sites and the use of empty buildings, ref to Oxford Mail article that 4,000 empty houses existing around Oxford. Building for rental specifically allocated for low income professionals in the health system and education and to be kept occupied by such professionals only.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0752 | Keeley     | Middleditch |              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. Its not acceptable to wait nearly 5 weeks for a doctors appointment, it will get worse. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . Relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin     | Palmer      |              | 1            |                         |               | It iss important that Kidlington does not become part of Oxford City by being helpful. The environments of each are different and by building on land that separates then would be a disaster. Separation is required to allow them to operate in their own interests and on supporting each other in providing work.   |
| PR-B-0756 | Keith      | Dancey      |              | 1            |                         |               | Absolutely not. This rep strongly objects to the question having concerns for traffic, air and noise pollution, schools, health services, open countryside, GB, wildlife, lost habitats (quoting The State of Nature 2016 Report) and quality of life. The rep has quoted Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment and has many questions. Negative comments towards the SHMA. Oxford is dumping its share onto Kidlington. Rep refers to the freedom of movement and population increase.   |
| PR-B-0756 | Keith      | Dancey      |              | 1            |                         |               | The rep strongly objects to the question and has quoted the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment. Clearly not meeting Kidlington's housing needs, this can not happen. Oxford is dumping its share onto Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-0756 | Keith      | Dancey      |              | 1            |                         |               | Yes. The proposals are unsustainable. Have there been considerations to the water supply, waste, minerals, greenhouse gas emissions, job's, school's, hospital's and public transport. What happens after 2031?   |
| PR-B-0756 | Keith      | Dancey      |              | 1            |                         |               | Objection to the destruction of GB between Oxford and Kidlington. Government guidance has stated that "unmet housing need" is not a valid reason for building on GB. Conservative Manifesto mentions that GB would be safe. These proposals threaten the integrity of the Conservative Party.   |
| PR-B-0756 | Keith      | Dancey      |              | 1            |                         |               | Objection to any building on the GB between Oxford and Kidlington. Government guidance has stated that "unmet housing need" is not a valid reason for building on GB. Conservative Manifesto mentions that GB would be safe. Building on GB destroys beautiful unspoilt countryside. Oxford's proposed growth is a scam only in the interest of developers.   |
| PR-B-0757 | Martin     | Palmer      |              | 1            |                         |               | You have no policy for developers to complete all the houses for which permission might be granted. Developers will not build if the price they get drops. Civitas report that in the ten years up to 2015 there were 774,485 more permissions granted in England than new homes started, demonstrating that developers deliberately hold back building homes - once they have received planning consent - in order to maintain high prices. The whole thing, from the SHMA to uncontrolled immigration, is a scam in favour of land owners and developers to maximise profits. |
| PR-B-0757 | Martin     | Palmer      |              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . Relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. The locations are close to Oxford Parkway, making it a commuter target keeping house prices high, what's happened to affordable housing?           |
| PR-B-0759 | R L        | Davies      |              | 1            |                         |               | No. 4,400 houses in Kidlington and Yarnton will radically change the character. Transport and services are already over stretched. Two week waiting time now at the doctors, this along with other services will become overwhelmed with the extra population in these areas.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname      | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth       | Moore        |   | 1            |                         |               | Strongly objects to the apportionment of 4,400 homes around Kidlington is unjustified and destructive to their communities. However, supports the proportional contribution from Cherwell towards meeting housing need, most specifically for affordable housing. Has provided a more detailed statement on the impacts of size and scale of the potential development around Kidlington would have on the existing infrastructure, services and facilities, including questioning the Growth Board figures in the representation.                                   |
| PR-B-0764 | Steven          | Daggitt      |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. Relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-0765 | Layla           | Vidal-Martin | NLP Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Taylor Wimpey | 1            |                         |               | Note that, in the absence of SODC's agreement, the OGB apportionment does not meet Oxford's unmet need in full. This could potentially mean that other Authorities around Oxford may need to make greater provision to meet this unmet need.   |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve           | Pickles      | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                 | 1            |                         |               | The figure has been derived from a careful evaluation of Oxford's housing need and the options for accommodating it, including the SHMA (2014); the Oxford Spatial Options Assessment (Sept 2016) and the Oxford Growth Board (Sept 2016). Consider that the 4,400 apportionment to CDC is both justified and that the District has the capacity to accommodate these dwellings.   |
| PR-B-0776 | Anthony         | East         |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. Relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. The locations are close to Oxford Parkway, making it a commuter target keeping house prices high, what's happened to affordable housing? |
| PR-B-0779 | David C         | Hinde        | Hinde Law Ltd   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-0782 | Andrew and Emma | Mundy        |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. Relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane            | Olds         | Caversfield Parish Council                                      | 1            |                         |               | The Parish believes that Oxford should be accommodating its own housing and re-thinking its policy of putting employment before housing.   |
| PR-B-0796 | David           | Tighe        |   | 1            |                         |               | No, the figure is far too large. Oxford should prioritise housing needs rather than employment adopting a more robust policy on housing density. Therefore being able to accommodate housing in its own boundaries.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation                               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0797 | Clive      | Booth    | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group        | 1            |                         |               | Planning for housing need, and for employment sites and the essential transport infrastructure to provide connectivity should be carried out on a strategic basis, taking account of the economic region of Oxford. Planning for the functional region across 6 separate authorities, on a fragmented and uncoordinated basis is patently neither efficient nor effective, but is a symptom of the administrative boundaries which are now obsolete in not reflecting the realities of the economic region. However, given the current circumstances in which the Oxfordshire Local Authorities have been unable to coordinate their activities in ways which have been achieved in other regions, accept that the contribution of 4400 houses within the Cherwell District Council administrative area is appropriate. |
| PR-B-0801 | Janet      | Stott    |  | 1            |                         |               | No, the figure of 4,400 is too large, based on assumptions of growth in employment in and around Oxford. Oxford City to prioritise land for housing rather than employment. Adopt a robust policy on housing density, accommodating a much larger proportion of its proposed housing need within its own boundaries. The proposed garden village outside Eynsham in West Oxfordshire will provide substantial housing in a more sustainable setting, with schools, community centres etc.   |
| PR-B-0807 | Justin     | Scroggie |  | 1            |                         |               | No it is not. Unfair that the proposed homes are intended to meet the needs of Oxford and not Kidlington. The figure of 4,400 based on the premise Oxford is to experience a rise in jobs. Ignores that Oxford contains a huge number of empty properties and land to be built upon. Increase in air pollution with extra cars, effecting local health. Schools and health services under more pressure. Kidlington ceases to be a village, GB built on which can not be recovered, creating an urban only generation.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris      | Robbins  |  | 1            |                         |               | Doubtful about the precise figure, suggestion that the SHMA influenced by vested interests. Evident that Oxford City has some level of unmet need which provisions should be made in Cherwell. At the present time this is the only available quantification of that need, and as such am prepared to accept it on a provisional basis.   |
| PR-B-0809 | Karen      | Selway   |  | 1            |                         |               | No. Further areas within Oxford need to be considered like Peartree Park and Ride. For Oxford City to build 550 homes is unacceptable. Kidlington specifically if 4,400 houses are permitted traffic problems will increase, schools like Gosford Hill are already overstretched and health services will not be able to cope. GB lost and natural habitats destroyed. The figure of 4,400 calculated prior to Brexit decision 3years ago. Our economic situation will be changing, can the figures be recalculated.  |
| PR-B-0812 | Tim        | Stott    |  | 1            |                         |               | No, the figure of 4,400 is too large, based on assumptions of growth in employment in and around Oxford. Oxford City to prioritise land for housing rather than employment. Adopt a robust policy on housing density, accommodating a much larger proportion of its proposed housing need within its own boundaries. The proposed garden village outside Eynsham in West Oxfordshire will provide substantial housing in a more sustainable setting, with schools, community centres etc.   |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim        | Green    | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 homes is overstated as a result of underlying assumption that there will be very large growth in Oxford's employment. Have provided a detailed response in their representation.  |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam       | Ryder    | Gladman Developments Ltd                   | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 homes should be regarded as the minimum housing requirement. This is because a) The total figure of 15,000 homes is only a working assumption agreed by the Growth Board. This figure may increase as work progresses on the Oxford City Local Plan; b)If South Oxon is unwilling to accommodate its full share of Oxford's unmet need it will be necessary for the balance to be redistributed between the other Oxfordshire Districts including Cherwell. There needs to be sufficient flexibility to provide for contingency to ensure the need is met in full.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation                                    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor     |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Figure is exaggerated because it is based on an assumption that there will be very large growth in employment in Oxford. Oxford has virtually full employment Oxford City should not zone land for employment, whilst expecting the surrounding DC to meet its housing needs. City should prioritise land for housing, build more densely and accommodate their own needs. Oxford already congested this will increase. Air and noise pollution will also increase. The document indicates that majority of jobs are based in Headington and Cowley. Building houses near to Kidlington would add strain to the roads, environment and public transport.  |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce      | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire | 1            |                         |               | Yes. Whilst agreeing with the figure of 4,400 homes, do not agree with the potential allocations set out in para 2.37 of the Options Paper that all these homes could be accommodated within the Oxford GB. Developing land immediately to the north of Oxford is likely to result in coalescence between Kidlington and the City and further sprawl of Oxford which would conflict with three of the five key purposes of the GB. It is considered that the exceptional circumstances required to alter the GB do not exist. Consequently greater consideration should be given to the land in sustainable locations outside the GB such as the land at Launton. (site plan provided).   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson     |   | 1            |                         |               | Not convinced that Oxford could not accommodate at least some of these within its own boundaries. Have reservations about these proposals meeting Oxford's greatest need which is for affordable housing. Can see the development sucking in relatively well-off people from Outer London who see the attractions of commuting via Chiltern Railways.   |
| PR-B-0827 | Paul             | Staniforth |   | 1            |                         |               | No. If this target were met Oxford would still have a housing need of similar size or greater. The City must live with the consequences of its own magnetism. If it is given an easy way out of its present problems then yet more people will be attracted to it and the problem will regenerate itself, resulting in yet more urban sprawl. There will be repeated demands to consume the countryside and destroy the homes of wildlife to the impoverishment of both village and city dwellers. Oxford will expand to fill the space available for its occupation. The GB is there partly to prevent Oxford from swallowing up the surrounding villages. If current planning restraints must be overridden in a doomed attempt to meet Oxford City's housing needs they should be overridden in Oxford. If that necessitates the replacement of old, energy-inefficient buildings by high-rise blocks of small flats, so be it. Easier in the future to replace high-rise build by low-rise than to convert built-up land back to agricultural land. |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel            | Buttler    |   | 1            |                         |               | Housing need is for Oxford, more homes should be provided in and around the vicinity of Oxford, not in the Banbury area. Oxford's unmet requirements, therefore more appropriate to be in areas much closer to Oxford. Additional homes in the Banbury area would put a strain on the locality in finding suitable sites, particularly in the Banbury area, with its existing infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha          | Eliot      | Oxford Preservation Trust                       | 1            |                         |               | Accepts that there is a need for more housing, but considers that the 4,400 may not be the correct number. Suggest that Cherwell must start with an assessment of how to create the new balanced communities that are well connected to Oxford, are of exemplar design and are supported by the necessary infrastructure etc. From this assessment should then flow an understanding of how many houses can be accommodated within Cherwell District. OPT's view is that it is not possible for Cherwell District Council to commit to numbers of houses to be provided without such assessment.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard          | Hills      |   | 1            |                         |               | No – many more will be needed, given the lack of development around Oxford spanning several decades. But 4,400 new homes will make a difference and must be built without delay. Also, given that it is likely that fewer homes will be delivered than planned, should aim to over-deliver, to maximise the chances of sorting the housing crisis.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0833 | Cas        | Lester     |   | 1            |                         |               | Don't believe so. Building 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. The area does not have the infrastructure to support them. The 4,400 is based on calculations which have been heavily criticised since they were made public. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. These assumptions need to be re-examined before an irreversible and destructive housing policy is implemented.   |
| PR-B-0834 | Eleanor    | Williamson |   | 1            |                         |               | No. The vast number is entirely inappropriate for Cherwell. This rep provides a lengthy objection to the proposals.  |
| PR-B-0837 | David      | Jackson    | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP                                | 1            |                         |               | Whilst generally supportive of the work of the OGB clients identify that the 2014 SHMA specifies that the housing requirement is between 1200-1600 dwellings per annum, equating to 24,00-32,000 over the period of the Plan with a midpoint of 28,000. The OGB has however, taken its starting point as 25,000. In light of the shortfall the conclusions of the OGB should be regarded as a minimum requirement for each of the adjoining districts and not an 'up to' figure.   |
| PR-B-0838 | David      | Jackson    | Savills on behalf of University of Oxford, Christ Church, Exeter, Magdalen, Merton and St John's Colleges | 1            |                         |               | Whilst generally supportive of the work of the OGB clients identify that the 2014 SHMA specifies that the housing requirement is between 1200-1600 dwellings per annum, equating to 24,00-32,000 over the period of the Plan with a midpoint of 28,000. The OGB has however, taken its starting point as 25,000. In light of the shortfall the conclusions of the OGB should be regarded as a minimum requirement for each of the adjoining districts and not an 'up to' figure.   |
| PR-B-0839 | Mark       | Rose       | Define on behalf of William Davies Ltd  | 1            |                         |               | CDC should be planning to provide a minimum of 4,400 homes. The rep goes on to refer to the SHMA, the Oxford Local Plan and the Options Consultation process. It concludes by stating that CDC should undertake a comprehensive assessment of the potential of the rest of the District to accommodate a greater proportion of the unmet need based upon the strategy in the adopted Local Plan. A higher level of provision would provide flexibility to accommodate for any shortfalls in the District or the wider HMA. |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike       | Gilbert    | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd   | 1            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex       | Wilson     | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd  | 1            |                         |               | This is a long rep which outlines the work of the Oxfordshire Growth Board and the local plan approaches of the other districts in Oxfordshire. It is recognised that SODC does not agree with the apportionment and the effect of this will need to be considered. Would the remaining districts be required to meet a greater proportion or will there be a review of the approach to apportionment and the assumptions that underlie it.  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard    | Cutler     | Bloombridge LLP   | 1            |                         |               | Yes. But would be helpful to split the 4,400 in order to identify what can be delivered before 2021 as Oxford's unmet need is current and pressing. A strategy with early delivery avoids any 5 year housing land supply questions/challenges and provides time to tackle the very challenging set of constraints close to Oxford. The rep outlines these constraints. It then goes on to discuss in some detail the merits, or otherwise, of siting University related development around Oxford Parkway.                 |
| PR-B-0848 | Rob        | McLennan   | Rob McLennan Planning on behalf of Mr RF Kendall  | 1            |                         |               | The figures were produced without adequate public consultation or notice for the public to respond before being 'signed off' by the Growth Board, which is considered as an undemocratic process and severely undermines the Local Plan process since it presents Councils with a 'fait-accompli' as regards housing numbers to be planned for which may not be soundly based. Disagree with the 4,400 homes for Cherwell for economic growth in Oxford. Have provided a detailed statement in the representation.         |
| PR-B-0856 | David      | Smith      |   | 1            |                         |               | How the projections are calculated are not disclosed. If the figure of 28,000 is correct, then 4,400 for Cherwell is not unreasonable, taking into consideration the commitment to 22,810 units by 2031. If the shortfall is due to the increased commercial development within the city, this needs to be reviewed when the matter of the projected unmet need is addressed.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0857 | Mark       | Christodoulou |  | 1            |                         |               | Objection to build 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. The figures are based on assumptions that are no longer valid, given the recent decision to leave the EU, this needs re-assessed to confirm the true numbers required. Urge CDC to get this recalculated as a matter of urgency. Disingenuous of Oxford City to claim it can not accommodate its own share when it is able to construct business parks on a whim. If housing is such a priority Oxford City need to build houses with the supporting infrastructure such as schools and medical centres. Then only build business parks, rather than white elephants, with no houses near by. Kidlington's house will be sold to London commuters not serve Oxford or Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim        | Perkins       | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | 1            |                         |               | No, the PC does not agree, and considers the scale of the proposed development is untested and unjustified. It will have a major impact on the GB, environment and transport infrastructure within the Parish and the surrounding area. Detailed comments are made on the methodology and findings of the Oxford Growth Board. Specific reference is made to the assumption that 3 areas within the GB (land North of Oxford, land at Begbroke and land SE of Kidlington) can provide this level of housing and are most suitable. The assessments were at a very high level, lacking detail and taking little account of local impacts. View is that given the potential impacts which are considered further in other parts of our response, 4,400 homes is too high and a much lower figure should be considered. |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt       | Todd          |  | 1            |                         |               | Without time to research this fully, would not quibble over the exact figure. Building on GB and spoiling the Oxfordshire countryside must be considered a restraint on any figure. Less priority to building for future development, look at the current needs. If this is based on new developments, question this need with reference to the Northern Gateway which has huge flaws especially concerning transport infrastructure.  |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer   | McFadden      |  | 1            |                         |               | Strongly considered 4,400 houses far too great for this area, site PR50 is vast. Difficult to find justification for the sheer scale proposed in the 157 page document. Assumptions that Oxford will have growth with employment, figures are unconvincing. Northern Gateway development creating the employment angle, looking to Cherwell to accommodate the workers. Impact would be immense with Kidlington and Oxford becoming one large city. The village concept would become ludicrous, rep quotes from page 12 of the plan with reference to the Kidlington village concept.  |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter      | Hainsworth    |  | 1            |                         |               | There is no reason for thinking that the need will be as large as this. What need there is should be containable within Oxford borders if sites are properly identified and controlled. Above all expansion on this scale on the edge of Oxford will make impossible demands on infrastructure for example transport arrangements.   |
| PR-B-0871 | Patricia   | Redpath       |  | 1            |                         |               | No. Remains no proven need for the numbers provided over and above Cherwell's allocation even within the City boundary. This high number is causing much controversy within communities. 4,400 homes in the area is three times the size of Woodstock. The delivery is unsustainable and the infrastructure can not cope. Creative thinking within Oxford to resolve this issue as Cherwell has already done its own bit.  |
| PR-B-0873 | Jenyth     | Worsley       |  | 1            |                         |               | There is no evidence that so many houses will be needed. Oxford should build more houses on brownfield land and keep them within its own boundaries.   |
| PR-B-0877 | David      | Flavin        | Oxfordshire County Council                               | 1            |                         |               | Agree with the apportionment proposed for Cherwell. Suggest that new development should be on key transport corridors.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds          | Wendlebury Parish Council                                | 1            |                         |               | No - 4,400 which equates to 20,000 people is too many houses for Cherwell. Oxford should do more to accommodate within its own boundaries. There is already unprecedented growth in Banbury and Bicester and more housing within the District will damage the environment around towns and put more pressure on services and facilities that are under strain.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname | Organisation                         | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|---------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0880 | Rhiannon      | Davies  |                                      | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-0881 | James Kenneth | Jutton  |                                      | 1            |                         |               | How can you justify the figure of 4,400 homes? Can you rely on the assumption of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. How can you be sure that these homes would not be bought up by London and other commuters?  |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia         | Trowles |                                      | 1            |                         |               | No. Calculations based on assumptions of a high growth rate in jobs, which can not be achieved. The figure and calculations has been criticised and needs to be reviewed. Strongly disagree with Oxford's proportion for unmet housing.  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter         | Trowles |                                      | 1            |                         |               | No. Calculations based on assumptions of a high growth rate in jobs, which can not be achieved. The figure and calculations has been criticised and needs to be reviewed. Strongly disagree with Oxford's proportion for unmet housing.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul          | Buckley |                                      | 1            |                         |               | The number is too high, partly based on Oxford's needs and their natural evolution up to 2031, which has been amplified by their predicted employment growth, which depends on future planning decisions made by Oxford City with the priority they give to land for houses versus employment. The SHMA assumes that employment growth will replicate what various employers in Oxford wish for without consideration to sustainability the consequences in terms of housing required. Destruction of GB and increased commuter traffic. This is an unacceptable approach. Sustainability consequences of housing required should be central to any planning decisions to provide building for further employment in Oxford. If this were the case, Oxford's future 'unmet housing need' would definitely be lower than the SHMA predicts. |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun       | Breith  | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust | 1            |                         |               | The most appropriate quantum is difficult to judge without reviewing all the information. Recognise that Oxford City is constraint and has limited opportunities to meet its housing needs whilst at the same time retaining sufficient open space for people and wildlife. Having said this are very concerned about the quantum of development proposed in Cherwell District and Oxfordshire as a whole.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris         | Dicks   |                                      | 1            |                         |               | No, Oxford's figure of 550 is too low. Am not in favour of losing green spaces within Oxford as it retains the city's character however many opportunities have been lost to provide homes, such as the Westgate development. The former Royal Mail site, the Northern Gateway and Osney Mead need to be considered. Priority needs to be given to housing local people as well as students. If Oxford's business needs can only happen at the expense of the GB, this is not grounds for "exceptional circumstances" and alternative sites such as Milton Park should be considered.  |
| PR-B-0891 | Katherine     | Simpson |                                      | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable the existing infrastructure already unable to cope. Roads not able to cope in rush hour. Schools at full capacity and not offered places in their catchment area. Health services have long waiting times. Object strongly to the building on open countryside. GB has a purpose to protect from urban sprawl and is not to be built upon. Wildlife and natural habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer and air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0892 | Richard                | Simpson  |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable the existing infrastructure already unable to cope. Roads suffer like Preatree roundabout. Schools at full capacity and not offered places in their catchment area. Health services have long waiting times. Object strongly to the building on open countryside. GB has a purpose to protect from urban sprawl and is not to be built upon. Wildlife and natural habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer and air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |                        | 1            |                         |               | Yes but with reservations. To favour starter homes and to minimise traffic congestion. Clear from the SHMA that an average 5,000 homes are needed per year across Oxfordshire to make up for the fewer houses being built. Providing affordable housing for the young. Such figures justifies these numbers according to perceived economic growth areas. For this reason housing would need to be as close as possible to potentially high areas of employment. Would not support 4,400 homes in Cherwell if this were to lead to 4,400 extra cars travelling on already busy roads towards Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard       | Miles    |                        | 1            |                         |               | The figure seems an inappropriate amount for Cherwell to meet Oxford's unmet housing need, the reason is due to Oxford's resistance to build on GB, the burden shouldn't be passed on to build on GB. Option A would lead to merging of Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington, resulting in urban sprawl into Oxford and the and identity and character.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |                        | 1            |                         |               | The figure is excessive because of the following reasons. Significant stress on local infrastructure. Damage villages rural character and is contrary to the NPPF and Local Plan. Fallen unfairly on Cherwell compared to other Oxfordshire districts. Oxford need to address and do more to meet their own needs. Inadequate transport links. SHMA is flawed the figure is too high and the figure does not take into account the impact of Brexit.  |
| PR-B-0902 | Vanessa                | Pinder   |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-0904 | Jill                   | Grain    |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. Should provide affordable homes for those who already work here.  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 is disproportionately high when compared to Cherwell's assessed need of 22,800. It is difficult to have confidence that the assessed need truly reflects Oxford's need. Concern regarding South Oxfordshire's apportionment not being taken up by them. Oxford should take greater proportion by increasing densities and creative use of brownfield sites. Also, impact of Brexit should be considered.  |
| PR-B-0906 | Steve and Anne         | Handsley |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched at a time when services for children and elderly are being cut, putting many at risk. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0907 | Alison     | Forfar   |  | 1            |                         |               | Oxford should look to use all its own land especially brownfield before asking other areas to support their needs. Building in surrounding areas will increase traffic and increase air pollution which is detrimental to the health of the population in Cherwell. Inadequate public transport and to get into Oxford by public transport you have to drive a distance to get onto a bus or train.   |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark       | Lowen    |  | 1            |                         |               | Insufficient evidence to justify 4,400 homes being built in Cherwell and Oxford's assertion that they need to increase employment will lead to the need for more housing. If there is a crisis Oxford City should build houses before commercial development such as the Northern Gateway. There has been inadequate and poorly publicised consultation with Kidlington residents, who feel the decision has already been made without any consideration to Kidlington. There is no acknowledgement of the upheaval 10,000 extra people would create to the community cohesion and schools. Roads are already congested, journey times long and the Rapid Transit Lines suggested are little more than aspirations unlikely to take place, or be in place for development. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify building on the GB and driving from outside the GB to Oxford takes only fractionally longer than from within due to congestion. The vast majority of employment sites are to the south, east and west of the city, building to the north doesn't provide the opportunity to walk or cycle to work. |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton   |  | 1            |                         |               | No. The question attempts to presuppose the answer. There is no evidence Oxford has an unmet housing need. There are not a large number of people living on the streets, there are unfortunately some. Oxford could accommodate for this need, which would be closer to the source of jobs and be far more sustainable. Large employers in Oxford are the public sector, this is not the sector that should be increasing employment. It needs to be focused on companies that are growing who would be better placed on business parks within reach of Oxford, but there is no need to be within the City or on the surrounding GB. Housing for the employees can be dispersed over a wide area of Oxfordshire and surrounding counties and if this is the case the existing and new transport infrastructure has the chance of coping.  |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew     | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                 | 1            |                         |               | The 4,400 homes would be in areas A and B. Kidlington would see major growth and into the Green Belt. It will destroy the current independent identities and histories of these settlement  |
| PR-B-0912 | David      | Mason    |  | 1            |                         |               | No it seems disproportionately high compared to other District Councils including Oxford itself. The numbers are based on out of date information. Not clear what the effect of Brexit has but housing demand is slowing and the rate of demand will decrease.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 1            |                         |               | Fundamentally disagrees with the 4,400 homes because it relies on the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) which is deeply flawed, significantly over-estimates housing numbers and is out of date. It is based on a strategy of rapidly increasing employment within Oxford City which is unnecessary and potentially highly damaging. It is not supported by an adequate spatial strategy that takes into account the environmental, social and economic capacity of the county as a whole. The level of housing proposed is not deliverable or sustainable. Have provided a very detailed statement in response to this question inn their representation on The Oxfordshire SHMA, Employment growth in Oxford, Lack of a democratic and coherent spatial strategy, The level of housing proposed is not delivered or sustainable.   |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 1            |                         |               | SODC have refused to meet the required provision set out by the Growth Board. This leaves an unmet need of 4950, which may have to be met by the adjacent districts. Consider that a number of sites could be brought forward to meet the shortfall, in addition to the Cherwell allocation.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric    | Sidebottom |  | 1            |                         |               | No the figure is too large. It is based on assumptions that there will be a large employment growth in and around Oxford. There is no need for Oxford to zone land for employment while expecting other districts to meet their unmet housing needs. Oxford needs to prioritise land for housing and not employment with a robust policy for housing then they would be able to build a larger proportion within their own boundaries.   |
| PR-B-0928 | Stephanie  | White      |  | 1            |                         |               | Objects to building in the Green Belt because it would lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which CDC has undertaken to protect. Most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain it; Even more pressure on local infrastructure: local roads, schools and health services are already overstretched; Creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock is likely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters; Loss of their villages' character, identities and ancient historical settings; and Loss, for ever, of their adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie      | Lodwick    |  | 1            |                         |               | Very strongly objects to the 4,400 homes in Cherwell to meet Oxford's needs is not appropriate. The question is fallacious, it is an attempt to deceive the reader into thinking the premises of the plan, the acceptance of the Growth Board's decision to apportion 4,400 homes, is fait accompli. Yet, the Plan explicitly states that the decision has been made. Has provided more detailed response in her representation.   |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds       | Fringford Parish Council                             | 1            |                         |               | Cherwell has clearly met its needs, it seems unfair that Cherwell has to help make good Oxford's lack of earlier planning.   |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter      | Bateman    | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family             | 1            |                         |               | The methodology and evidence used to calculate Oxford's needs is out of date. It will therefore not be robust or fully accord with Para 158 of the Framework. New population data will exist and therefore the 4,400 figure may not be correct at the time of examination. The assessment of the urban capacity of Oxford should also be up to date. In addition there does not appear to be a county wide IDP to underpin the overall 15,000 homes for the City. Spreading the growth around the County without having a County wide IDP in place is unsound.   |
| PR-B-0935 | David      | Lock       | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates | 1            |                         |               | Consider that CDC is well placed to take growth as proposed, and could potentially take more.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle      | Greenlight Developments                              | 1            |                         |               | The 4,400 homes figure significantly underplays the contribution that Cherwell must make in meeting, in part, Oxford's unmet housing needs. The rep assesses a range of variables to demonstrate why the figure is substantially below that which Cherwell must accommodate. Greenlight Developments position is that Cherwell's requirement should be at least 6,540 dwellings (based on a 30% apportionment of the full, objectively assessed housing needs).  |
| PR-B-0939 | Lynne      | Tighe      |  | 1            |                         |               | No the figure is too large it is based on assumptions that there will be a large employment growth in and around Oxford. There is no logical reason for Oxford to zone land for employment while expecting other districts to meet their unmet housing needs. Oxford needs to prioritise land for housing and not employment with a robust policy for housing then they would be able to build a larger proportion within their own boundaries.  |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo   |  | 1            |                         |               | Objection to the lack of consultation to this planning document for residents of North Oxford. No notice of the Cutteslowe Park exhibition and knowledge was spread by word of mouth after the event. Another consultation must be held. Do not agree with the number of houses proposed for Oxford. Seems far too high. Disagree with what appears to be the continual enlargement of Oxford. Soon becoming larger and less historic City just like so many others. Why is larger better.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname                  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0949 | Peter                  | Monk                     | Banbury Civic Society   | 1            |                         |               | Welcomes the opportunity to comment on this consultation paper. The introductory paragraphs give the impression that Cherwell is not convinced that the City is doing its utmost to provide for the needs of the City, but are using the 'Duty to Co-operate' as a means to get others (e.g. the District Councils) to fulfil their obligations on behalf of the City. This may be argued as unfair but, notwithstanding the 'Critical Friends' report to the Growth Board, prima facie there are many undeveloped areas within the City's boundary and the city should be required to publish a schedule of ALL undeveloped land within the City boundary, private and public, green and brown, with an indication of how this land is to contribute to alleviating the City's difficulties. This is NOT to say that some must be retained to provide public open space to the accepted criteria or retained for future employment related development. There is no reason why private and/or public sports grounds and golf courses should not be relocated to outside the City boundary within the 'Green Belt'. Green space is as important to residents of the surrounding Districts as it is to those in the City. |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark                   | Recchia                  | Banbury Town Council  | 1            |                         |               | Agrees with 4,400. It finds that the Strategic Constraints identified for Options G, Junction 10 M40, Options H are appropriate.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                 | Small                    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 homes is likely to have a significant effective on Sustainability Objective 9 (historic environment). Are minded to support a lower figure. Have provided a more detailed statement in their representation covering issues like SHMA, Table 5.3 of Spatial Options Paper, etc.  |
| PR-B-0959 | Cllrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |   | 1            |                         |               | Agree that 4,400 is appropriate for Cherwell, however, they consider that there are problems that need resolving before the houses are built. Would like to be kept up to date when it comes to resolving the issues that they have identified in response to this question. They are:<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Public transport and road upgrades needed to mitigate the impact of the additional 4,400 homes in the area.</li> <li>* New Schools and upgrading existing Schools to accommodate the additional capacity.</li> <li>* NHS services in the Cherwell area will need increased capacity, the Horton Hospital is used by the whole of the District and needs to be protected from being downgraded</li> <li>* Mitigation measures including areas of tree planning to mitigate against the loss of green space and impact on habitat.</li> <li>* Benefits in way of funding from Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council for accommodating a larger proportion of the City's growth in the District.</li> </ul>   |
| PR-B-0960 | M                      | O'Mahoney                |   | 1            |                         |               | Objects to the 4,400 homes on sustainability grounds. Considers that it will increase traffic problems, schools and healthcare will be even more stretched, open countryside in the GB will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views will be lost, natural habitats will be destroyed, and his quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. Also considers that the 4,400 is based on dubious calculations which have been heavily criticised since they were made public. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-0963 | Mr and Mrs             | Shepherd                 |   | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems have already increased with the new station this will get worse with the amount of houses. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB is sacrificed and Kidlington will become an extension of Oxford City, this is not why we moved here. Walks, views and habitats will be lost. Quality of life will suffer with an increase to air, noise and light pollution. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. Rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county and be able to get to their place of work. Kidlington will not cope with the extra traffic. Talks about workplace car park levy's and what vehicles can go into Oxford, it is questionable about the strategy and job growth in Oxford. The high cost of living makes it difficult to recruit in all public sectors. It is not acceptable to build in an area already full.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0967 | Eileen     | Bloomer   |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin    | Noke Parish Meeting    | 1            |                         |               | The housing requirement of 4,400 highly questionable and hugely exaggerated. They are based on very high estimates of jobs growth put forward by Oxfordshire LEP to support its bids for external funding. In Cherwell's analysis much of the pressure is coming from the rental sector for student housing. The vast majority do not want to live outside the city centre for practical reasons. It would be far better to utilise the brownfield sites already identified for industrial and commercial development within Oxford for appropriate housing and can be focussed towards high density, smaller homes which is characteristic to City Centre and not Rural homes. |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd  | 1            |                         |               | Yes. If SODC cannot accept all of the recommended contribution then other districts including Cherwell may have to increase the requirement from 4,400.   |
| PR-B-0983 | Suzanne    | Morris    |                        | 1            |                         |               | The figure of 4,400 is based on assumptions of very high growth in employment in and around Oxford, the figure is too large. There is no logical reason for Oxford to zone land for employment while expecting other districts to meet their unmet housing needs. Estimate of Oxford's unemployment rate from April 2014 to March 2015 is 3.7%, this is below the national average of 6%. Oxford needs to prioritise land for housing and not employment with a robust policy for housing then they would be able to build a larger proportion within their own boundaries.   |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett   |                        | 1            |                         |               | This number is very large. If Cherwell can not meet its own housing and employment targets would it still be required to assist Oxford City or would Cherwell's needs take priority? Bicester is already in full development, requiring major infrastructure and is closely monitored by CDC. South Oxfordshire does not accept their quota, so will this be forced onto the other districts and will this be equal. CDC should not agree to accept anymore.  |
| PR-B-0996 | Lucy       | Smith     |                        | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase, unable to see a strategy outlined. Schools and health services become more stretched. Where would a school be placed and waiting times for doctors are horrendous. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Losing the area above The Moors is heart-breaking. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-0997 | George     | Thomas    |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-0998 | Lisa       | Coulling  |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase, the roads are in bad conditions as it is especially the old Bicester Road near the new cemetery. Schools and health services become more stretched, have had to wait up to seven weeks for a doctors appointment. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner    | Launton Parish Council | 1            |                         |               | Its a fait accompli!  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1005 | SP and SA  | McQuillan     |   | 1            |                         |               | No rational for accepting this specific number. The case has not been proven for the need for unmet housing. Again there's no rational that CDC to accept this while SODC have chosen not to accept additional homes.  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council                                    | 1            |                         |               | Support, but this must be maximum. Wish that Oxford City would take more of the load.  |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher       | Rosconn Group   | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 is consistent with the OGB recommendation. Given that the SODC apportionment was not agreed and that the working assumption is 15,000 dwellings, consider that an element of flexibility should be accommodated in the figure to be adopted by CDC.  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                             | 1            |                         |               | This figure has not been consulted on before and there is no indication as to how or why it was arrived at. Cherwell District is well placed to accommodate Oxford's growth. It has excellent direct rail connections. There is a very strong justification for accommodating growth at suitable locations along these lines to encourage residents to use the train. These features mean that Cherwell is able to accommodate more than its proportionate amount of Oxford's unmet needs and there is certainly capacity to accommodate at least 6,000 homes in locations well connected to Oxford and the main employment foci to the south of Oxford. In addition, it could be that part of the number allocated to South Oxfordshire should be reassigned to Cherwell. Council is urged to review this issue via the Growth Board and resolve the position before the Submission of the Plan, otherwise it will be a potentially fatal issue for the Plan Review at Examination. |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd                                      | 1            |                         |               | Aware that SODC is distancing itself from its apportionment of the Oxford City unmet housing need. This is an important issue which needs resolving. Do not disagree that 4,400 is a reasonable portion for Cherwell to take, if South Oxfordshire does not commit to providing for its fair share (4,950 homes).  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | 1            |                         |               | Disagrees with the 4,400 apportionment, but accepts them only as a provisional figure for two reasons. (1) demand for employment at Northern Gateway may not be as rapid as envisaged due to the effects of Brexit on the wider economy; therefore release of housing land should be monitored in the medium term after 5 years. (2) LTP strategy for three new Park and Rides to replace the Pear Tree Park and Ride, which would potentially release land for 1500 homes within city boundaries. Therefore it should be a condition for accepting the additional replacement Park and Ride spaces. Discusses white land at Northern Gateway in more detail.  |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan   | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 1            |                         |               | If South Oxfordshire cannot accept all of the recommended contribution to the unmet need, then other districts including Cherwell may have to increase the requirement from 4,400 in order to address the unmet need in full.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David      | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford | 1            |                         |               | The 4,400 figure does not represent the fully objectively assessed need established through the SHMA. It would be preferable and place the plan in a more robust position to provide for the full housing need and make the plan less vulnerable to challenge. The under provision should be noted from the outset. If the figure is to remain at 4,400 units this should serve as a minimum level of development. Some contingency should be provided for any under provision in South Oxfordshire or elsewhere.  |
| PR-B-1033 | Matthew    | Symons        | Hollins Strategic Land  | 1            |                         |               | It has demonstrated that the Partial Review should plan for more than 4,400 because of South Oxfordshire Council's refusal to contribute at the level required by the Oxfordshire Growth Board. Have provided more detailed information in their submitted representation  |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1036 | Robert       | Davies     | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford              | 1            |                         |               | Promoting land at Yarnton for Merton College. Suggest that Cherwell should be seeking to provide significantly more than 4,400 dwellings across the district in order to meet Oxford's need. The SA has considered a significantly more than 4,400 scenario, which is welcomed. Notwithstanding that the assessment of only the 4,400 home scenario forms the subject of the Transport and Sustainability Appraisal. Suggest that Cherwell should increase its housing provision to 5000+ to take account of potential constraints to development and a shortfall as a result, which would negate potential shortfalls in other districts (SODC). 5000+ would be appropriate with 4,400 as a minimum figure. Suggest that given the circumstances with SODC it is necessary to have a contingency in place within the revised Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 to take account of SODC's continued resistance to OGB figures. On this basis the 4,400 should be reviewed. |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 1            |                         |               | Reference is made to the on going work of Oxford City Council and the Growth Board. The comments conclude that on the basis of the evidence provided, it is clear that the working figure of 15,000 is not an agreed figure for the true amount of need, which Oxford City now anticipates to be 22,000. On this basis it is clear that the apportionment is likely to be increased and therefore the figure of 4,400 for Cherwell DC can only be treated as a minimum in order to ensure the soundness of the plan.  |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret | Sidebottom |   | 1            |                         |               | No this figure is too large. Do not accept the assumptions on which the figure is based. Do not accept that there will be a very large growth in employment in and around Oxford. The calculations are spurious. Oxford has virtually full employment no reason for Oxford to zone land for employment, whilst expecting the surrounding DC to meet its housing needs. Oxford should prioritise land for housing, build more densely and accommodate their own needs within their own boundaries.   |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson      |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land, be affordable and house the current population first.   |
| PR-B-1040 | Robert       | Dyson      |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. It seems that it is about building houses at the lowest cost to be sold at the highest to gain and highest profit. It will save the issue in the area but bring in a new population who will commute to London. It seems that the 4,400 was obtained by seeing how much could be squeezed into the GB and then making that the assessment of need.   |
| PR-B-1046 | William      | Hodgson    |   | 1            |                         |               | Object to Kidlington and Oxford being joined by a dormitory housing block that attracts commuters to London. 4,400 is a soulless mass that in no way could be called a village community. The figure is too large. Oxford should accommodate a much larger proportion of its proposed housing need within its own existing city boundaries.   |
| PR-B-1049 | Maria        | Page       |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-1052 | Andrew       | Mundy      |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. The roads around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke are already an issue at peak times this would add to the problem. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1053 | David             | Hemingway |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1054 | Bharat and Jankee | Badiani   |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1055 | Philippa          | Mullineux | Dragon School Pre-Prep | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable and will mean that: open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, against planning policy<br>- traffic problems will get much worse<br>- schools and health services will be even more stretched<br>- countryside walks and views will be lost<br>- natural habitats will be destroyed<br>- our quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase<br>- in areas, the historic environment will be unduly affected.<br>The 4,400 is based on dubious calculations, which have been heavily criticised since they were made public. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. The provision of these houses does not constitute 'very special circumstances'(NPPG para 34), as it relates to potential future employment that is not needed in Oxford. The proposals are not designed to principally address the affordable housing crisis, and it would be sleight of hand to suggest that it was.  |
| PR-B-1056 | Simon             | Parker    |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1064 | Karen and Tony    | East      |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. The roads around Kidlington are already heavily congested and often reach gridlock. The roads are dangerous without any extra traffic and the train link has increased rather than reduced the volume. The health service in Kidlington is stretched along with the parking. The local schools are full, class sizes huge and teachers pushed to the limit. Building on green land will reduce the much needed space for children and teenagers. The countryside is well used for recreation, for health, its views and wildlife. The fields pinpointed for development flood regularly during winter and high rain. More traffic and houses will cause pollution and in turn health problems. Quality of life will suffer and will encourage anti-social behaviour. The 4,400 is based on dubious calculations, that rely on assumptions of job growth and there does not appear to be a demand for houses. Object to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable. |
| PR-B-1065 | J                 | Bevis     |                        | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1068 | Louise          | Crone     |              | 1            |                         |               | No of course not. Almost doubling the size of a village is ridiculous. The roads are already congested with lengthy journey times before adding another 9,000 cars. The infrastructure is not in place, in particular doctors are at capacity. Our beautiful countryside with its walks will be destroyed and wildlife driven away. These new houses will not be for our children but people moving into the area, the only people to benefit will be the developers and landowners.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP              | Lyes      |              | 1            |                         |               | No. 4,400 homes is not appropriate. The number is based on a biased and flawed report which of it's own admission is "to be treated with caution in looking at the need for affordable housing" Whilst the report has been accepted as the basis for the whole strategy, it has not been subject to a truly independent review.   |
| PR-B-1073 | Susan           | Simms     |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and the figure is based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-1079 | JW              | Fresen    |              | 1            |                         |               | No an extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-1080 | Mr and Mrs      | Horne     |              | 1            |                         |               | No an extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-1081 | Lynn            | Pilgrim   |              | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. The figure relies on assumptions regarding job growth but Oxford and Kidlington are areas of high employment and do not need creation of jobs. There are unoccupied houses within the city and Oxford has its own golf course, ancient meadow and GB. Why are Kidlington's assets of less importance? This rep provides a list of suggested sites for development including the Northern Gateway and Pear Tree Park and Ride site. It also suggests flaws in the SHMA findings and reasons why Oxford can't meet its housing needs. |
| PR-B-1082 | Nicholas Edward | Mullineux |              | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M         | Rugg      |              | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-1088 | Bryan           | Rugg      |              | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-1089 | Dave            | Bevis     |              | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations which make assumptions about job growth. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F         | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 1            |                         |               | Disappointed that there is continuous endorsement of Oxford's housing need. Oxfordshire Growth Board's apportionment for Cherwell is questioned. Oxford has a responsibility to meet its need as fully as it can, and the general principle should be that any perceived need is met where it arises. Concerned about increased commuter traffic. Aim for a 'Rapid Transit Network' is laudable, but feel it will inevitably lag far behind the building of houses if it materializes at all.  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val              | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council   | 1            |                         |               | As this housing is for Oxford, considerably more homes should be apportioned to Oxford itself, rather than the 550 stated. It is Oxford's unmet housing need. 4,400 additional homes will put a strain on Cherwell in respect of finding suitable site locations, ensuring there is appropriate infrastructure, etc.   |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg             | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 1            |                         |               | A long and comprehensive response which in summary states that it must first be assessed whether the 15,000 Growth Board figure is an appropriate target. Oxford City SHLAA 2014 identifies a housing supply of 10,212 homes from 2011-2031. However, with an OAN of 28,000 the shortfall equates to c.18,000 as a minimum. The shortfall increases to 22,000 when referring to the higher range identified in the OAN, which is the identified need. Therefore 22,000 should be the minimum benchmark set, and subsequently reapportioned between the districts. Sites will need to be identified to accommodate a greater level of development than 4,400 new homes.     |
| PR-B-1097 | Caroline         | Hayes     |   | 1            |                         |               | This figure is too large and is based on assumptions that do not stand up to scrutiny.   |
| PR-B-1098 | Michael          | Bott      |   | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. The sites are close to Oxford Parkway making it attractive for commuters and keep property prices will be high. The Government is keen to provide affordable housing, it is therefore nonsensical to choose such a high priced location. |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan             | Storah    | Oxford City Council   | 1            |                         |               | Welcomes Cherwell's acceptance of the apportionment and agrees that 4,400 homes is appropriate.  |
| PR-B-1100 | Katherine        | Andrews   |   | 1            |                         |               | No, an extra 4,400 houses is not appropriate and based on calculations which have been criticised publically. The infrastructure for these new jobs including housing should be in an area which has adequate space and amenities. Strongly believe that GB should remain to protect the over-development of Oxford and provide a flood plain for the areas that flood regularly. Local amenities are already stretched such as the doctors and additional traffic would add to the traffic problems. Am concerned that natural local habitats and wildlife will be destroyed.   |
| PR-B-1101 | Catherine        | Dobson    |   | 1            |                         |               | No, this figure is vastly exaggerated and based on assumptions that growth in employment will occur. This figure needs substantiating. Oxford should strive to accommodate a much larger proportion and insist on affordable houses when granting permission for development. Priority should be given to land for houses before employment. Consideration needs to be given to schools, this would be needed for the Barton development.  |
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate   | Hamilton  |   | 1            |                         |               | The number of proposed houses published in the SHMA needs revisiting as there has been significant changes since then. A new government, Brexit and the promise of a railway line between Oxford and Cambridge.  |
| PR-B-1104 | Lawrence Michael | Colvin    |   | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 homes is only appropriate if these homes are either grouped as one, two or three new villages each with their own schools and NHS surgery. Or distributed into existing settlements in such a way that the population increase is no more than 10%.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1105 | Norman and Janet | Bates      |   | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and the figures are based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom              | Hockaday   |   | 1            |                         |               | No, this number is too high. The development already planned in Cherwell cannot be increased by another 4,400 houses. There is a huge opportunity for Oxford to grow and retain its historic character by releasing GB especially to the south of the city. There are substantially greater and more sensible options in South Oxfordshire and their apportionment should be higher.   |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith            | Johnston   |   | 1            |                         |               | The document states that 'the urban capacity of Oxford is as yet unconfirmed.' This appears to undermine an 'unmet need' of 15,000 homes, thus making any subsequent apportionment unsafe. Given the challenges in accommodating CDC plan of 22,840 new homes in the 20-year period 2011 – 2031 to further absorb 4,400 additional homes for Oxford City is disproportionate. The development of the Northern Powerhouse and results of the EU referendum will change economic forecasts. 4,400 new homes around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke would change the individual, identifiable characters of each village.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson    |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Groups such as the Oxford GB network and CPRE have disputed this figure. The jobs growth estimate for Oxford is very high. Even with the planned University business parks the job growth is unlikely. Also, a high proportion of any new housing in Oxford is not bought by people working in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat              | Clissold   |   | 1            |                         |               | No, Cherwell has already agreed to build 23,000 new homes, another 4,400 is an increase of almost 20% which is too high.   |
| PR-B-1119 | Bob              | Hessian    | Weston on the Green Parish Council                    | 1            |                         |               | Questions the validity of the figures of housing requirement is calculated and it is suggested that the figure is an overestimate. More effort is needed to identify properties within Oxford City by Oxford City Council to reduce housing need.  |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul             | Mayhook    |   | 1            |                         |               | Although extra housing needs to be found somewhere, 4,400 houses north of the city is too many. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed.   |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie            | Lewis      | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate | 1            |                         |               | Needs to be seen as a minimum figure. The figure of 4,400 homes is an appropriate minimum figure to consider and assess within the boundaries of the district. It should not be regarded as a ceiling figure.  |
| PR-B-1127 | David            | Betts      |   | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. Whilst housing is required, the number provided by the SHMA needs revisiting following the EU referendum and likely scaled down figure for transport infrastructure from the Local Growth Fund. Oxford needs to look within the city and exhaust all possibilities for example Southfield Golf Course which is not in GB. There will be opportunities on Park and Ride sites if they are relocated and employment land in the Northern Gateway should be revisited. |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward       | Kidlington Development Watch                          | 1            |                         |               | Object to the 4,400 homes for Cherwell. Question the figure and its reliance on evidence it is based on. Seriously concerned of the impact this can have on Kidlington in all respects. Have provided a detailed statement in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1134 | Neil             | McKendrick |   | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation                 | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1136 | Giles      | Lewis      |                              | 1            |                         |               | Strongly objects to 4,400 houses for Cherwell especially as this threatens to lead to incursions on the GB. The `needs` are really `wants` articulated by the Oxford Growth Board and the Oxford Local Enterprise Partnership, with enthusiastic backing from landowners and developers; therefore based on assumptions around future business growth within the City. Has provided a detailed statement setting out all concerns and reasons why development in the GB would not be acceptable.   |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine  | Richenburg |                              | 1            |                         |               | No, it is far too many and believe the figure to be based on dubious assumptions about the expansion of Oxford. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB will be eroded and urban sprawl created. SODC has not agreed to its apportionment and CDC should do the same.  |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan       | Lodwick    |                              | 1            |                         |               | This rep provides a detailed objection based on the SHMA being fundamentally flawed. Reference is made to the Local Plan Part 1 and lack of evidence that the SHMA has been independently tested or validated. Specific reference is made to many people involved including MP Tony Baldry. The housing numbers are undeliverable and not sustainable.   |
| PR-B-1143 | Dr Pamela  | Roberts    |                              | 1            |                         |               | No. 4,400 houses is an excessive number for CDC to take especially when it has committed to build 22,800 houses as part of its Local Plan and is more than other districts. The numbers are based on discredited analysis and are an overestimate of local growth needs. There is financial uncertainty arising from Brexit and changing global markets, therefore employment growth estimates on which housing is based are not robust. Oxford City needs to increase its housing density and undertake urban regeneration by building on brownfield or derelict sites.   |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard    | Bennett    |                              | 1            |                         |               | No, 4,400 is excessive. Agree a requirement must be met but this figure is not appropriate.  |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ         | French     | Deddington Development Watch | 1            |                         |               | Objects to the 4,400. This is undemocratic and severely undermines the Local Plan process since it presents district councils with a fait accompli as regards housing numbers. The figures are unrealistic and exaggerated. They are based not on existing need but on the need that would be generated by notional job creation targets which may, or may not, be achieved. This falls short of a robust evidence base. Concur with the concerns summarised in para 2.44. Have doubts on whether Oxford is maximising the opportunities for home building on brownfield sites that would benefit from regeneration and affordable homes. For instance, should not the regeneration of the Osney Mead industrial estate focus on more high density housing to maximise land use ? 550 homes is not an adequate housing contribution by Oxford. The comment about Cherwell having further housing potential because it was considered that the district was "one of the least constrained districts due to its strong relationship with Oxford" makes little sense without further context. |
| PR-B-1147 | Joan       | Tossell    |                              | 1            |                         |               | No, this plan is based on a flawed and out of date review. The figure reached by the SHMA was based on a review that was not truly independent as part of the property advice was for the developers as well as the public sector. According to the Office for National Statistics there were 4,300 residents in the city seeking employment between July 2015 and 2016. If Oxford business employed a significant number of these, the housing requirement would fall   |
| PR-B-1148 | Terry      | Tossell    |                              | 1            |                         |               | No, this plan is based on a flawed and out of date review. The figure reached by the SHMA was based on a review that was not truly independent as part of the property advice was for the developers as well as the public sector. According to the Office for National Statistics there were 4,300 residents in the city seeking employment between July 2015 and 2016. If Oxford business employed a significant number of these, the housing requirement would fall   |
| PR-B-1152 | Helen      | Pattison   |                              | 1            |                         |               | There is a need for affordable housing and the GB should be more rigorously questioned. However it is wrong to ask the districts to supply 50% of the houses. If Oxford wants growth it need to address the issue in a more creative way because it may never be able to meet its needs.   |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim        | Spencer    |                              | 1            |                         |               | Yes, given this is district wide it should be attainable.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation            | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council | 1            |                         |               | Objects to an extra 4,400 north of the City. Traffic problems will deteriorate, Schools and health services will be even more stretched. Begbroke residents enjoy walking and the benefits that arise with open countryside because they do not wish to live in a town. They fear that their quality of life will suffer together with wildlife with increased air, noise and light pollution. The calculations of 4,400 are unfounded, relying on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the country. The people who live in Begbroke and work elsewhere have not been accounted for. What is the definition of home in the context of this consultation? There are currently 4400 empty homes in Oxfordshire - why build more?  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |                         | 1            |                         |               | No, the extra 4,400 homes is based on predicted growth with backing from landowners and developers. It is an assumption rather than actual needs so therefore does not represent the exceptional circumstances to overturn GB policy. It does not take into account the undetermined effects of Brexit, the needs are really wants articulated by the OxLEP whose mission is driving economic growth. The assumptions on job growth are unrealistically high and to plan for an eventuality that might not happen is an inefficient use of resources and would require such infrastructure as a new hospital. An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats and historic landscapes destroyed. High grade agricultural land used for food production will be sacrificed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing |
| PR-B-1158 | Elizabeth        | Leckie    |                         | 1            |                         |               | No, Cherwell should take fewer than the 4,400 houses apportioned to them. Oxford's housing needs have been overestimated due to assumptions of very high jobs growth and Oxford City should take more than the 550 apportioned to themselves. Brownfield sites such as Pear Tree should be used as well as sites reserved for science and business parks. GB is a precious resource and the suggestion by SHMA 2014 and Oxford's Housing Strategy that housing outside the city will not be as expensive is unlikely to be valid. Areas in the GB close to Oxford Parkway will be attractive to London commuters making houses neither affordable or likely to be bought by Oxford workers. Cherwell's apportionment should be spread throughout the district and not concentrated around Kidlington. Such an increase in one area is unsustainable, unfair and will damage community cohesion.   |
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin           | Leckie    |                         | 1            |                         |               | Cherwell should take fewer than the 4,400 houses apportioned to them. Oxford's housing needs have been overestimated due to assumptions of very high jobs growth and Oxford City should take more than the 550 apportioned to themselves. Brownfield sites such as Pear Tree should be used as well as sites reserved for science and business parks. GB is a precious resource and the suggestion by SHMA 2014 and Oxford's Housing Strategy that housing outside the city will not be as expensive is unlikely to be valid. Areas in the GB close to Oxford Parkway will be attractive to London commuters making houses neither affordable or likely to be bought by Oxford workers. Cherwell's apportionment should be spread throughout the district and not concentrated around Kidlington. Such an increase in one place is unsustainable, unfair and will damage community cohesion.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 1            |                         |               | No. If the need is in Oxford, then building further away will only exacerbate current transport problems including parking, access to sufficient services and facilities  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |                         | 1            |                         |               | No, there is no need for Cherwell to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs and it is not an 'exceptional circumstance' for encroaching on the GB. It is premised on economic growth which runs counter to current trends and if the growth board believes 35,000 houses will be needed they should have a more imaginative scheme i.e. a new town. There may be room within the Oxford ring road to accommodate a significant number of houses for example the Pear tree interchange if it is relocated.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline           | Johnson   |  | 1            |                         |               | This number of homes is inappropriate and based on estimates made by Oxford City and the LEP of future employment growth. The figures are highly ambitious and are likely to prove to be incorrect. These proposals would make changes to the GB and would be irrevocable so should only be considered when the employment levels have been proven. The construction rates proposed are undeliverable and the location of these houses would encourage London commuting and thus would not achieve its objective.   |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi               | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands                                     | 1            |                         |               | Agree with the total of 14,850 apportionment. However, not sensible for Cherwell to confirm their apportionment at 4,400 until it is known what numbers South Oxon will take and where the remainder will be apportioned. At this stage 4,400 should represent a minimum requirement for Cherwell.  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis              | Davies    |  | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations. There are existing traffic problems and details are unclear on how traffic issues will be addressed. Local bus services have been cut when there is a greater need for them. Schools and health services are currently stretched and additional housing will increase the issue. GB will be sacrificed when there is no justified reason for it and walks and views will be lost. Natural habitats will be destroyed and agricultural land which may be needed for food production, post Brexit, will be lost. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. Development of industry and business in the city of Oxford where there is effectively full employment will cause more people to move into the area to the detriment of other cities. |
| PR-B-1175 | Clare              | Cooper    |  | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 homes north of the city is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations reliant on growth in jobs. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-1176 | Laura              | Pritchard |  | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 homes north of the city is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations reliant on growth in jobs. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.  |
| PR-B-1177 | Sandra and Richard | Tyrrell   |  | 1            |                         |               | No. Question the need for such a large development when there is a much publicised aging population. If it is based merely on people moving to the area for work then work should be sited in areas of unemployment. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city would increase traffic problems and stretch schools, emergency services and health services further. GB with walks and views will be lost, along with natural habitats. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-1180 | RA                 | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 homes is an excessive housing requirement for Cherwell District, being the second highest in the county and requiring the potentially highly damaging release of Green Belt land. Only 550 homes are proposed within Oxford itself. The preservation of the GB around rural settlements, such as Yarnton, has been critical in maintaining their rural setting and preventing their coalescence into what would otherwise become a sprawling dormitory conurbation around the City of Oxford. This would contravene the purposes of the GB as set out in the NPPF.  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi              | Lancaster |  | 1            |                         |               | CDC is working to meet its own housing needs with plans such as the garden town near Bicester and should not have the burden of Oxford's needs as well. Too much development will put a strain on services and change the rural feel of the district.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1182 | Alison             | Noel     |              | 1            |                         |               | The figure of 4,400 homes is far too many and based on assumptions of large employment growth in and around Oxford. Brexit has to be taken into account as it may reduce the population. Oxford has virtually full employment and business growth will increase pressure on housing and roads. Infrastructure is already over capacity and pollution levels are exceeding European 2017 levels. If Oxford were to prioritise land for housing rather than employment and adopt a more robust policy on housing density, it could accommodate a much larger proportion of its proposed housing need within its own boundaries.  |
| PR-B-1186 | Christina          | Miskin   |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable. Believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations and reliant on assumptions about growth in jobs. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-1187 | Nigel              | Homent   |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable. Believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations and reliant on assumptions about growth in jobs. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol              | Matheson |              | 1            |                         |               | Do not consider this to be an appropriate number for CDC, it is too large and based on assumptions and flawed thinking. It fails to consider the needs of affected villages and their residents, the traffic issues in Kidlington or the environmental impact of a large development. It disregards GB, removes agricultural land and increases the risk of flooding in Oxford. It flies in the face of the Local Plan Policy ESD14 which seeks to prevent coalescence and ESD13 that seeks to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, particularly in urban fringes. Oxford City and the Growth Board need to update their information and review the proposals. |
| PR-B-1192 | Robert             | Selway   |              | 1            |                         |               | No. It's unacceptable for Oxford City to only be building 550 and areas within Oxford need further consideration including Pear Tree Park and Ride site. With Kidlington specifically, 4,400 houses would increase traffic problems and schools and health services would not be able to cope. Valuable GB would be lost and natural habitats destroyed. The figures need updating and recalculating following the Brexit decision.  |
| PR-B-1207 | Douglas and Louise | Lloyd    |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 homes is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations reliant on growth in jobs. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-1213 | Fleur              | Hodgson  |              | 1            |                         |               | No, do not believe it is necessary to build 4,400 homes on GB around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. It is not sustainable, and believe the figure to be based on dubious calculations and assumptions about the growth in jobs. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-1216 | Christine          | Lodge    |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of Oxford is not sustainable. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. The figures are based on dubious calculations reliant on high growth in jobs around Oxford. The improved rail links are likely to attract London commuters and therefore the houses won't be affordable to local people  |
| PR-B-1221 | Martin             | Perisi   |              | 1            |                         |               | No. See general comments   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss            | Adderbury Parish Council  | 1            |                         |               | Accepts the need to accommodate Oxford's unmet need but are concerned that all Oxford's neighbouring Districts should share this responsibility so CDC will not be overloaded. Feel that Vale and South Oxon should be considered for more potential sites and that agreement be obtained from South Oxon to their apportionment. Oxford City should also be pressed to reconsider the apportionment of housing they are able to provide. The Parish would not support any further apportionment of housing to CDC area.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt            | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 1            |                         |               | This is a detailed response which describes the work of the OGB, the view of SODC and sets the Local Plan Part 1 context for the Partial Review. It concludes by stating that 4,400 homes is not the appropriate housing requirement until the OGB apportionment of the total of 14859 dwellings is confirmed by all the relevant councils. In the absence of such confirmation the appropriate figure ought to be 4965 (about a third of the total of Oxford's unmet housing need).  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway        | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 1            |                         |               | Consider this figure should be adopted as a minimum given South Oxfordshire not accommodating unmet need. The 2007 Oxfordshire SHMA was reviewed and updated in 2012 to focus on Cherwell only, but did not take in to account figures from the 2011 census, which would have provided a more up-to-date and factual basis on which to make a number of the key projections contained within the SHMA. It is also noted that no work has been done on updated population projections at District-level, which could potentially open the Local Plan Part 1 Partial Review and Local Plan Part 2 to challenge. |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard    | Silvester       |   | 1            |                         |               | No, this seems an excessive number of new homes based on a questionable assumption that there will be a large growth in jobs in and around Oxford where full employment levels already exist.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 1            |                         |               | The figure of 4,400 is ultimately based on pre-Brexit assumptions of economic growth which are probably no longer valid. The figure should be reviewed and the consultation based on such a review.   |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green           |   | 1            |                         |               | No, 4,400 homes is not an appropriate housing requirement. The Partial Review documents indicate that outside the city centre the majority of jobs are based in Headington and Cowley. Development at Kidlington would therefore add to the strain on the roads, the environment and public transport. The roads around North Oxford are extremely overcrowded already.   |
| PR-B-1231 | Prof J M   | Baker           |   | 1            |                         |               | No. 4,400 homes is too large a figure. It assumes, without proper justification, that there will be very large growth in employment in the Oxford area.   |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark       | Schmull         | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 1            |                         |               | CCE note that the OGB apportionment does not meet the needs of Oxford in full. In the absence of a full agreement it may be that other authorities surrounding Oxford (including Cherwell) may need to take a greater provision to meet this unmet need. The fig of 4,400 should therefore be treated as a minimum target, rather than necessarily a maximum.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 1            |                         |               | Supports and welcomes the pragmatic decision to accommodate part of Oxford's unmet housing need in Cherwell District. Agrees with the figure of 4,400 homes. Would welcome the opportunity to discuss the housing requirement and the role that land at Cotefield Farm, Bodicote, could play in meeting part of that overall requirement.   |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 1            |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 1            |                         |               | Yes. It is considered that the work undertaken by the Oxfordshire LPAs through the OGB is consistent with the requirements of the NPPF.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 1            |                         |               | Objects to the 4,400 homes in Cherwell and considers that this is untested and unjustified. It will have a major impact on the GB, environment and transport infrastructure within the Parish and surrounding area. Has provided a more detailed response in the representation.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname   | Organisation                  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1241 | Beverley        | Kwan      |                               | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of Oxford is not sustainable. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. The figures are based on dubious calculations reliant on high growth in jobs around Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera       | Kantor    |                               | 1            |                         |               | No. The requirement for homes is based on theoretical and untested future needs and such speculative estimates cannot be the basis for building 4,400 houses in the Oxfordshire countryside. There will be no benefit to existing residents as GB with walks and natural habitats will be lost. Traffic will increase and the shortage of GP's services will be exacerbated. Pressure will increase on the infrastructure and the likely outcome for the new houses is a dormitory for London.  |
| PR-B-1245 | Jason and Petra | Tyrell    |                               | 1            |                         |               | 4400 homes is too large and based on questionable research, bearing in mind there is full employment in Oxford. Oxford City should use land which is zoned for employment and maximise brownfield sites rather than extend into the GB. Oxford City currently seeks affordable housing contributions on all sites which propose more than three units which makes a large proportion of the sites within the city unviable. Oxpens would suit a well designed high rise, high density development.  |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan           | Silvester |                               | 1            |                         |               | No, this seems an excessive number of new homes which has been based on a questionable assumption that there will be a large growth in employment in and around Oxford where full employment levels already exist.  |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip          | Boxall    |                               | 1            |                         |               | It is realised that agreement on this kind of apportionment is very hard to arrive at, but would nevertheless support significantly less housing provision overall, believing the growth forecasts to be over estimated and the coherence of the transport plan significantly overstated. There are undoubtedly constraints and pressures on housing within Oxford but is this proportionate? Figure 5 suggests and illustrates that in 2011 46,000 people out of 100,000 employed in Oxford, travel from outside Oxford. So would suggest that it is not equitable that Cherwell valley is asked to find 4,400 homes that is to say growth equating to around 10% of commuters. Do not think that this is proportionate. |
| PR-B-1254 | Philip          | Redpath   |                               | 1            |                         |               | Its not appropriate for Cherwell to increase its housing numbers to meet Oxford's needs. There has been an incorrect basis for the calculation of the housing needs of the area. Too much emphasis on homes for the increased economic activity. The quotas are not to provide affordable homes for local people which is what is actually needed. If Oxford need these homes then they must find sites within their own boundary.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia           | Sheppard  |                               | 1            |                         |               | No. 4,400 is too many. Not convinced about the employment growth forecasts. Why does Oxford require employment land zones, they should be used for housing rather than develop on GB. Why should Cherwell district provide housing for Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola          | Mallows   | Gresswell Environmental Trust | 1            |                         |               | Objects to 4,400 and consider this as completely inappropriate and ridiculous. It is grossly exaggerated; based on SHMA, which is based on wishful thinking for a conjecture economic boom when and if Oxford develops its brownfield sites for business, rather than housing. They strongly feel that this will not solve the housing crisis. The knock on effect of losing open GB land to housing will be an increase in commuter traffic in the area, and reduction of air quality along major trunk roads. They have provided a detailed response in their representation.   |
| PR-B-1257 | Charles         | Fletcher  |                               | 1            |                         |               | The figure of 4,400 is based on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford. The calculations are spurious and I feel that the number is too large. Oxford has virtually full employment and should not zone land for employment, whilst expecting the surrounding DC to meet its housing needs. Oxford need to prioritise land for housing needs rather than employment, adopt a more robust policy on housing density. Therefore being able to accommodate housing in its own boundaries.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname             | Organisation                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1258 | Hilary     | Fletcher            |                                   | 1            |                         |               | The figure of 4,400 is based on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford. The calculations are spurious and the number is too large. Oxford has virtually full employment and should not zone land for employment, whilst expecting the surrounding DC to meet its housing needs. Oxford need to prioritise land for housing needs rather than employment, adopt a more robust policy on housing density. Therefore being able to accommodate housing in its own boundaries.  |
| PR-B-1259 | Mircea     | Popa                |                                   | 1            |                         |               | The figure of 4,400 is based on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford. The calculations are spurious and the number is too large. Oxford has virtually full employment and should not zone land for employment, whilst expecting the surrounding DC to meet its housing needs. Oxford need to prioritise land for housing needs rather than employment, adopt a more robust policy on housing density. Therefore being able to accommodate housing in its own boundaries.  |
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard            |                                   | 1            |                         |               | The proposed 4,400 homes is too many as the assumed growth of employment in the Oxford area is based on calculations which are not robust. Oxford has high employment rates, why do they designate land for employment and expect the other districts to provide for the increased housing need. Land needs to be prioritised for housing with a well thought through policy on housing density, Oxford would then manage most of the need within its own boundaries.  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew     | Gant                | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group | 1            |                         |               | It is unclear why this question is asked when the numbers have been agreed by an Inspector as part of the SHMA, and adopted by the Growth Board, as Cllr Wood stated at the public meeting. However, if CDC is looking again at the numbers, they represent very significant growth, and the basis for them should be monitored, including whether the projected jobs figures have been affected by for example Brexit, where those jobs will be, and what kind of jobs they are.  |
| PR-B-1263 | Katie      | Silvester           |                                   | 1            |                         |               | No, this seems an excessive number of new homes which has been based on a questionable assumption that there will be a large growth in employment in and around Oxford where full employment levels already exist.   |
| PR-B-1264 | Drs        | Slater and Harrison |                                   | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. Our mental and physical health may suffer as access to green space is essential for our wellbeing. Recent research in Canada suggests links between air pollution and the onset of dementia. There is already a proven link with health issues with air pollution. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. Accept the need for housing but do not accept the allocation for Kidlington. Kidlington would be swamped by Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1266 | Linda      | Ward                |                                   | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. Oxford should do more for their needs rather than prioritising job creation and pushing this onto other districts, the drive for growth is not necessary and at the expense of Cherwell. The rep. has criticised the SHLA.. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. A 40% population increase would be overwhelming, destroying the rural nature of the county. It is a very politically sensitive policy yet has not been subjected to public scrutiny or vote. Will the infrastructure be in place to match the scale of development. At the Public exhibition officers were blasé that infrastructure would happen yet it should not follow the housing, it needs to precede it. Cherwell should not accept additional housing over and above the current already extortionate District target. People who work in Oxford can live in the new houses already planned. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1268 | Garry      | Lancaster |   | 1            |                         |               | No. Cherwell should focus on Cherwell's needs. Oxford need to solve its own problems rather than delegate this onto the surrounding areas. The consultation states that Oxford does have a housing supply problem which leads to high house prices, but they don't have an unemployment issue. Oxford need to make housing affordable rather than concentrate on commercial development and work harder to identify and convert long term empty houses. The 4,400 figure was calculated before the EU referendum and therefore the figures need to be recalculated.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells     | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 1            |                         |               | Objects to the apportionment as it has not been demonstrated to be achievable and should be viewed as a working target. The proposed scale of growth to Cherwell is a political solution to share the plan rather than a strategic approach to identifying the best areas to accommodate growth. At the heart of the matter is the principal that Oxford should be allowed to expand to meet its housing needs in surrounding Districts at any cost. The Parish states that, 'Gain for the City, Pain for the Districts', and that it flies in the face of the fundamental purpose of maintaining a Green Belt to restrict the growth of the City, and prevent coalescence. |
| PR-B-1271 | Rebecca    | Hodgson   |   | 1            |                         |               | No this figure is too large. It is based on estimated future need not what is needed now. It is based on assumptions that there will be a large employment growth in and around Oxford. There is no need for Oxford to zone land for employment while expecting other districts to meet their unmet housing needs. Oxford needs to prioritise land for housing and not employment with a robust policy for housing then they would be able to build a larger proportion within their own boundaries.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling  |   | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 is an excessive number of houses, most of the industry in Oxford is in the South and East. The new residents would have to travel into and through central Oxford. Thus increasing the air and noise pollution, which would have a severe detrimental effect on the health of the new residents, Kidlington and North Oxford's residents. Housing should be located on the South and East side of the city which would reduce journey times.  |
| PR-B-1274 | Andrea     | Duffy     |   | 1            |                         |               | Do not know, it completely depends of the projected increase in population. This itself depends on the development policies of the council. If the council encourages the growth of jobs, then it will require more housing to house the workers attracted by the employment.   |
| PR-B-1275 | Dagmar     | Carr      |   | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-1276 | John       | Carr      |   | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-1278 | Helena     | Boyce     |   | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1280 | Peter              | Offord    | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers                      | 1            |                         |               | Do not consider that 4,400 is an appropriate housing requirement for Cherwell to meet Oxford's needs and consideration needs to be given to increasing densities and to build on brownfield land. Wish to ensure that the open spaces and countryside of Oxfordshire are not developed unnecessarily as these are vital to support the health and well being of the residents of Cherwell District through outdoor recreation. CDC has already committed to build 22,800 homes by 2031, this additional requirement will put extra pressure on the countryside on which population depends for food production and recreation.  |
| PR-B-1281 | G M J              | Taylor    |  | 1            |                         |               | Yes but not necessarily in Kidlington. That is far too high a number for this community to absorb and there is no justification for building that number of homes in the GB.  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon              | Barry     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes              | 1            |                         |               | Based on the Fortismere report the OGB approved working assumption of 15,000, is not a true indication of Oxford's unmet need and it is now anticipating a need to be in the region of 22,000. On this basis, it is clear that the apportionment of housing between Oxfordshire Authorities is likely to be increased and therefore the 4,400 can be treated as a minimum.  |
| PR-B-1286 | Gary               | Crone     |  | 1            |                         |               | No it's not. The already congested roads will become gridlocked and not able to cope with the increase of cars. Schools are already bursting, where will the new children be educated? will the current schools be expected to take them on? Doctors and hospitals are already struggling. It already takes up to three weeks to get an appointment at the doctors. The parking at the JR is an issue and made the BBC news, things will only get worse with the increase in the population. GB should be protected at all costs, the natural habitats will be lost forever.  |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley             | Soanes    |  | 1            |                         |               | Rather than it being an appropriate number for Cherwell, should be challenging the rather small number offered by Oxford City – 550 from them and many times that from adjoining districts is unfair. If the colleges were prevented from constantly building part time student accommodation, Oxford City would have land that they could use to build the affordable housing for their own electorates.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles              | Hughes    | West Oxfordshire District Council                    | 1            |                         |               | WODC welcomes the positive steps taken by CDC to amend the LP in order to address the issue of Oxford City's unmet need. The 4,400 is set out in the apportionment agreed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board. The apportionment reflects the conclusions of the Growth Board strategic work programme and is consistent with the evidence base.  |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha            | Blackmore | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family | 1            |                         |               | Support the 4,400 homes apportionment for Cherwell. Cherwell needs to take a large proportion of the unmet housing need. In addition to the disputed apportionment for SODC should be redistributed and Cherwell will need to take additional proportion.   |
| PR-B-1296 | Graciela Inglesias | Rogers    |  | 1            |                         |               | No having lived in the area for 21 years, believe that far from helping Oxford's needs, to build an extra 4,400 houses north of the city would make things worse. House prices would increase due to demand for city accommodation. Extending Oxford at the edges would result in increased traffic issues. Schools, social and health services become more stretched. Air, noise and light pollution which Oxford is known for will spread to the GB areas. GB will not act as the green lung. Heritage walks, views, flora and fauna habitats will be lost. Quality of life will suffer both inside and outside of the city.  |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon              | Handy     | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd    | 1            |                         |               | 4,400 is an appropriate housing requirement to assist Oxford in meeting its unmet need. Work carried out by OGB provides evidence and justification for this figure for Cherwell, and that this figure should be formally adopted for the LPP1 PR moving forward. Disagree that the potential allocation solely accommodated across the three areas immediately to the north of Oxford (to the south of the A34), in the vicinity of Begbroke (to the west of Kidlington and north of Yarnton), and to the south-east of Kidlington (north of the A34). Developing the land immediately to the north of Oxford is likely to result in coalescence between Kidlington and the city, which would conflict with one of the key purposes of the Oxford Green Belt. It is therefore considered that greater consideration should be given to the land to the north of Kidlington (identified as sites PR14 and PR27 in the Options Paper) as an alternative location for some of the housing growth. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation                                     | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn  |  | 1            |                         |               | No. According to every demographic and economic projection in the SHMA, Cherwell's commitment to house building in the Local Plan 2011-2031 is already at the extreme end of what can be considered sustainable under NPPF and PPG. The SHMA is equally clear that Oxford's 'unmet housing need' is overwhelmingly a need for more affordable housing, and according to CDC's Plan, only 33% of new housing is to be classified as affordable. Thus, according to the Council's own documents at least 67% of the additional 4,400 homes will not be 'affordable. This rep details objections based on the SHMA outcome and Cherwell's Initial Sustainability Appraisal. It suggests that CDC should look at increasing the percentage of affordable housing in planned development as it engages with Oxford City to achieve a sustainable result. |
| PR-B-1300 | Julia      | Hammett  |  | 1            |                         |               | An extra 4,400 houses is completely unsustainable. The calculations have come from OxLEP/Growth Board who are looking at growth in an area that has high levels of employment. The area will be concreted over resulting in the loss of countryside and wildlife habitats. The settlements around Oxford will merge with the city. Additional houses will add to the traffic issue and local service will be stretched.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk   | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust | 1            |                         |               | Agree with the apportionment of 4,400 homes   |
| PR-B-1302 | Clare      | Creese   |  | 1            |                         |               | No. More creative urban development and financing needed in Oxford, including development of Oxford Brownfield sites.   |
| PR-B-1303 | Steve      | Gerrish  |  | 1            |                         |               | Have responded to questions 4, 9, 10 and 24 below ...   |
| PR-B-1304 | Tim        | Wakeman  |  | 1            |                         |               | Why not use the former brownfield site at Upper Heyford. The houses would boost the local economy and provide jobs for local builders and suppliers. A tram system to connect to trains at Banbury, Oxford and Bicester would be good. Giving major access to cities and work opportunities in the area. Kidlington has a growing population and housing isn't affordable other options need consideration. Oxford Parkway and Langford Lane could be considered for social housing, giving locals priority thus preventing investors and buy to let landlords looking in this area.  |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster   | Fritwell Parish Council                          | 1            |                         |               | Objects to the housing requirement for Cherwell. The OGB's estimates are speculative and aspirational and should be challenged. Target seems to be delivered to produce the housing needed for workers in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede   |  | 1            |                         |               | No. Oxford's housing need is an estimation made before Brexit. The current housing shortage is due to development outpacing housing provision and taking employment from other areas such as reducing services at Banbury Hospital. Oxford has multiple recreational spaces and huge GB whereas North Kidlington has one small playground and limited GB, the same applies to schools. Roads are congested at peak times despite recent upgrades. An extra 4,400 homes north of Oxford would increase traffic problems and air and noise pollution. Oversubscribed schools and health services would be stretched further and the GB which provides open space would be reduced. CDC should support development to the north of the county where there is no housing crisis.  |
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria   | Campbell |  | 1            |                         |               | No. Cherwell should challenge the SHMA figures that have been based on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford and the need for more people to move into the county. The evidence predates the EU referendum. Oxford City could do more to increase dwellings within the city. Oxford City is the main driver for employment growth and they need to ensure that its employment growth and strategy is more consistent with its own housing provision capability.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname               | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric     | Rose                  |              | 1            |                         |               | Do not think that number is appropriate. The SHMA needs to redone due to the result of the EU referendum. Funding in science and universities will be reduced, to which this would have been integral to the Science Vale and Knowledge Spine that formed a large part of the data the SHMA was based on. This demonstrates the plans are unsustainable. There will be less funding for infrastructure from central government and the EU. The amount awarded from the Local Growth Fund will not address the current shortfalls or the demands for the expanding population. The rep. has provided a link to two websites with reference to funding. Cherwell appears to be taking on a disproportionate level of the unmet housing. To which these are being planned North and North West of the City. The employment areas are East and South East of the City. Infrastructure between these areas will need vast improvement. Schools and health centres in Kidlington and Yarnton are not suitable for expansion, they are already overstretched. Is there funding for these to support the growth. |
| PR-B-1309 | Kate       | Miklaszewska-Gorczyca |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-1310 | Tara       | Prayag                |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase, the commuter times in Gosford are already suffering with the new S5 routes to Bicester. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB will be sacrificed Kidlington and Gosford have no parks unlike Oxford City Centre GB is their park. If you build on this you contradict your own policy on housing and access to green areas. Walks, views and habitats lost, is there a list of environmental concerns. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase, GB balances this. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. No allowance for any growth or requirements of the wider county. It is very City centred and whilst it impacts on the entire county does not take their concerns into any kind of consideration.  |
| PR-B-1311 | Keith E    | Stratford             |              | 1            |                         |               | Absolutely not. The extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic congestion increases, this is already a major issue around Kidlington which also adds to pollution. Schools and health services become further stretched like Gosford Hill and Marlborough secondary schools. Resulting in travelling further a field which adds to congestion and pollution. GB, walks and views sacrificed, these need to be preserved for our future generations. Destruction of many natural habitats which enhance all of our lives. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. The current infrastructure can not cope or absorb the 4,400 additional families.   |
| PR-B-1312 | Carl       | Parker                |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable and is at no point justified. Traffic will become much worse despite the recent expensive infrastructure improvements. There will be a need for extensive infrastructure work to take place throughout Kidlington so that it can cope with the extra demand. Difficulty already to obtain a doctor's appointment and schools are oversubscribed. Further pressure on these services could result in their decline, they need improving. Kidlington and surrounding villages charm and character is due to the close vicinity to the unspoilt GB countryside, enjoyed by many local residents who chose to live in this area. It's not acceptable to scarf ice this. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. Natural habitats and wildlife will be destroyed. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname            | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1313 | Helen             | Broxap             |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems will increase, it already takes 45 minutes on public transport to central Oxford. Schools and health services will become more stretched. It can take up to five weeks to wait for an appointment at the Key surgery. GB will be sacrificed, choosing to live alongside the canal to appreciate the views and walks. Concerned that the bats in the area would have their ecosystem destroyed which would be a concern for The Bat Conservation Trust. There is a wide variety of birds and mammals who's habitats would be destroyed. For those who work in the city it is important to protect the GB, so that the open countryside can be enjoyed by all for walking and cycling. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. Flood plains would be put under pressure. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. The houses will not attract locals to the area but London commuters with access to the new railway link. Surely this defeats the objective. Perhaps focus on Bicester and Didcot who have room for growth. |
| PR-B-1314 | Nicole and Eugene | Brooks and Griffin |              | 1            |                         |               | No, this level of development is not sustainable for this area. The current traffic issues already affect the lives of the residents and this will only get worse for commuters through Yarnton and surrounding villages. Despite the improvements around the Wolvercote roundabout. GB should be preserved, not sacrificed at the proposed levels. CDC has committed to protect this and should continue to do so. Extensive population growth adds to traffic, noise, pollution and overcrowding. Public services, health services and schools places are also put under immense pressure. The area would attract London commuters and therefore not meet the requirement of local housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1315 | Joel              | Phipps             |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1316 | Christian         | Gilliam            |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1317 | Rachel            | Walton             |              | 1            |                         |               | No. 4,400 extra homes in Cherwell are not appropriate. Believe the number allocated to CDC has been calculated using now outdated assessment. Since Brexit, a major employer in Oxford, the university has made predictions regarding a decrease in European funding and a reduction in recruitment. The 2014 SHMA may now not be valid. Oxford City should look within its own boundaries and prioritise housing over industrial parks. 4,400 houses north of Oxford is not sustainable, traffic is already heavy and journey times long. Schools and health services will be even more stretched and GB, countryside and wildlife will be damaged. The proposals are unlikely to ease Oxford's housing needs. As developers find themselves unable to provide 30% affordable housing and the proximity to Oxford Parkway attracts London commuters.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname       | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1318 | Laura       | Walton        |              | 1            |                         |               | No. Kidlington has minimal and overstretched facilities and an increase in homes will add to the strain that they are already under. It takes four weeks to get a doctors appointment. Bus services to Oxford are packed during rush hour and it takes over 45 minutes to get to Oxford, Kidlington will become gridlocked, the roads can not cope. The current sewage system can not cope. GB should not be built upon, it should be protected and not lost for ever. Wildlife habitats will be destroyed. Some of the areas are prone to flooding, development will make it worse and move it into other areas if there are no green run off areas. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. This is Oxford's quota and it is questionable why Cherwell is meeting their needs. Oxford need to look at previously developed areas first before expecting other councils to sort their issue. The housing will not be affordable for the local people, buy to let or London commuters will buy them and the prices will increase and be out of the reach of local residents who work in the area. |
| PR-B-1319 | Mr and Mrs  | Unwin         |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems between Kidlington and Oxford will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. The figure of 4,400 is reported to be based on dubious calculations that rely on assumptions of high growth in jobs around Oxford. These are not reliable enough to justify building on GB. The impact from Brexit needs to be taken into consideration.  |
| PR-B-1320 | Vassilis    | Athanassoglou |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1321 | Catherine R | Mundell       |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems will increase already several times a day it is standstill between Kidlington and Oxford, it has not helped with the Oxford Parkway station. With a dedicated bus lane it can take up to an hour for a 35 minute journey. Extra time needs to be allowed for even a four to five mile journey. Schools and health services become more stretched. To get to see a GP can take up to four weeks. GB sacrificed along with walks and views enjoyed and used by many Kidlington residents would be lost. Natural habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. It is questionable if the addition of these homes around Kidlington with the new Oxford Parkway station will have a benefit for all the local residents who work locally. It has been reported of a sharp price increase in Kidlington already due to the commuter influx. It's almost certain that these houses would be swallowed up by commuter demand and the idea that they will remain affordable is quite laughable.                  |
| PR-B-1322 | Judy        | East          |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1323 | Karen       | Suter         |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname         | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1324 | Katie L       | Stratford       |              | 1            |                         |               | Absolutely not. The extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic congestion increases, this is already a major issue around Kidlington which also adds to pollution. Schools and health services become further stretched like Gosford Hill and Marlborough secondary schools. Resulting in travelling further a field which adds to congestion and pollution. GB, walks and views sacrificed, these need to be preserved for our future generations. Destruction of many natural habitats which enhance all of our lives. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. The current infrastructure can not cope or absorb the 4,400 additional families.   |
| PR-B-1325 | Richard       | Lodge           |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. The new improved links to London will encourage London commuters. The new houses will not be affordable for the local's as the prices would be inflated making it difficult for first time byers. Can the housing be made affordable, so that it can support our young community.  |
| PR-B-1326 | Jan and Chris | Lacey and Plant |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An additional 4,400 houses in the Cherwell area will mean. Traffic problems increase. Schools, health services and other infrastructure become more stretched. The time for a GP appointment is ridiculously long. GB sacrificed, walks, views that attract visitors to the area and natural habitats, flora and fauna would be lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1327 | John          | Pilgrim         |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life in Kidlington will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. The figures are based on heavily criticised calculations from the SHMA reliant on high growth in jobs around Oxford. The SHMA was conducted pre Brexit by non independent consultants and should be challenged. Oxford and Kidlington have high employment and low unemployment and do not need extra developments and creation of jobs. There are significant numbers of unoccupied houses in Oxford and land allocated for business and retail such as the Northern Gateway that could be used. The golf course, ancient meadows and GB of Kidlington are no less important than those assets in Oxford. Previous developments such as Lucy's Waterways have not provided enough affordable housing and this proposal is unlikely to address the shortage for local people as it will attract investors and London commuters. |
| PR-B-1330 | N M           | O'Mahoney       |              | 1            |                         |               | No. An extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-1333 | Zoe           | Christodoulou   |              | 1            |                         |               | No. If Cherwell agree to 4,400 houses north of the city it will increase Traffic problems. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1334 | Jenny          | Betts   |              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |
| PR-B-1335 | Natalie        | Usher   |              | 1            |                         |               | No, the planning documents lack evidence to justify this projection and the methodology is unclear. 2014 is when the projection was made and has no account for Brexit, which could have a negative impact on Oxford, possible the University and the surrounding area. The figure is arbitrary and is not taking into account the uncertainty of the area.  |
| PR-B-1337 | Marcus         | Lloyd   |              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems will increase. Six years ago it would take an hour each day by bus to get from Kidlington to Oxford city centre. Now travel 20 miles north and get there much quicker. Improvements have not helped. Schools and health services become more stretched, with already long waiting times for appointments. GB sacrificed. Isn't this to stop the encroachment of urban areas. Walks and views the areas that Kidlington residents can enjoy open spaces, flora and fauna would be lost. Natural habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. The area is already under an AQMA along the Bicester Road and also Oxford City. This would be compromised if the areas are joined and fail the targets of reduction. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. Unemployment isn't an issue in this area, it will only attract London commuters to this cheap area. |
| PR-B-1338 | Philip         | Camp    |              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Loss of villages character in an unacceptable merging and in fill is not viable with village life with the loss of green space between Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1339 | Dr Christopher | Wedge   |              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems in Kidlington and Cutteslowe will exacerbate. Open countryside that GB protects will be sacrificed along with natural habitats. Building near or on flood plains leads to flooding in Kidlington, Botley and Osney. Schools and health services become more stretched. Walks and views will be lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.   |
| PR-B-1340 | Sophia         | Argyris |              | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase and are already bad. Schools and health services become more stretched and it take ages to get an appointment. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. Oxford is known for terrible air quality and excessive amounts of lung diseases such as asthma. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations which have been criticised since made public.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname     | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1341 | Olga Lascano | Choperena   |  | 1            |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems will increase. Six years ago it would take an hour each day by bus to get from Kidlington to Oxford city centre. Now travel 20 miles north and get there much quicker. Improvements have not helped. Schools and health services become more stretched, with already long waiting times for appointments. GB sacrificed. Isn't this to stop the encroachment of urban areas. Walks and views - the areas that Kidlington residents can enjoy open spaces, flora and fauna would be lost. Natural habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. The area is already under a AQMA along the Bicester Road and also Oxford City. This would be compromised if the areas are joined and fail the targets of reduction. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. Unemployment isn't an issue in this area, it will only attract London commuters to this cheap area. |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura        | Precious    | Quod on behalf of Albion Land                                  | 1            |                         |               | CDC should considered their site at south east Bicester as a strategic site to meet Oxford's unmet need. The apportionment was based on an assumption that strategic development could potentially be accommodated in three of these areas (A, B and E). Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun        | Richards    | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                 | 1            |                         |               | No. The 4400 homes figure is not the appropriate housing requirement. The evidence base suggests a requirement of 18000homes to meet the need. In addition whatever SODC does not accept has to be redistributed across the other four districts and Cherwell's Part 1 Plan does not take this in to account. The rep goes on to give a detailed analysis and critique on the work of the OGB and the SHMA.  |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan     | Harbottle   | Land and Partners Ltd  | 1            |                         |               | Agree, and consider that this figure is based on robust OAN evidence. However this was agreed based on the remainder of the unmet requirement being shared between the other Oxfordshire districts. South Oxfordshire District Council has not agreed to the future recommended to them. If South Oxfordshire cannot accept all of the recommended contribution to the unmet need, then other districts including Cherwell may have to increase the requirement from 4,400 in order to address the unmet need in full.   |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil         | Tiley       | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                      | 1            |                         |               | Have provided a very long explanation in response to the apportionment of Oxford's housing need. A further review of the SHMA and an early review of the Local Plans would be needed to accommodate the real housing need for Oxford's and London's growth.  |
| PR-B-1347 | Zahra        | Alrashed    | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of Kenley Holdings | 1            |                         |               | Supports the minimum of 4,400 as an appropriate requirement for Cherwell. However they acknowledge that the final figure may be higher.  |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz          | Boden       | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                       | 1            |                         |               | Cherwell has to take additional numbers to compensate for SODC and that 4,400 is actually too low a figure. The Initial SA examined options for 'significantly more' development than the 4,400 and that this recorded significant positive effects with regard to SA objectives concerned with ensuring opportunities to live in decent, sustainably constructed and affordable housing, high and stable levels of employment and improving accessibility to all services and facilities - but the 'Quantum Options Sustainability Effects' were only tested using Areas of Search A and B, on the assumption that the growth would all be located within these sustainable locations.  |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian          | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                                    | 1            |                         |               | Do not believe that a valid case has been made for this number of houses. Doubt that this number of homes is likely to be built within the timescale suggested. Proposals will not address the real problem of meeting the needs of people on the housing register, or provide homes for young families unless a completely different approach is taken to the current developer-led arrangements.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation                           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1274 | Andrea     | Duffy       |  | 2            | A,B                     |               | No, do not think that we have that obligation. Oxford City has promoted the increase of employment unrelated to its traditional industries. The business parks would be better located where the unmet demand is not for land or houses but jobs. These areas do exist in England. Oxford city centre is already congested and travelling seven miles takes up to an hour. Concerned that options A and B will be preferred, with the focus on Kidlington as it is close to Oxford and therefore attractive to developers. GB will be destroyed if building between arterial roads and rail lines; essential workers deserve better. Kidlington is not in an AONB but there are areas outside the village that enhance the quality life for it's residents like the nature park along the Cherwell River. Some developments have already encroached on its edge. More development would lose the nature park and be replaced with a suburban park. |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura      | Precious    | Quod on behalf of Albion Land          | 2            | E                       |               | Agree, but considers that Area E should be included in the area of search. Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler      | Middle Aston Parish Meeting            | 2            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday      |  | 2            |                         |               | Object to Kidlington providing houses for Oxford as was done in the 1960's. Oxford City council should address their social housing policy which would include housing for people with disabilities. Oxford could build on Port Meadow instead of Kidlington's meadows.  |
| PR-B-0039 | Susan      | Cooper      |  | 2            |                         |               | Yes, the city is important and does not have the land to solve its housing shortage. Many people depend on it for work, culture and services. Key workers who support Oxford cannot afford to live in the city.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall        |  | 2            |                         |               | No, Oxford has full employment and development should only be on brownfield sites.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor      | Aitchison Rafferty                     | 2            |                         |               | Yes. Oxford has a worsening housing crisis. There is a shortage of land suitable for housing within the City's boundary. Development beyond the green belt to allow homes to be built sustainably should be considered. The 2014 URBED report proposed the expansion of Bicester and Didcot and their surroundings, linked by improved train/tram services. Site WG019 at Weston on the Green provides opportunity to deliver housing and sustainably commute to the wider area.   |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony    | Hall        |  | 2            |                         |               | No. If Oxford were serious about meeting its housing needs, it would not exacerbate them by building an industrial estate (fatuously titled "Northern Gateway") in the green belt in the most congested tangle of roads in the area.   |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue        | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                  | 2            |                         |               | If CDC have to accommodate additional housing for Oxford's needs, this should be built as close as possible to the city.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A        | McCall      |  | 2            |                         |               | No, Kidlington and CDC should not meet Oxford's requirements. They should consider brownfield sites.   |
| PR-B-0120 | E          | Tonkin      |  | 2            |                         |               | No specifically convincing account has been provided.  |
| PR-B-0122 | A          | Dyer        |  | 2            |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul       | Goulding QC |  | 2            |                         |               | No, The importance of affordable housing for local people in Oxford is undeniable, however, does not provide 'exceptional circumstances' sufficient to justify the release of land from the GB. The Five GB Purposes remain valid and essential to a balanced coherent and environmentally-sustainable plan for the whole of Oxfordshire. It is important to discourage Oxford sprawl into the surrounding GB. The housing needs of Oxford should be addressed in other ways that avoid unacceptable erosion of the surrounding GB, including building more affordable homes within the City and beyond the GB.  |
| PR-B-0156 | Val        | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK | 2            |                         |               | Yes. Oxford City is a compact urban area tightly surrounded by Green Belt. The opportunity for the city to meet its housing needs is limited. Cherwell has already made a commitment to accommodate some of the City's housing needs through its adopted Local Plan.   |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin      | Carrit      |  | 2            |                         |               | Yes. Cherwell, West Oxfordshire, the Vale and South Oxfordshire.   |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter      | Worth       |  | 2            |                         |               | Yes because Oxford is the regional economic hub. Kidlington and Yarnton by their close vicinity to Oxford are in demand. If housing is further afield it will add to the congestion, so additional housing needs to be provided close to Oxford on the good bus route.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0184 | Roger               | Prince     |   | 2            |                         |               | Apart from the flaw in the figures, extra houses in the north of the city would be inappropriate due to the chronic traffic problems. The improvements to the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts have had little impact and with the forthcoming Northern Gateway traffic will increase. Kidlington has seen widespread residential and commercial development over the years and the approval for a Technology Park at Langford Lane will make matters worse without an additional 4,400 homes. Air and noise pollution will reduce quality of life for everyone and the "Kidlington Gap" along with GB, with its walks, views and natural habitat will be lost. The health services in Kidlington is already stretched and the schools will come under pressure. |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                | Walker     | Oxford Bus Company                                      | 2            |                         |               | The majority of travel demands arising from this, will by definition be seeking destinations within the City. It would be easier to provide attractive public transport options if this housing were to be located adjoining the City. Nearby high frequency bus-routes could be made available to early and successive phases by incremental extensions, and journey time advantages over private car use can be achieved owing to existing in bus priority. This is before potential further improvements are identified.   |
| PR-B-0200 | John and Elizabeth  | Gittings   |   | 2            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings   |   | 2            |                         |               | No Cherwell should be looking at developing its own economic activity in and around other hubs such as Bicester and Banbury, which are well connected to Oxford. The model that Cherwell should be building large quantities of housing for people to commute into Oxford every day is flawed and does not align with some of the stated objectives regarding traffic, facilities and the environment   |
| PR-B-0234 | Prof Roger          | Davies     |   | 2            |                         |               | Not unless the transport infrastructure is significantly improved to cater for the increased population. Routes to the north of Oxford are congested and The Rapid Transit lines although welcome, would not be achievable in the time.   |
| PR-B-0238 | D A                 | Burt       |   | 2            |                         |               | No, there has been a report that Oxford City are looking at developing a 39 acre site near the BMW works as a sports complex. This appears to be misuse of land, prioritising business over housing.  |
| PR-B-0260 | Chris               | Pack       |   | 2            |                         |               | No, Oxford's housing needs have been wildly exaggerated. They are based not upon exiting need but by jobs that may or may not be created. There are empty houses within the city.   |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole              | Pack       |   | 2            |                         |               | Not as much as this proposal. Oxford's housing needs are exaggerated.   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |   | 2            |                         |               | No, we do not. Oxford is generating a housing demand by prioritising the development of business parks such as the Northern Gateway, even though unemployment is not a problem in Oxfordshire.  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield   |   | 2            |                         |               | No, CDC should seek only to meet its own needs. Sacrificing GB for Oxford housing will ruin the local environment for all.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen      |   | 2            |                         |               | No. This rep has provided a detailed and lengthy objection to meeting Oxford's needs.   |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber     |   | 2            |                         |               | CDC should only assist Oxford City to meet its housing needs when they cannot be met within the city. I believe the City council needs to thoroughly explore all possibilities within Oxford to satisfy its own housing needs. Attention is drawn to a recent planning application for 45 flats in William Morris Close that was rejected within its boundaries.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley    |   | 2            |                         |               | No, the environment will be damaged beyond repair forever.  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley    |   | 2            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan               | Oldfield   |   | 2            |                         |               | No, I do not. Oxford city has scope for meeting its own housing needs within its boundaries. It could use brownfield sites, unoccupied buildings and build close to its ambitious industrial and business developments. New houses in our area are likely to provide a dormitory for London commuters than for Oxford workers.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw    | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw | 2            |                         |               | Concerned that the houses provided will be purchased by London commuters rather than people who work locally. However, the real issue is the Green Belt which is a fundamental demarcation between Oxford and Cherwell. The rep describes in detail the five purposes of the Green belt as set out in the NPPF and assesses the proposals against them. It also sets out detailed comments as to why Green belt exceptions do not apply.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname             | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small               | Stagecoach   | 2            |                         |               | Strongly agrees. This need should be met as close as possible to where the need arises, and thus releases from the green belt should be carefully considered, as they are likely to be much better able to sustainably meet Oxford's housing needs rather than greenfield land beyond its outer edge.   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn     | Phillips            |  | 2            |                         |               | Oxford need to be clear on why the need this growth and how it benefits the population of Oxfordshire. Note that there are no obvious documents referring to this requirement.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony    | Matthews            | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 2            |                         |               | If the housing requirement as established and agreed is specifically for Oxford City needs then it should be specifically designed and provided to meet this need.  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA         | Humphreys           | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 2            |                         |               | Strongly disagree that there is a clear and demonstrable need for CDC to meet Oxford's housing need. CDC makes provision for 22,840 new homes in the adopted local plan, which will deliver a very significant supply of housing more than sufficient to satisfy the requirements set out in the NPPF.  |
| PR-B-0731 | Ioana      | Davies              |  | 2            |                         |               | No. Cherwell has a clear relationship with Oxford, but focusing on development to the North of Oxford will cause major problems. Already congested roads taking an hour to travel 5 miles into the city centre. The potential rapid transit illustration would not be built or approved in time to meet the need for those living in the North.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John       | Tremlett            |  | 2            |                         |               | Yes. think it is obviously necessary to coordinate plans regionally, that most new employment will be in Oxford and other urban areas and that therefore Oxford's suburbia needs to expand.   |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian     | Scargill            | Oxford Green Belt Network  | 2            |                         |               | Do not agree that Oxford's needs have been correctly assessed and hugely exaggerated based on Ox LEP's estimated job growth. The approach to encourage growth away from Oxford should continue. Oxford City could make a contribution to the strategy and it could use some of the land it has currently allocated for employment, together with other previously developed land, for well planned high density housing.  |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian     | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories   | 2            |                         |               | It is not clear how rural areas in the northern part of Oxfordshire can contribute to the housing required for those working in Oxford and avoid contributing to the already heavily congested road infrastructure without major expenditure on new infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-0751 | Dr Katrin  | Kiessling           |  | 2            |                         |               | If Oxford needs housing outside of Oxford it needs to be in a commutable range without the destruction of the GB.   |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin     | Palmer              |  | 2            |                         |               | No. Do not see that Oxford's problems are the responsibility of Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-0759 | R L        | Davies              |  | 2            |                         |               | Not unless the transport infrastructure is significantly improved due to increased population. Routes to the north of Oxford are already highly congested. The Rapid Transit lines shown on P.8 of the Summary Leaflet would be welcome but are not achievable on the timescale considered for the housing to be built.   |
| PR-B-0765 | Layla      | Vidal-Martin        | NLP Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Taylor Wimpey      | 2            |                         |               | Have made a very detailed response to this question on the spatial relationship to Oxford. Submit that it is important that the search process is not undertaken on too narrow a basis. I.e. not rejecting options from further analysis at too early a stage. Concerned about the adopted local plan strategy of concentrating growth at Banbury and Bicester. The ability of other settlements e.g. Bloxham must be fully assessed through the Partial Review process. Subsequent iterations of the Transport and Sustainability analysis must assess the individual context of the Cat A villages. A more balanced spread of housing should be sought. |
| PR-B-0769 | Debbie     | Jones               | Bidwells on behalf of City of Oxford Charity                         | 2            |                         |               | Development should be well connected to Oxford by public transport/cycle routes. Development should encourage the use of public transport. It follows that development should be located on existing effective public transport routes and those routes that are included in the Interim Transport Assessment.  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve      | Pickles             | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 2            |                         |               | Yes. Strongly support statement in Para 3.38. Development in parts of the district where there is poor transport access to Oxford, particularly by public transport, would clearly not help to meet Oxford's unmet housing need.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation                                   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0786 | Jane             | Olds       | Caversfield Parish Council                     | 2            |                         |               | Does not agree that Cherwell needs to specifically meet Oxford's needs. If Oxford re-allocated the large areas of land set aside for employment to high density, affordable housing there would be less need for other areas. This would also reduce the amount of vehicles travelling longer to get to work in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip           | Morley     | North Oxford Golf Club                         | 2            |                         |               | Consider that the complex issues require collaborative problem-solving and long term housing needs cannot, in our view, be treated with a "Not In My Back Yard" mentality. Hope and expect that all the Oxfordshire Councils will take the same constructive and inclusive approach that appears to be being adopted by CDC. Note that the land of Oxford Golf Club (previously Southfield GC) was, to quote from Section 4.4 of the 2010 Inspector's Report, "rightly excluded" by Oxford City from its Core Strategy because of its "importance in recreational terms". Believe that NOGC's location and role provides even stronger arguments for its continued role as Green Belt and as a recreational facility.  |
| PR-B-0796 | David            | Tighe      |  | 2            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive            | Booth      | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group            | 2            |                         |               | Agree  |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard   |  | 2            |                         |               | No, do not agree   |
| PR-B-0802 | Peter J          | Frampton   | Framptons on behalf of db Symmetry             | 2            |                         |               | It is agreed that Cherwell should meet Oxford's unmet housing needs. However, the spatial requirements of existing businesses, and particularly the requirement for new logistics floorspace to meet the needs of existing employers and the increasing demand for electronic retailing should not be frustrated by the belief that additional employment land will necessarily give rise to increased housing land requirements. The Framework makes clear that strategies for housing and employment in local plans should be integrated. It is in the interests of sustainable development that existing manufacturing industries within the Oxford area, are adequately served by component supplies through the logistic supply chain. The rep provides a detailed argument to support this approach. |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris            | Robbins    |  | 2            |                         |               | Yes. The purpose of GB in preventing coalescence of communities needs to be given more weight, GB sites selected should not compromise this purpose.   |
| PR-B-0809 | Karen            | Selway     |  | 2            |                         |               | No. Oxford City need to consider building more than 550 houses, not pass the problem on to neighbouring, rural villages where the impact on services and infrastructure will be vast.  |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim              | Green      | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association     | 2            |                         |               | Disagree that Cherwell should specifically meet Oxford's needs in planning for additional housing development. Oxford should be expected to do more of its own housing needs first. Building houses outside Oxford so that people can travel into the City each day is a flawed plan and Cherwell should develop its own employment and related housing.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder      | Gladman Developments Ltd                       | 2            |                         |               | Yes. The need to address the issue is urgent. If Oxford's unmet needs are not provided for, the economy of the area is threatened. Spatially Cherwell is very closely linked to Oxford both in terms of transport connections and in travel to work patterns. As such it is not essential that allocations are located in close proximity to the City.   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor     |  | 2            |                         |               | No do not agree. The idea that Cherwell should build large quantities of housing so that people can travel into Oxford each day is flawed. Cherwell should continue to develop its own economic hubs in areas that it deems sustainable on the basis of its own criteria. The City should be expected to meet more of its own housing need as explained in question 1.   |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce      | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbshire | 2            |                         |               | Yes, agree that Cherwell should specifically meet Oxford's needs in planning for additional housing development.   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson     |  | 2            |                         |               | Yes, some of them.   |
| PR-B-0827 | Paul             | Staniforth |  | 2            |                         |               | No the GB should not be infringed.   |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel            | Buttler    |  | 2            |                         |               | Only if this is provided in close proximity to Oxford, otherwise it is unlikely to meet Oxford's needs   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha    | Eliot    | Oxford Preservation Trust   | 2            |                         |               | Pleased to see the CDC is working closely with Oxford City. However, consider that City should look more closely and creatively within its own boundaries to create the 'new balanced' communities mentioned at Question 4 and to ask them to look to allocate sites for housing wherever possible, and to discourage the current trend towards supplying speculative student accommodation on sites which would be suitable to provide more permanent homes.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard    | Hills    |   | 2            |                         |               | Yes. Oxford's population is growing as people choose to live there, and the city boundaries are too tight for the existing geographical area. New housing to support Oxford must be built as close to the city as is possible. Building further away will only increase commuting misery and pollution. If the surrounding areas do not support this, there is a strong argument that Oxford's geographical boundaries should expand to reflect its growing population, to allow it to meet its own housing requirement.   |
| PR-B-0837 | David      | Jackson  | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP                                | 2            |                         |               | The most sustainable way of meeting Oxford's need is to locate it as close as possible to the City. It is right for CDC to contribute towards the housing need of Oxford given that it has land that directly adjoins the northern boundary of the built up area of Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0838 | David      | Jackson  | Savills on behalf of University of Oxford, Christ Church, Exeter, Magdalen, Merton and St John's Colleges | 2            |                         |               | The most sustainable way of meeting Oxford's need is to locate it as close as possible to the City. It is right for CDC to contribute towards the housing need of Oxford given that it has land that directly adjoins the northern boundary of the built up area of Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0839 | Mark       | Rose     | Define on behalf of William Davies Ltd  | 2            |                         |               | A district wide approach should be applied to considering additional opportunities for allocating residential land. An over emphasis and reliance on a small number of locations increases the risk of the need not being met in the Plan period. The District has excellent transport links that support a district-wide approach. This approach reflects the strategy in the adopted local plan. It should include consideration of the potential role of the higher order Cat A Service Villages that have already been identified as sustainable locations for future development.   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike       | Gilbert  | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd   | 2            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren     | Bell     | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd   | 2            |                         |               | Agree that an additional housing requirement for Cherwell should be identified to meet Oxford's unmet needs. Cherwell and Oxford are part of the Oxfordshire HMA and they have a strong relationship.  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex       | Wilson   | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd  | 2            |                         |               | Bicester is already identified as a location in which the bulk of the proposed growth in Cherwell will be accommodated. Bicester has good links to Oxford City. Consider there is capacity/opportunity to accommodate further growth to meet unmet need. The Government's announcement of Garden City status confirms its support for the development of Bicester.   |
| PR-B-0844 | Peter J    | Frampton | Framptons on behalf of EP Barrus  | 2            |                         |               | Yes.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard    | Cutler   | Bloombridge LLP   | 2            |                         |               | Yes. The OGB position statement gives the District no room for manoeuvre.  |
| PR-B-0856 | David      | Smith    |   | 2            |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim        | Perkins  | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC  | 2            |                         |               | This is not proven. The PC fully accepts that there are housing problems within Oxford, especially regarding affordability which is a key issue for workers looking for accommodation. Accept that much work has been carried out to look at Oxford's housing capacity, note that the Updated Advice Note on Oxford's Development Capacity prepared by Fortismere Associates Aug 2015 made a number of recommendations, and that these still need to be addressed through review of the Oxford Local Plan. These unanswered questions need to be addressed before land is released in other Districts, especially in the GB. Therefore do not agree that Cherwell should accept Oxford's housing needs on the scale proposed given the likely impact on the GB, communities and the environment. |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname   | Organisation               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0862 | Peter                  | Nicholson |                            | 2            |                         |               | Objects, and considers that this perceived need for housing appears to arise from city/county plans for aggressive, unsustainable, economic= growth in Oxford and around the County as a whole. Has provided a more detailed statement in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt                   | Todd      |                            | 2            |                         |               | No. Oxford has housing and transport issues currently, so it needs to be considered whether adding more homes would exacerbate these problems or solve them?  |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer               | McFadden  |                            | 2            |                         |               | No, it is not agreed that you "need to specifically meet Oxford's needs in planning for the additional housing development". It makes sense for councils to work together, but unclear why Cherwell should meet Oxford's needs in this area and on such a scale. Is a much larger city being planned, is coalescence inevitable.  |
| PR-B-0871 | Patricia               | Redpath   |                            | 2            |                         |               | No. Regardless of NPPF requirements, where there is no suitable land for development that is it. Cherwell has worked hard to accommodate its own numbers and enough is enough.  |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin    | Oxfordshire County Council | 2            |                         |               | Agree   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds      | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 2            |                         |               | No. The Parish considers that Oxford should do more to provide accommodation for key workers and affordable homes. They suggest redeveloping Osney Mead site for housing which also improve access to the site.   |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia                  | Trowles   |                            | 2            |                         |               | Planning for developments in Cherwell should be based on Cherwell's needs.  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter                  | Trowles   |                            | 2            |                         |               | Planning for developments in Cherwell should be based on Cherwell's needs.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley   |                            | 2            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks     |                            | 2            |                         |               | Yes a holistic approach is good but South Cherwell cannot be considered in isolation to Oxford city. Oxford must try harder to meet its own needs and it must not be at the expense of the GB or Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke's identities.   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street    |                            | 2            |                         |               | No. Cherwell should only agree once clear evidence that existing brownfield sites and sites within the ring road have been analysed for potential housing first. SHMA suggests a greater need for affordable rental property in Oxford. It would seem more appropriate to develop within the ring road.   |
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard       | Miles     |                            | 2            |                         |               | Majority of workers in Oxford work in Headington, Cowley and the city centre, the opposite side of Oxford from Cherwell, it seems inappropriate to meet Oxford's needs in Cherwell adding to the pressure of infrastructure and network. Both the A34 and A44 are currently unable to cope with traffic levels. Houses built in option A would be used for London commuters using Oxford Parkway rather than travelling into Oxford. Houses should be built near to Headington, Cowley and the city centre to avoid added pressure on the transport and roads from the north of Oxford. |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence  |                            | 2            |                         |               | No. Oxford's public transport system is utterly inadequate and cars are not practical in the city. Its time consuming and the journeys are unpleasant, until the problems have been fixed like a subway system, no houses should be built. Oxford should be do more to address their own housing needs.   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss      | Bloxham Parish Council     | 2            |                         |               | Yes. Oxford City has identified the need for affordable housing in the right location, close to the city with good connections to the city, which could improve it's housing stock particularly in the rented sector. The Green Belt around Oxford should be redesignated and used for development. Sites close to Oxford could maximise developer contributions to allow real improvements already identified around the city.   |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar    |                            | 2            |                         |               | When Oxford has exhausted its land then some additional housing may need to be planned for Cherwell. Transport infrastructure needs to be in place for this to work as it already inadequate.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton     |  | 2            |                         |               | No. The question attempts to presuppose the answer. There is no evidence Oxford has an unmet housing need. There are not a large number of people living on the streets, there are unfortunately some. Oxford could accommodate for this need, which would be closer to the source of jobs and be far more sustainable. Large employers in Oxford are the public sector, this is not the sector that should be increasing employment. It needs to be focused on companies that are growing who would be better placed on business parks within reach of Oxford, but there is no need to be within the City or on the surrounding GB. Housing for the employees can be dispersed over a wide area of Oxfordshire and surrounding counties and if this is the case the existing and new transport infrastructure has the chance of coping. |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew     | Smith      | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                 | 2            |                         |               | Understand the economic and cultural importance for Oxfordshire, but Kidlington should not be scarified for Oxford. Retaining the green gap, recreational value of the Countryside, etc are important to Kidlington residents. Oxford City's housing strategy should be revisited. Considerations should be given to moving current facilities out of the City, where they can more easily be accommodated in the countryside and free up land for redevelopment.  |
| PR-B-0912 | David      | Mason      |  | 2            |                         |               | In part only, but proportionately.   |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall   | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 2            |                         |               | Do not consider that Oxford's needs have been correctly assessed. They also consider that Oxford City could do much more to meet its own needs for e.g. by proposing large-scale employment-generating development, by relocating employment sites for housing and by increasing density of development. Object to and question how development on greenfield sites should be more financially attractive than within Oxford City limits on brownfield sites. Therefore, as a minimum, issues such as the proportion of affordable housing must be agreed between Councils. Have provided more detailed arguments discussing Oxfordshire SHMA in their representation. Suggest that the affordable housing requirement should be 50%.  |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux   | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 2            |                         |               | Yes, the purpose of the provision of sites under the Duty to Cooperate is to meet Oxford's unmet need. Whilst there is an argument that the provision of any additional housing will assist in meeting need within an area, it is likely that residents will wish to retain a significant social and economic link with the city.  |
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric    | Sidebottom |  | 2            |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds       | Fringford Parish Council   | 2            |                         |               | "The urban capacity of Oxford is yet to be confirmed" The parish accepts Duty to Co-operate. However considers that Oxford also should be asked to complete a partial review and consider London densities to accommodate all of its proposed housing need within its own boundaries, and that it should reduce its employment aspirations and future employment growth should be targeted towards Oxford-Cambridge corridor in line with Govt. Strategy. Any proposed external sites are likely to be less 'sustainable' than the sites within Oxford. The proposed number of extra homes need further negotiation if general feedback within Cherwell is not supportive of accepting number.   |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter      | Bateman    | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                             | 2            |                         |               | Cherwell has a duty to cooperate with the City. Does Cherwell fit within Oxford's HMA - Yes. But the Framework is clear that accommodating any proven unmet development needs from neighbouring authorities should only take place where meeting that need does harm the principles and policies of the Framework.   |
| PR-B-0935 | David      | Lock       | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates                 | 2            |                         |               | Supports the approach to identify an additional housing requirement in Cherwell to help meet Oxford's unmet needs. Cherwell sits within the Oxfordshire HMA and has strong functional and economic links to Oxford City.   |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle      | Greenlight Developments  | 2            |                         |               | An underlying theme in the Options document is that Oxford has significantly different housing market characteristics and issues relating to it than the rest of the HMA (Oxfordshire as a whole). We do not agree with these assertions, which in turn underpins the very approach being taken. i.e. to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs as close to the City as possible (resulting in GB releases). The rep analyses the SHMA in some detail.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone     |   | 2            |                         |               | Yes, agree CDC has a responsibility to assist with this requirement. Do not accept the term ' Spatial Relationship to Oxford.' It is completely unsustainable and unbalanced to place any or all of the 2,200 houses or more, between and around Oxford and Kidlington. Suggesting "it is Oxford's problem, have it back on your doorstep!" Does not lead to an effective, sustainable, balanced solution. This fails to offer the solutions suggested in your documents and it result in the irreversible damage to community cohesion, transport, ancillary services and the removal of the essential purpose of the GB much affecting neighbouring environments. |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo  |   | 2            |                         |               | See the need to assist Oxford in its housing needs but not to the extent proposed.  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk      | Banbury Civic Society   | 2            |                         |               | Given the 'Duty to Co-operate' Cherwell has little choice than to identify sites that can be used to meet this requirement, but also given recent national decisions (e.g. Brexit) there is no urgent need to programme the development of such sites until the need is actually identified through accurate and timely monitoring. In addition , notwithstanding the provisions of LTP4, it will be necessary to put in place any appropriate transport and environmental infrastructure to ensure that any development can function properly from the outset.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia   | Banbury Town Council  | 2            |                         |               | Agrees, but is concerned that in doing so the development needs of settlements where Oxford's unmet housing need end up located are overlooked or worse adversely affected, like Option H sites around Banbury. Outside of strategic housing sites allocated in the Local Plan, emphasis should be on smaller housing developments concentrating on brownfield sites within the existing footprint of the town alongside mixed-use development in town centre location as advanced by the Banbury Masterplan.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 2            |                         |               | Agrees, and consider that this does seem to the point of the Partial Review of the Local Plan.  |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson |   | 2            |                         |               | No, believe that Oxford City should meet its own housing needs. This need results from pursuing an unsustainable growth policy that should have been foreseen. Growth should have been limited to a level that could be supported within its boundaries. If development in Cherwell went ahead it is likely to be occupied by London commuters, not solve the deficit and ruin the countryside and GB.  |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin    | Noke Parish Meeting   | 2            |                         |               | The housing need for Oxford is exaggerated. Brownfield sites in the City should be utilised before any sites are identified in Cherwell.  |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd   | 2            |                         |               | Yes, as Cherwell forms part of the same Housing Market Area.  |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett   |   | 2            |                         |               | Only if appropriate for employment in Headington, Cowley and the city itself. and if the journey times are reasonable which they are not at peak times from Bicester to Oxford. If transport possibility and costs are affordable with the salaries and wages paid. Any unmet housing needs to be as near to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter      | Collins   | Islip Parish Council  | 2            |                         |               | It would have been far better if Oxford City had focussed on building new commercial development rather than providing additional employment opportunities until it had built sufficient transport infrastructure and sufficient housing within the city to facilitate the desired strategic growth. The Parish Council agree, but consider that we should never have been put in this position.  |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner    | Launton Parish Council  | 2            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1005 | SP and SA  | McQuillan |   | 2            |                         |               | There may be some need, the quantum is not proven. Oxford's needs are unlikely to be met with new commuter areas of 5-10 miles from the city. Pressure on car travel will follow and there are no costing's or timings to address this matter. The areas will attract London commuters who will use the new Oxford Parkway. This is the exact opposite of CDC's aim. London will benefit while the cost of services, schools, doctors etc. remain in the local community.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles    | Kirtlington Parish Council                                      | 2            |                         |               | Support Cherwell rather than agree to this need.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel       | Hatcher       | Rosconn Group   | 2            |                         |               | Agree with the spatial relationship to Oxford and therefore agree with Cherwell meeting Oxford's needs for additional housing in the Cherwell area.   |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben          | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                               | 2            |                         |               | It is right for the Review to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs. The question of where that growth should be is different. Until now there has been no public input in to possible locations. Despite the existence of 2 railway lines providing direct services to Oxford (and related road corridors) the potential locations identified by the Growth Board are all on or close to the edge of Oxford, within the GB. The rep continues by discussing the historic growth of Oxford and the problems this has created , particularly traffic congestion. It is argued that further growth on the edge of the City will only exacerbate these problems. The rep then goes on to discuss the merits of creating a new community at New Alchester, including the ability of people living in Bicester to travel by rail and then on to the 'Science Vale' and the creation of a 'Garden Park of Oxfordshire'. |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver       | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 2            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew       | Hornsby-Smith |   | 2            |                         |               | Disagrees, or at least not exclusively. Considers that proximity to Oxford should not be the only material consideration in assessing these sites. Discusses the SA, ITA and Growth Board's assessment of sites and that very little if any of the criteria was used to assess the impact on the Green Belt, and that the Growth Board's Green Belt study is partial, inaccurate and skewed. Has provided a detailed statement on the assessment of the SA and ITA in the representation, in particular to the access to infrastructure and key services and facilities in the area and air quality. Objection is not so much that the Council should meet Oxford's needs, but that Oxford's preferred option within Cherwell should not be the main weighting that is applied in the evaluation of options.  |
| PR-B-1027 | Jonathan     | Porter        | Archstone Projects Ltd  | 2            |                         |               | It is logical to seek to provide Oxford's unmet need which relate closely to the City. While directly attributing certain sites and ring fencing housing supply to Oxford alone is convenient, it is an artificial and questionable approach.   |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan     | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 2            |                         |               | Yes, as Cherwell forms part of the same Housing Market Area.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David        | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 2            |                         |               | The strategy should focus upon the City and development opportunities in close proximity to ensure strong links. This is in keeping with the objectives of LTP4 and the existing travel patterns of commuting movement in to the City from the outlying single housing market. Connections with Oxford require strengthening through investment in sustainable transport infrastructure whilst simultaneously siting Cherwell's allocations in sustainable locations near existing or new transport corridors. For example, through the new rail station and Park and Ride at Begbroke proposed in the masterplan.  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert       | Davies        | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford              | 2            |                         |               | Agree to the spatial relationship to Oxford. Additional housing should be directed towards sites that are sustainably located and in close proximity to Oxford, by developing housing on sites that are (or have the potential to be) well connected to the City and its associated employment. In light of the statement on page 30 of the Options Paper, support and consider that it is right for Cherwell District to contribute towards housing for Oxford's needs as there is land with the District that is well connected to Oxford and has the potential to meet its needs.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 2            |                         |               | It is the 'unmet' needs of Oxford that CDC should jointly work with other Oxon authorities to meet (as opposed to Oxford's needs' as referred to in the question). It is important to clearly set out and agree what these unmet needs actually are. There is currently a lack of certainty over exactly what these unmet needs are and in order to ensure the soundness of the plan, robust evidence is required to clearly establish these needs to ensure the proposed strategy is justified and effective.  |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret | Sidebottom    |   | 2            |                         |               | No.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri   | Dyson     |   | 2            |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land, be affordable and house the current population first.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP             | Lyes      |   | 2            |                         |               | No. Kidlington needs to preserve a separate identity to Oxford. A public enquiry should look at how Oxford is resolving its housing crisis in order to ensure its making headway on affordable housing as well as achieving a balance between industrial and residential development. At present it appears to be generating industrial ahead of residential.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F       | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 2            |                         |               | This is a requirement for Oxford City. It seems logical that any housing falling in this category should be located as close as possible to the City. Cherwell should not concede to the City's need therefore no need for a vision.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val            | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council   | 2            |                         |               | Only if this is close to Oxford - otherwise the housing will not be to meet Oxford's needs.  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg           | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 2            |                         |               | A long and comprehensive response which in summary states that where sites are demonstrated to be appropriate and capable of providing housing in the form of sustainable development, these should be delivered to increase the supply of new homes. Where it is identified that Cherwell has capacity to deliver housing, these sites should be brought forward as a positive opportunity to increase supply of new homes.   |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan           | Storah    | Oxford City Council   | 2            |                         |               | Cherwell should contribute to meeting Oxford's needs.  |
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate | Hamilton  |   | 2            |                         |               | No do not need to meet Oxford's needs. Oxford has many acres of undeveloped brownfield sites within its boundaries which could be used for housing rather than industry. Likewise there is land in Kidlington earmarked for Industry. CDC should challenge Oxford City on this.  |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom            | Hockaday  |   | 2            |                         |               | Some additional developments in the Cherwell District areas closest to Oxford are reasonable; for example Kidlington, Begbroke, Bicester, and within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith          | Johnston  |   | 2            |                         |               | No. Oxford City must review its growth plans, be more realistic about actual demand and accommodate it's needs in a more imaginative and less intrusive ways.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain           | Johnson   |   | 2            |                         |               | No. CDC is not Oxford City, the city needs to look after its own needs and ask the University, its major landowner, to consider what can be done to meet housing pressure.   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat            | Clissold  |   | 2            |                         |               | Oxford had a commuter population of 16,000 in 2011. If this number could be reduced there would be more houses available for essential workers in Oxford. Houses built outside Oxford will contribute to its traffic problems, as workers commute in. 9,500 people commuted from Cherwell into Oxford City in 2011 consensus. Only 54% of people who work in Oxford also live in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie          | Lewis     | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                   | 2            |                         |               | It is agreed that Cherwell should be responding directly to meet the needs of Oxford, based on a sustainable and connected relationship with the City. This should utilise the existing good transport links within the district. However, the pressures on existing identified growth points will need to be assessed and in addition the need to expand development in smaller settlements will need to be considered to meet the increased housing requirement as a whole.  |
| PR-B-1127 | David          | Betts     |   | 2            |                         |               | No, this is premature. The SHMA needs to be revisited as these figures appear to be based on an optimistic growth in jobs and events such as the EU referendum need to be considered. There is little evidence that Oxford has examined its ability to accommodate more housing before building on GB.   |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda          | Ward      | Kidlington Development Watch  | 2            |                         |               | Do not agree that CDC need to meet Oxford's needs as these have not been correctly assessed. Oxford has not done enough to accommodate further housing within the city's boundaries. Oxford should also substantially reduce the number of sites it has identified for employment purposes and should reallocate that land for housing. It should also embark on a strategy to divert employment growth elsewhere to areas that need and would welcome it both in Oxfordshire and the country as a whole. By taking these actions its assessed needs (grossly overestimated as they are) would be reduced further. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation                 | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1133 | Philip     | Towler     |                              | 2            |                         |               | Accept that Oxford has housing needs but need to be based on robust analysis and sensible projections. The figures were derived from the SHMA, not a truly independent body, and the methodology is flawed. These figures need further assessment and the impacts of Brexit considered. Oxford City should bear a proper share of the burden.  |
| PR-B-1139 | Ken        | Martin     |                              | 2            |                         |               | No, Oxford could meet their own needs by using neglected brownfield sites currently used or earmarked for commercial and industrial purposes. The universities must be stopped from the relentless push for growth within the city and students housed in high density accommodation rather than family homes. Oxford exacerbated the problem by allowing Oxford Brookes to move accommodation from Wheatley to the city centre.   |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine  | Richenburg |                              | 2            |                         |               | No, Oxford should not expand if it does not have the space. Research and innovation hubs should be developed elsewhere in England where jobs are needed, housing is cheap and there are excellent universities i.e. Durham and Newcastle. This is the approach by the CPRE in seeking to protect the historic city of Oxford from overdevelopment.   |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan       | Lodwick    |                              | 2            |                         |               | No. The flawed Oxfordshire SHMA does not correctly assess Oxford's needs. Oxford City could address its own needs better for example by substantially reducing its proposed employment sites, reallocating them for housing and making better use of brownfield sites.   |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard    | Bennett    |                              | 2            |                         |               | No, not individually which this plan is suggesting each Cherwell district do. Why not go further afield where brown belts are available and more suitable?   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ         | French     | Deddington Development Watch | 2            |                         |               | Agrees. Seeking to promote additional employment generating development in Cherwell is inconsistent with the priority of providing housing to meet the accommodation needs of Oxford's employment market.  |
| PR-B-1147 | Joan       | Tossell    |                              | 2            |                         |               | No, the city has created a housing problem and has done little to solve it. Development in Oxford in recent years has been aimed primarily at attracting commercial and retail investment - the Northern Gateway for example. Figures from 2013 show that 1,300 dwelling in Oxford are unoccupied these could be bought back into use to solve the problem. The SHMA allocation of 550 new homes in Oxford is a disgrace, the county cannot pick up the problem when it needs to meet its own housing needs. South Oxford is challenging this allocation CDC should do the same. |
| PR-B-1148 | Terry      | Tossell    |                              | 2            |                         |               | No, the city has created a housing problem and has done little to solve it. Development in Oxford in recent years has been aimed primarily at attracting commercial and retail investment - the Northern Gateway for example. Figures from 2013 show that 1,300 dwelling in Oxford are unoccupied these could be bought back into use to solve the problem. The SHMA allocation of 550 new homes in Oxford is a disgrace, the county cannot pick up the problem when it needs to meet its own housing needs. South Oxford is challenging this allocation CDC should do the same. |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim        | Spencer    |                              | 2            |                         |               | Yes, Oxford is a geographically compact city and does not have the space to meet its housing requirements  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey    | Wright     | Begbroke Parish Council      | 2            |                         |               | Do not think that there is an obligation to do this although understand why this would appear attractive. However, consider the green belt to be vital demarcation between the city and our villages.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation             | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |                          | 2            |                         |               | No, do not agree, Oxford needs to do more to meet its own needs as the fifth objective in the Planning Policy Network is designed to encourage. Oxford should prioritise housing over employment generating development and provide housing for existing workers before attracting more. Employment generation could be proposed for areas such as Bicester to share wealth creation opportunities elsewhere. The most important need is to preserve the GB to stop urban sprawl destroying the historic character of the city. To prevent coalescence of Oxford, Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton and safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The GB preserves the setting and special character of historic towns, Begbroke is mentioned in the 'Doomsday Book'. Oxford City needs to consider recycling derelict and other urban land before looking outside of the city. Any housing to the north of Oxford will be attractive to London commuters. |
| PR-B-1158 | Elizabeth        | Leckie    |                          | 2            |                         |               | Oxford's needs and preferences should not be placed above the interests and preferences of Cherwell's residents. Oxford shouldn't impose high density dormitory housing on the surrounding GB to service its own ambitions and prestige projects. Congestion in and around Gosford and Kidlington would be exacerbated, whereas new housing within Oxford would not add to this congestion. Given the proximity to Oxford Parkway new houses would attract London commuters and not fulfil Oxford's unmet housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin           | Leckie    |                          | 2            |                         |               | Oxford's needs and preferences should not be placed above the interests and preferences of Cherwell's residents. Oxford shouldn't impose high density dormitory housing on the surrounding GB to service its own ambitions and prestige projects. Congestion in and around Gosford and Kidlington would be exacerbated, whereas new housing within Oxford would not add to this congestion. Given the proximity to Oxford Parkway new houses would attract London commuters and not fulfil Oxford's unmet housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council   | 2            |                         |               | No. Even though Cherwell is adjacent to Oxford City Council, transport and facilities would still be needed to access the city.  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |                          | 2            |                         |               | No, there is no need for Cherwell to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs and it is not an 'exceptional circumstance' for encroaching on the GB. It is premised on economic growth which runs counter to current trends and if the growth board believes 35,000 houses will be needed they should have a more imaginative scheme i.e. a new town. There may be room within the Oxford ring road to accommodate a significant number of houses for example the Pear tree interchange if it is relocated.   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson   |                          | 2            |                         |               | There appears to have been little discussion of Oxford's figures and do not consider that they are soundly based. It would be more appropriate for employment to be generated in Oxfordshire rather than in Oxford and for housing to be located in proximity. There are successful science parks in South Oxfordshire and the same could be achieved in North Oxfordshire. This should be CDC's objective. The current areas to which people commute are Cowley, Headington and the centre so building houses near to these jobs would reduce pressure on transport. It would be more appropriate to get the employment opportunities sited in CDC's area. Areas of land that Oxford City currently has allocated for employment should be used for housing.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands | 2            |                         |               | It is key that this strategic growth should be met within sustainable patterns of development with good transport links and connections to Oxford. Kidlington and Bicester should look to plan for additional homes, as they are sustainable settlements in close proximity to Oxford. The characteristics of these towns are outlined. Banbury should also not be ruled out for taking strategic housing sites.   |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis            | Davies    |                          | 2            |                         |               | No. Attracting more business into Oxford will add to the housing needs. Other Major cities with equally historic buildings have managed to build at much higher densities. There need to be consideration to how many people living in Oxford commute to London and the Midlands.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1180 | RA         | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd            | 2            |                         |               | Strongly disagree that there is a clear and demonstrable need for the Cherwell district to meet Oxford's needs. The existing housing commitment in the adopted local plan is more than sufficient to satisfy the NPPF requirement to significantly increase the supply of housing.  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi      | Lancaster |   | 2            |                         |               | No, if Oxford cannot meet their housing needs development needs to stop. The traffic system of Oxford is already at capacity and the flood plains around the city provide a natural limit. Need to retain the character of individual cities and villages which attracts tourists. Oxford should consider building on areas identified for business development as housing should take priority and business will further increase the housing demand.  |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol      | Matheson  |   | 2            |                         |               | It is accepted that Oxford believes it requires more houses and there is a need for affordable housing for key workers. However this will not be achieved by releasing expensive developer land around Gosford/ Kidlington where it will be bought by London commuters. Planners should look at developing brownfield sites and filling in gaps within the built up parish areas of Gosford and Water Eaton. Policy villages 1 categorises Gosford and Water Eaton as a category A village where only minor developments or infilling is allowed. Have concerns regarding Oxford, Water Eaton and Gosford merging together and Local Plan Policy ESD14 seeks to prevent this and encroachment on the GB. Building on the edges of the parish will not enhance the character or appearance of Gosford and Water Eaton as Policy ESD13 seeks to do. |
| PR-B-1192 | Robert     | Selway    |   | 2            |                         |               | No. Oxford City needs to consider building more than 550 houses and not pass the problem onto neighbouring, rural villages where the impact on services and infrastructure would be vast.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council  | 2            |                         |               | Yes, particularly for more affordable housing and starter homes. However APC hopes planners will avoid the creation of affordable 'ghettos' where housing is of poor quality and which creates issues for the future.   |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt      | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 2            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 2            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard    | Silvester |   | 2            |                         |               | It is not logical for Oxford to expect other District Councils to help to meet its housing needs as it could feasibly develop additional accommodation within its own boundaries if land usage was allocated more sensibly.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham  |   | 2            |                         |               | Yes, subject to the qualifier in Q1 regarding a review of the figure in the light of Brexit.  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green     |   | 2            |                         |               | No do not agree. Oxford Citys should be expected to meet more of its own housing need and employment is based in Headington and Cowley. Any houses built between Kidlington and North Oxford are likely to be purchased by London commuters using the new Parkway station.  |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark       | Schmull   | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 2            |                         |               | The starting point should be locations close to Oxford. It follows logically that where there are opportunities to meet this need in sustainable locations with strong transport connectivity to the source of the need these should be considered. Islip would be capable of growing without increasing the risk of coalescence with Oxford. It's location along the Oxford-Cambridge-Milton Keynes 'Growth Corridor' further enhances this case.  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage    | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 2            |                         |               | Agrees that CDC should specifically plan to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs and has no further comment to make at this time.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett   | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 2            |                         |               | Yes it is agreed that CDC need to specifically meet Oxford's needs when planning for additional housing development.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother   | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 2            |                         |               | Yes. It is agreed that the Oxfordshire SHMA (2014) provides the objective assessment of need and that it is consistent with the NPPF that CDC and other Oxfordshire councils have, through the OGB, apportioned housing throughout the county in order to meet the unmet need identified.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname         | Organisation                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne         | Willson-Higgins |                                   | 2            |                         |               | Disagrees and considers that this is not proven. Fully accepts that there are housing problems in Oxford, especially affordable housing for key workers. Refers to Fortismere report 2015 which made a number of recommendations and that these still need to be addressed through review of the Oxford housing capacity. These unanswered questions need to be addressed before releasing land within the GB and in other districts.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera       | Kantor          |                                   | 2            |                         |               | Since the demand estimates are based on flimsy theoretical assessments, it would be unwise to proceed with this project. The infrastructure cannot cope. If Oxford City believe that their estimates are sound they should utilise the brownfield sites within the City which already have planning permission and the as yet unexploited land in areas which will not test the infrastructure. Oxford City should be responsible for balancing its commercial developments and residential needs.  |
| PR-B-1245 | Jason and Petra | Tyrell          |                                   | 2            |                         |               | No, it is not Cherwell's responsibility. In addition the proposed developments are within Cherwell District but the impact of the developments would be on Oxford and their already constrained infrastructure network.   |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan           | Silvester       |                                   | 2            |                         |               | It is not logical for Oxford to expect other District Councils to help meet its housing needs when it could feasibly develop additional accommodation within its own boundaries if land usage was allocated more sensibly.  |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip          | Boxall          |                                   | 2            |                         |               | The duty to cooperate is a good thing. Note the suggestion in section 4.18 that in return Oxford City should contribute to funding infrastructure within Cherwell and would agree with that.  |
| PR-B-1254 | Philip          | Redpath         |                                   | 2            |                         |               | Cherwell and West Oxon have met their own needs which has been a difficult task, they should not be expected to take additional large numbers to accommodate another district.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia           | Sheppard        |                                   | 2            |                         |               | Not 'we' specifically- other non-GB sites would be suitable.  |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola          | Mallows         | Gresswell Environmental Trust     | 2            |                         |               | Oxford should develop its own land bank for its housing. It needs to stop dumping its quota onto other district councils. Just as Local District Councils have a duty to co-operate with each other, so too does Oxford City have a duty to respect its outlying villages, and to acknowledge the health benefits that the Green Belt offers. Oxford has an obligation to serve its existing residents, most of whom value the benefit from the easy access to open agricultural or amenity land in the GB. There is a case for strategic planning over the whole of the Oxford area so that there is no loss of quality of life, so that green corridors such as the Green Belt, open land and environmentally sensitive areas such as the Thames Valley and Otmoor are protected forever from development. Oxford will be a lesser place if the amenity of the surrounding villages and open Green Belt land are in any way compromised. What makes Oxford a sustainable and a nice place to live work and breath, is the existing ease of access to open agricultural and amenity land. It is vital to our well being. |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew          | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group | 2            |                         |               | Agrees, but if the infrastructure to connect housing to jobs, schools etc. in a sustainable way is properly factored in before the numbers are agreed and sites allocated. Oxford City Council's response to WODC's proposals for housing at Eynsham (including the so-called new "garden village") makes this point, and we agree with that document both in the context of WODC and CDC. In the past, sites have been allocated and plans adopted without the infrastructure being fully in place- the Northern Gateway AAP is an example   |
| PR-B-1263 | Katie           | Silvester       |                                   | 2            |                         |               | It is not logical for Oxford to expect other District Councils to help to meet its housing needs as it could feasibly develop additional accommodation within its own boundaries if land usage was allocated more sensibly.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1268 | Garry      | Lancaster |   | 2            |                         |               | This is essentially the same question as question 1. No. Cherwell should focus on Cherwell's needs. Oxford need to solve its own problems rather than delegate this onto the surrounding areas. The consultation states that Oxford does have a housing supply problem which leads to high house prices, but they don't have an unemployment issue. Oxford need to make housing affordable rather than concentrate on commercial development and work harder to identify and convert long term empty houses. The 4,400 figure was calculated before the EU referendum and therefore the figures need to be recalculated.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells     | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 2            |                         |               | Accept in principle the spatial relationship to Oxford, and that genuine employment growth needs to be reflected in housing growth, and the quantum of need outside the City is untested and proven. More work needs to be done to establish genuine opportunities for accommodating growth within the City boundaries, in line with the Fortismere recommendations and other forthcoming sites from Northern Gateway and Oxford Southfield Golf Course. The problem is associated with excessive employment growth in Oxford City. Oxford City needs to commit to a policy of restraint in the future. If Green Belt is reduced as a strategic allocation, commensurate increases to maintain its function and a substantial area without new major development in the future. Selecting the closest land to Oxford is not proven as being the best way to accommodate growth. Green belt is intended to restrict uncontrolled growth. No consultation has been undertaken with Oxford City and there is concern about the potential loss of the long established 'Green Lungs', which provides a setting to Oxford. |
| PR-B-1271 | Rebecca    | Hodgson   |   | 2            |                         |               | No. Most of the planned investment and most of the industry is in South Oxford. Housing in the north of Oxford will place unnecessary pressure on the roads.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling  |   | 2            |                         |               | Cherwell should consider Oxford's needs, but only if Oxford agrees to no more commercial or industrial developments north of the city. If there is a need for employment in the northern part of the city, Cherwell should address this need, but this small need should be outside of Oxford's GB. 4,400 is an excessive number of houses, most of the industry in Oxford is in the South and East. The new residents would have to travel into and through central Oxford. Thus increasing the air and noise pollution, which would have a severe detrimental effect on the health of the new residents, Kidlington and North Oxford's residents. Housing should be located on the South and East side of the city which would reduce journey times.  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 2            |                         |               | CDC should jointly work with other Oxfordshire authorities to meet Oxford's housing needs. However, the apportionment is likely to need to be increased and therefore the apportionment of 4,400 to CDC can only be treated as a minimum in order to ensure the soundness of the plan.  |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley     | Soanes    |   | 2            |                         |               | No. They should look at brown fields and building fewer short term accommodation student blocks, the solution is on their doorstep.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes    | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 2            |                         |               | Agree, because this concerns Oxford's unmet housing need it is important to consider the relationship of sites with Oxford and consider how well they contribute to helping meet Oxford's needs. Transport is a key aspect as it is important that future residents will be able to access Oxford's services and employment areas relatively easily   |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha    | Blackmore | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family                    | 2            |                         |               | Agree. The Oxford Green Belt and other special landscape designations, in particular the Cotswolds Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty mean that the objectively assessed housing land requirement cannot reasonably be accommodated within the administrative boundaries of the city. Due to the close proximity of Cherwell District to Oxford City, and other employment regions, it is necessary to directly meet the housing need. It is important for Cherwell District to accommodate an appropriate amount of this additional housing need within existing sustainable settlements.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation                                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy    | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd | 2            |                         |               | Agree that CDC should specifically meet Oxford's needs in planning for additional housing development. New housing development in Cherwell should be located near to Oxford so that the locations of housing demand and supply are not detached or disconnected. Development to the north of Kidlington (on sites PR14 and PR27) would help fulfil this aspiration due to the sites' close proximity to two of the three potential Rapid Transit lines (RT lines) identified for the city – which will link a network of new outer Park and Ride sites – and the sites' good relationship with existing walking, cycling and public transport routes in and out of the city. The SA concludes that these sites have no significant negative effects on Oxford and consequently, it is submitted that the two areas of land combine to form a logical opportunity for a strategic scale urban extension to the north of Kidlington, which would help meet the significant unmet housing need of Oxford City. |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn  |   | 2            |                         |               | No, this question is poorly put and shows a misunderstanding of Oxford's and Cherwell's needs as demonstrated by the SHMA. The SHMA shows that additional housing development cannot meet Cherwell's needs, as those needs have already been met in full by the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031. All additional housing is therefore surplus to requirements in Cherwell and fails the test of sustainable development set by the NPPF. The SHMA shows that Oxford's specific need is for more affordable housing. As Cherwell has set a target of 33% of new housing to be affordable, any additional housing development in Cherwell cannot be held to meet Oxford's needs. The Planning Practice Guidance states that the Duty to Cooperate is not a duty to agree. Cherwell should engage constructively, actively and on an ongoing basis with Oxford City to help address Oxford's needs.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk   | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust  | 2            |                         |               | Agree with the need to meet Oxford's unmet needs for housing.   |
| PR-B-1302 | Clare      | Creese   |   | 2            |                         |               | No, wherever increased car traffic is a result. And there is no clarity on how infrastructure needs would be met.   |
| PR-B-1304 | Tim        | Wakeman  |   | 2            |                         |               | Should ignore Oxford's issues without the offer of funding. Oxford is attempting to deal with its statutory housing issues with the proposed purchase and rental of new properties in the new Barton development. If Oxford was to tackle the issue of buy to let landlord fees it has the ability to make Oxford the first affordable Housing City in Oxford. It can also develop to the west by putting in better transport systems and grow towards and around Witney and Eynsham.   |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster   | Fritwell Parish Council                           | 2            |                         |               | Housing for Oxford should be built in close proximity to the city. Housing in rural villages particularly Bicester and Banbury are likely to be occupied by commuters to London and not Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede   |   | 2            |                         |               | No, Oxford should ensure that provision of housing keeps pace with its own development, or restrict development in line with its ability to provide housing. The majority of workers in Oxford have their main job east and south of the city centre i.e. towards Buckinghamshire and South Oxfordshire.  |
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria   | Campbell |   | 2            |                         |               | No, not until Oxford City has done all that it can to meet its own needs within the city. Encourage the universities to build on their own land for student accommodation. Higher density developments creating more housing capacity. Employment sites for housing or mixed employment and housing. Use the Oxford Golf Course and the Greyhound Stadium for housing. The residents and the GB should not be considered less important than Oxford's needs, they need to do more.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric     | Rose          |  | 2            |                         |               | For the reasons detailed in answer to Question 1, no do not. Long term failures by Oxford City to manage a balance between residential and employment development. Oxford need to relook at their needs before relying on its neighbours. Criticism regarding the revised SHLAA by Oxford City. Areas within the ring road can be developed. Oxford can retain it's GB but expect other settlements to sacrifice theirs. A recent study identified 10,000 homes could be built on Southfield Golf Course, leaving enough space for a golf course. These would be close to two of Oxford's largest employment areas, Headington and the Business Parks of East Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1333 | Zoe        | Christodoulou |  | 2            |                         |               | No. Oxford City needs to do more, it is their problem not Cherwell or its residents. Approval of business developments such as Northern Gateway and Oxford Science Park should be used for housing and with continuing this policy Cherwell should refuse to consider their needs. The pressure is due to the large number of university students. Under no circumstances should CDC agree to development on our recreational space such as North Oxford Golf Course and Stratfield Brake. Whilst they refuse to develop Southfield Golf Course and their own leisure space.   |
| PR-B-1335 | Natalie    | Usher         |  | 2            |                         |               | It is sensible to plan and support Oxford's growth, but the documents do not consider the needs of the Cherwell residents. More emphasis is required on Oxford and the wider area not solely serving the city. The documents do not give indications of any benefits to Cherwell residents beyond statements about economic growth and access to work.   |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards      | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                 | 2            |                         |               | Agree. The sole reason for undertaking a Partial Review is to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs. By implication these should be in locations well related to Oxford. The rep continues by analysing the various considerations to be taken in to account in determining what is 'well related'.  |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd  | 2            |                         |               | Agree, and consider that Cherwell forms part of the same Housing Market Area.  |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley         | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                      | 2            |                         |               | Paragraph 47 of the NPPF requires that Local Plans meet the full OAN across HMAs for Oxfordshire. NPPF also requires LPA's to work together to address strategic priorities across local boundaries - joint working. It is therefore explicit in NPPF that the identified unmet needs of Oxford City are required to be addressed across HMA. OGB have worked in accordance with the NPPF. Cherwell should positively respond to this plan to deliver unmet needs to accord with the NPPF. Reference is made to recent joint strategies in Worcestershire, West Northamptonshire, and districts in Gloucestershire, which have identified specific sites that it is appropriate to meet the unmet needs of Oxford City |
| PR-B-1347 | Zahra      | Alrashed      | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of Kenley Holdings | 2            |                         |               | Supports the need to meet Oxford's unmet need  |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden         | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                       | 2            |                         |               | Acknowledges that Oxford has the strongest demand pressures for housing within the County it is clear that Cherwell does need to meet Oxford's needs. However, in some cases it may be that some sites are suitable to help meet City's needs as well as suitable as a Local Plan Part 2 housing allocation. Land at Grange Farm, Launton is entirely suitable as a sustainable site allocation to help meet either housing requirement.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott   | Upper Heyford Village Group                                    | 2            |                         |               | Given its virtually full employment levels, there is no logical reason why Oxford City should continue to zone land for employment whilst expecting the Districts to meet its housing need. A need which is exaggerated. Upper Heyford is not a suitable site for a large settlement due to the site's isolated and unsustainable rural location. There is clearly no case for adding even more homes at Upper Heyford.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname  | Organisation                                       | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1272 | S G            | Wakeling |  | 3            | A                       |               | Developments should only be allowed if they are situated outside Oxford's GB and a fast green public transport system is in place before any the houses are completed. Currently the route from Oxford along the Banbury Road does not cope. Dedicated bus and cycle lanes are needed from North Kidlington to the centre of Oxford, present journey times are not acceptable. An electric bus or tram system is required as a matter of urgency. In area A there is a need for a park for Kidlington, this would be ideally placed to the west side of the Oxford canal, north of Sandy Lane, between Begbroke and Kidlington. Access for all Kidlington and Begbroke residents to use.   |
| PR-B-0944 | David          | Stone    |  | 3            | A, B                    |               | Yes, listen carefully to the views and experience of the people living in North Oxford and Kidlington, since the design and timing of this Consultation appears be flawed and deliberately intended to ignore and restrict the views of these important communities. You have failed to address any exceptional circumstances for completely removing the GB in North Oxford and Kidlington and to understand the effects and impact of removing the GB. You need to comply with national planning policy. The health and wellbeing of residents needs consideration and the scientific evidence around car pollution and its detrimental affect to health.  |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura          | Precious | Quod on behalf of Albion Land                      | 3            | E                       |               | Agree, but considers that Area E should be included in the area of search. Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate | Hamilton |  | 3            |                         | PR14, PR27    | Oxford is a historic university city protected by the GB and universally recognised and valued. It is not Oxford or Kidlington's GB but everybody's providing walks, space and historic views enjoyed by thousands. To destroy it when we have no clear idea how the future will unfold is crass and vandalism. Site PR14 and PR27 should be declared a Special Area of Conservation due to the wildlife seen there.   |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin          | Carrit   |  | 3            |                         | PR22, PR25    | Fully support the need for more housing in Woodstock, 600-800 houses over the course of the plan period seems appropriate, and would prevent the decline of the town and ensure infrastructure needs are met. However WODC are also proposing 670 homes so it's essential that CDC and WODC co-ordinate their planning response whilst consulting with the residents of Woodstock.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel          | McGurk   | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust   | 3            |                         | PR23, PR24    | Sites PR23 and PR24 are in sustainable location with a direct route to Oxford City via the A44. They comprise Cherwell's most sustainable sites, closest to Oxford City, within the A44 Corridor.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul           | Buckley  |  | 3            |                         | PR38, PR50    | Yes. Importance of protecting the GB must be central in considering the options, which is a feature missed from the review. Also realistic predictions of future infrastructure provision must be central to consideration of the options. The review accepts that Banbury Road through to North Oxford will provide an efficient rapid transport route which has not been addressed locally, to which site PR38 and PR50 seem to be favourable. Where is the funding for this transport link and will it happen by 2031.  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert         | Davies   | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford | 3            |                         | PR51          | Unmet need must be provided in sustainable locations that will help Oxford, and therefore releasing these sites from the GB will be required. Support the statement in the Options Consultation that GB is not sacrosanct and that there are development opportunities within it, as highlighted within the responses to the Issues Paper in 2016, as this will be key to delivering homes to meet Oxford's unmet housing need. There is a strong and compelling set of exceptional circumstances which exist which justify a review of the GB boundaries to the north of Oxford City. Additionally consider that the site at Yarnton (PR51) provides a sustainable location for housing in close proximity to Oxford, which would provide a logical extension to an existing settlement, and which in turn provides a unique opportunity to bolster the local economy and expand the existing school and its catchment area, therefore benefiting the existing community. |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward         | Dowler   | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                        | 3            |                         |               | No   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname     | Organisation                           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0033 | Henry               | Munday      |  | 3            |                         |               | Reference is made to 2.20 NPPF to prevent urban sprawl onto GB unless exceptional circumstances; helping another council is not. The railway station is in the wrong place and the Kidlington buses stop short at St Johns   |
| PR-B-0041 | David               | Pratt       |  | 3            |                         |               | Areas that are within walking distance to Oxford Parkway, bus and cycle routes should be considered to reduce road traffic.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia             | Hall        |  | 3            |                         |               | The unknown effect of Brexit should be considered. EU citizens may leave and employment opportunities shrink. Currently earmarked sites are lying empty due to shortage of bricks.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew             | Taylor      | Aitchison Rafferty                     | 3            |                         |               | Client is the owner of an 8.7ha site of which 1ha has approval for 20 dwellings at a density of 10 units per acre. Part of the remaining 7.7ha is identified in the SHLAA for further 50 houses (SHLAA ref: WG019). This site is also included in the draft Weston on the Green Neighbourhood Plan. Development of this 7.7ha site is more appropriate for the village than sites PR82 and PR83 which lie to the east of the B430.   |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue                 | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                  | 3            |                         |               | The appropriate road infrastructure, Park and Ride etc. must be built to cope with the additional movements of people into Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A                 | McCall      |  | 3            |                         |               | Infrastructure i.e. schools, medical facilities and shops need to be considered along with additional traffic.   |
| PR-B-0120 | E                   | Tonkin      |  | 3            |                         |               | The word flood plain is mentioned as an objection to expanding in Oxford itself, why not in Kidlington. The High Street currently has adequate parking but will not allow for expansion, taking into account proposed development at the Co-op.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul                | Goulding QC |  | 3            |                         |               | Special consideration should be given to the unique character of village life in and around Noke and Islip and the importance of nature and wildlife at Otmoor. Public transport and infrastructure including sewerage and water needs to be taken into account.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val                 | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK | 3            |                         |               | None of the points listed in para 4.18 refer to the issue of villages stagnating by the restrictive policy approach towards villages. To retain the vitality of rural communities and to support local services some growth in villages should be allowed, particularly in more sustainable ones.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth       |  | 3            |                         |               | The pressure on community services of doctors, dentists, schools, local highways (traffic congestion outside William Fletcher Primary School).   |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                | Walker      | Oxford Bus Company                     | 3            |                         |               | Recommends that new housing are either located near existing public transport corridors where possible or they concentrate where volumes can justify the provision of a bus service. Having higher concentration in a place that already has an established public transport links will allow this 'network' to grow for the benefit of all residents with 'cross town' connections possible opening up more direct journey opportunities.   |
| PR-B-0200 | John and Elizabeth  | Gittings    |  | 3            |                         |               | Preservation of 'lungs' for Oxford. Minimal encroachment on green belt. Maintenance of a viable and much enjoyed 18-hole golf course.  |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings    |  | 3            |                         |               | See no discussion on creating alternative economic hubs in Oxfordshire, as opposed to trying to concentrate everything around Oxford, at the risk of destroying its unique character. Are new business and technology parks being created elsewhere in Oxfordshire that have space to provide suitable nearby housing. There are plenty of sites that are close to the M40, connected via rail and closer to London, but still close enough to have good connections to Oxford to benefit from Oxford as a knowledge centre. |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright  |  | 3            |                         |               | The protection of the GB is the most important issue as laid down in the NPPF and committed to by the present government in its 2015 manifesto. There are no exceptional circumstances here to justify using the GB and losing well used countryside and protected wildlife habitats. Proposals would double the sizes of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke resulting in the currently congested roads reaching gridlock.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield    |  | 3            |                         |               | Yes, consider the strong local response to protect GB and give sufficient time for consultation, not just 2 weeks over Christmas.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen       |  | 3            |                         |               | Although healthcare is mentioned , specific provision for the elderly and infirm should be considered for every proposed development site. Similarly sufficient retail and schools should be considered.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0653 | Peter          | Webber    |  | 3            |                         |               | GB is not for development and Oxford City needs to look at areas under its control. CDC's first duty is to its own inhabitants. To prevent Cherwell becoming a dormitory for London more thought has to be given to creating employment in sustainable communities elsewhere.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary | Shirley   |  | 3            |                         |               | Additional flooding, my garden is currently under water.  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G         | Shirley   |  | 3            |                         |               | The increased volume of traffic.  |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan          | Oldfield  |  | 3            |                         |               | It is unwise to add more traffic to congested roads. Health services and schools are already struggling to meet demand and the risk of flooding would be exacerbated. There would be irreparable damage to the countryside and historic sites.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J              | Kershaw   | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 3            |                         |               | Save for there being a review in five or six years time and further consideration of the impact of Brexit, the comments set out in para 4.18 of the consultation cover the key issues.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick           | Small     | Stagecoach   | 3            |                         |               | The list of issues is comprehensive. The only issue not signalled is the strategic role that Oxford Airport currently plays in the economy, and how that might develop in the future. Any allocations that affect or are influenced by the airport's existing or potential operations should be properly considered.  |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn         | Phillips  |  | 3            |                         |               | What government support will be available from a political and financial stance. Is GB safe? We will also need a real commitment to transport improvements. Such as the A34, the railway and access to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony        | Matthews  | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 3            |                         |               | No other issues occur to us   |
| PR-B-0723 | RA             | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 3            |                         |               | Consider that careful consideration needs to be given to the capacity of the District to accept new development and the implications of so doing for its environmental character and quality.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John           | Tremlett  |  | 3            |                         |               | No. At this level of detail think you have captured the issues.   |
| PR-B-0751 | Dr Katrin      | Kiessling |  | 3            |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin         | Palmer    |  | 3            |                         |               | Transport and road infrastructure must be addressed, even for a small increase, otherwise Kidlington will become gridlocked.  |
| PR-B-0769 | Debbie         | Jones     | Bidwells on behalf of City of Oxford Charity                         | 3            |                         |               | GB boundaries should continue to be reviewed. Land located within the GB in sustainable locations should be released and allocated for development.   |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve          | Pickles   | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 3            |                         |               | It is considered that the issues listed in para 4.18 cover the main issues that need to be taken in to consideration. In particular, providing housing to meet Oxford's unmet need in a sustainable location close to Oxford will necessitate a review of the Oxford GB boundary around Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane           | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council   | 3            |                         |               | Within Caversfield, the loss of the local bus service. Cherwell area should not become a dormitory for Oxford City.   |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip         | Morley    | North Oxford Golf Club   | 3            |                         |               | State that they are not experts in the field of housing, but have commented on other areas which have been highlighted in their response to other questions in the consultation.  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive          | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                                  | 3            |                         |               | Have no new issues CDC needs to consider  |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian            | Sheppard  |  | 3            |                         |               | Yes, not only Cherwell's development options, but the proposed developments of the surrounding other local authorities.   |
| PR-B-0802 | Peter J        | Frampton  | Framptons on behalf of db Symmetry                                   | 3            |                         |               | It is submitted that the Partial Review should consider the employment needs for the provision of large scale logistics floorspace which is essential to efficient manufacturing and in response to the growth of electronic retailing. At the EIP CDC indicated that the needs of the large scale logistics sector would be addressed in Part 2 of the Local Plan. This has not occurred and hence the issue should be addressed within this Partial Review. |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris          | Robbins   |  | 3            |                         |               | Cherwell plan assumes the housing need for Kidlington will be met elsewhere in the district, provisions for Kidlington is inadequate. Relative lack of local provision within Kidlington may perhaps be remedied within the 4,400 homes proposed if, the SHMA figure exaggerates the City's need.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0809 | Karen            | Selway   |  | 3            |                         |               | Consider recalculating the figures for predicted housing needs, which were calculated 3 years ago prior to Brexit. Housing and businesses will be dramatically effected and a predicted down turn in the economy could mean the houses and commercial buildings are not needed?  |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder    | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 3            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor   |  | 3            |                         |               | No sense to continue to mass more and more employment in Oxford. Other areas with good transport links should be developed. Improve your consultation procedures because you did not engage and adequately consult the residents of Oxford City in North Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce    | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbshire                             | 3            |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson   |  | 3            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus           | Campbell | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group                                   | 3            |                         |               | Any significant housing development will have implications for health provision in Oxfordshire. This will apply particularly to GP practices, many of which will need infrastructure development to meet additional population demand. Have provided a detailed statement to this question in their representation as a separate note. The key principles are that Health and GP services are an important component of any new community. Any housing development has the possibility to impact locally on health service delivery. The Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group would need to look to provide new facilities or support existing provision to expand. Much of the primary care estate is already at capacity and any development (especially over 200 units) is likely to need investment in primary care infrastructure such as expanding existing premises. In many areas, small branch surgeries are not seen as a cost effective model for delivering primary care. To support this increase in demand the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group would look for developer funding to support this important infrastructure development to ensure the health needs of the local population are met. They are undertaking a consultation on their healthcare strategy as part of the healthcare transformation programme mainly in relation to primary care. They welcome an opportunity to discuss further with Cherwell as these plans develop. |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel            | Buttler  |  | 3            |                         |               | Consideration should be given to provide the 4,400 homes on a single development site in close proximity to Oxford, even if this would mean releasing some of GB area. The implications of the Local Plan Part 2 for the Cherwell area will need to be taken into account as they could have an impact on the areas identified in this consultation paper.   |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha          | Eliot    | Oxford Preservation Trust  | 3            |                         |               | Oxford Preservation Trust is a charity which takes on a custodial role over the City and its setting, and for nearly a century, since the car factory was developed at Cowley, it has worked in a positive way to guide change, encouraging developers to keep the best of the old whilst encouraging the best of the new. Has an interest in the built environment of Oxford, its setting and views in and out of the City. It also owns land and buildings in order to protect Oxford and its setting for the people of Oxford and Oxfordshire to enjoy. In addition, it engages with planning matters in order to achieve this further. OPT has a unique knowledge of the City and its setting and how it has changed over time and is keen to share this knowledge as it sees the unprecedented amount of new development coming forward for the future. They have provided more detailed comments in their representation on the Green Belt and Flooding.   |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard          | Hills    |  | 3            |                         |               | Why do these planning processes take so long to conclude. There is no reason why schooling, health and traffic provisions must be reconsidered each time a new development is brought. Streamlining the process could allow many more thousands of homes to be built in a sustainable way.   |
| PR-B-0837 | David            | Jackson  | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 3            |                         |               | The issue of GB release needs to be specifically addressed. It is considered that there is a strong and compelling set of exceptional circumstances that justify a review of the GB. These are rehearsed in the rep. A clear case to support review of GB boundaries to the north of Oxford, in the vicinity of the Parkway station.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0838 | David                  | Jackson    | Savills on behalf of University of Oxford, Christ Church, Exeter, Magdalen, Merton and St John's Colleges | 3            |                         |               | The presence of the GB represents a policy constraint on the consideration of suitable locations for development that are close to Oxford. It is considered that there is a strong and compelling set of 'exceptional circumstances' that justify a review of the GB being undertaken. The rep lists these. This approach has recently been endorsed by the Planning Minister in relation to the Birmingham Plan. The rep outlines the Minister's actions. It is argued that this approach is directly comparable to the situation in Oxford and therefore supports GB review.   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike                   | Gilbert    | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd   | 3            |                         |               | No - but greater consideration needs to be given to the identified issue ' <i>the need to avoid coalescence between settlements and the loss of village identity</i> '   |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren                 | Bell       | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd   | 3            |                         |               | Need to consider the potential for Cat A villages. This should be done through a review of Cat A villages to assess which ones are the most sustainable and best able to meet Oxford's housing needs in relation to connectivity and sustainability. The issue of how housing requirements post 2031 will be met should also be addressed.   |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex                   | Wilson     | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd  | 3            |                         |               | Consideration must be given to a wide range of matters to establish the quantum, most suitable location and form of development required to meet need. A2D notes the issues listed in the consultation paper. The rep goes on to suggest 10 additional considerations.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler     | Bloombridge LLP   | 3            |                         |               | There is a need for a strategy that 1) meets Oxford's unmet housing needs whilst recognising that Oxford Parkway station and the GB here merit consideration for University related development; 2) is deliverable, and therefore 3) provides for a blended spatial strategy of short-term, smaller sites on the periphery of Kidlington. Two further issues to consider are existing infrastructure capacity, and planned infrastructure. The rep provides a detailed explanation and justification for these suggestions. Finally there is a detailed discussion relating to the constraints/potential benefits etc. to development in the North Oxford, Kidlington/Begbroke/Woodstock area. |
| PR-B-0856 | David                  | Smith      |   | 3            |                         |               | Cherwell has already allowed huge expansion at Banbury, Bicester and Heyford. It's the responsibility of the District Council to now protect and enhance the residents quality of life. There is scope for further development infill including development of some land currently designated as GB.   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC  | 3            |                         |               | In addition to those already identified in para 4.18 of the Options Paper: The importance of maintaining the separate identity of Kidlington/Gosford from Oxford; Ensuring that any new development includes substantial provision for affordable housing.   |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt                   | Todd       |   | 3            |                         |               | Absolutely! Loss of green belt, transport infrastructure, new housing merely adding population pressure.   |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter                  | Hainsworth |   | 3            |                         |               | Transport needs much more consideration.   |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council  | 3            |                         |               | Funding for infrastructure continues to be an issue. Viable development options should be capitalised on what is already planned.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council   | 3            |                         |               | The Parish considers that it would have an effect on the existing infrastructure, amenities and quality of living for existing residents.  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks      |   | 3            |                         |               | Oxford Airport is a key asset and any new development should not prevent expansion in the future. Equally developments near the main rail lines need to be mindful of noise if they were to expand.  |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street     |   | 3            |                         |               | No. Wish for stronger guarantees for improved education and health are included with CDC proposed scheme. Section 4.18 is a comprehensive list with little detailed referring to education and health needs. Consideration needs to be taken to Kidlington and Gosford Hill primary schools as regards to the temporary classrooms since 1980's. Previous negotiations to improve health care were not successful due to inadequate proposals by developers.   |
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard       | Miles      |   | 3            |                         |               | With the strategic development of Banbury and Bicester, is it not more appropriate to increase the house numbers in these areas where the infrastructure considerations have already been taken in to account?   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa    | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council   | 3            |                         |               | Cherwell has been proactive in its approach to addressing its housing need. Cherwell should be rigorous in assessing further development options on the 5 year housing land supply. Will the two figures run side by side or will there be an overarching figure? Cherwell needs to be mindful of the "easy" option taken by developers in putting forward sites in unsustainable locations that are not well connected to the City.   |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison     | Forfar   |  | 3            |                         |               | If property is built to meet Oxford's needs it should only be available for purchase or rent for people who can prove that they have a job in Oxford and have a covenant also preventing them being sold or let subsequently to anyone who doesn't work in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton   |  | 3            |                         |               | Questioning if there are any concrete plans in the plan to deal with the existing road congestion around Oxford and much less the increased traffic that's in the pipeline with Cherwell's own building programme. More housing will impact the traffic on the roads unless there is a major transport infrastructure investment programme, of which there are none.   |
| PR-B-0912 | David      | Mason    |  | 3            |                         |               | Brexit and wider national and international economics.   |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 3            |                         |               | Paragraph 81 of the NPPF requires LPA's to plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt 'to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity'. What steps will Cherwell DC be taking to fulfil this legal obligation? They have provided a very detailed statement on 'Affordability', which discusses average incomes and the availability of these houses to them in Oxfordshire. The Partial Review does not address the issue of affordability except in the vaguest terms (para 3.16): "there needs to be a careful examination of the alternative housing models which would be appropriate such as rent to buy or community based housing, and whether measures to provide options for key workers, could be supported." Have also provided a detailed statement on the density of housing in the representation, which should be 30%. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 3            |                         |               | The ability to provide a rail link should be a factor in the consideration of the suitability of sites. Also the ability to contribute to a mixed and balanced community. Ability to provide open space, recreational facilities. The Quarry is a brownfield site.   |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie      | Lodwick  |  | 3            |                         |               | The Council needs to rethink their broad ideas in this Plan and consider the possibility of a completely new village/small town instead of ruining the integrity of 3 existing well defined villages. There might be less opposition to such an idea, as it would not affect existing communities so directly. It would be designed on sustainable principles. It could be sited away from already congested roads. It could comply to a much greater degree with the Draft Vision. "to provide new well balanced communities..."  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds     | Fringford Parish Council   | 3            |                         |               | Key issues for consideration are sustainability, distance from Oxford and resultant travel pollution. The existing road system (A34 and M40) are inadequate with travel problems, the planned growth around Bicester will add to the congestion and environmental damage.  |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter      | Bateman  | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                             | 3            |                         |               | The adopted Local Plan strategy seeks to direct growth to the two most sustainable locations in the district. The Partial Review should adhere to the examined and adopted spatial strategy. The two main towns have strong transport links with Oxford and directing a proportion of growth to these places for Oxford's needs is appropriate and will deliver sustainable development. If directions for growth are considered near the Oxford GB a review of the GB should inform site locations. This was not a prominent part of the Part 1 examination process and further demonstrates the Partial Review has the potential to be a significant deviation from the adopted strategy.  |
| PR-B-0935 | David      | Lock     | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates                 | 3            |                         |               | The emerging strategy appears to rely solely on growth in Areas A and B. A critical part of Oxford's need is to adequately plan for the expansion of Oxford University. Consideration should therefore be given as to whether land close to Oxford should be dedicated to academic/research functions rather than being used for housing, when there are alternative development options available.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname                  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0937 | Philip                 | Rawle                    | Greenlight Developments   | 3            |                         |               | The single biggest issue is to protect the GB. The NPPF's requirements regarding the GB are outlined. There are 2 key aspects at the heart of the Review: 1) the need to meet and deliver full, objectively assessed housing needs; and 2) only in exceptional circumstances should the GB be amended. These aspects are discussed in some detail. In conclusion the rep states that this results in Bicester being the focus for accommodating Oxford's unmet housing needs.                                    |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim                    | del Nevo                 |   | 3            |                         |               | Consideration of the road transport network. Who will occupy these homes commuters from London and elsewhere, resulting in a commuter town. Fear that developers will chose to build large and expensive houses to maintain their profit margin, having had to provide affordable houses at a discount. Remember the need for smaller houses for sale.   |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter                  | Monk                     | Banbury Civic Society   | 3            |                         |               | Whilst the study is aimed at Oxford City's needs, it should not be overlooked that some (many ? ) of the new residents could be employed south of the City in the area referred to as Science Vale and this infers two things (a) that the housing provision should be as far to the south of the District as possible (to minimise the need to commute), and ( b ) that transport facilities will be the key to the acceptability and success of the development of the site(s) selected - see comment 2 above. |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark                   | Recchia                  | Banbury Town Council  | 3            |                         |               | The modal shift to public transport recommended by LTP4 is complicated by the ongoing review of bus subsidies within Banbury. New development would increase the reliance on private cars for travel to Oxford and lead to further congestion on the roads. This is contrary to 'The Highway Authority's Objectives for Oxford' outlined on p.26 of the consultation document. Focus development in locations which minimises the need to travel and encourage trips by sustainable transport choices.           |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                 | Small                    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 3            |                         |               | Welcomes the identification of “ensuring conservation of the historic environment and heritage assets” as an issue, although we would prefer “ensuring conservation and enhancement.....”. As this addresses our remit we have no suggestions for new issues.  |
| PR-B-0959 | Cllrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |   | 3            |                         |               | The downgrading of the Horton Hospital has been left off the list. The hospital is used by the whole District, if this hospital were downgraded more pressure would be put on the John Radcliffe Hospital. Cherwell needs to do everything that it can to make sure that the Horton is not downgraded.   |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken                    | Martin                   | Noke Parish Meeting   | 3            |                         |               | Questions on the steps taken to ensure that these houses are provided for Oxford's unmet needs and not attracting commuters from London for London's unmet need..  |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan               | Harbottle                | Land and Partners Ltd   | 3            |                         |               | Detailed reference is made to the findings of the Taylor Report which outlines the change in working patterns, principally the increase in home working , and advocates sensible increases in housing supply in villages which would support their economic growth.  |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane                   | Burrett                  |   | 3            |                         |               | Yes. The express way between Oxford and Cambridge. The outcome of the feasibility study for an additional junction between 8 and 9 on the M40. Changes to employment like at Cowley before the Brexit vote and housing need from the social economic changes in the region which will arise from Brexit., this will take time to become clear. Unclear to educational institutions because of Brexit as immigration decision are yet to be made.   |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon                  | Turner                   | Launton Parish Council  | 3            |                         |               | Areas outside Oxfordshire which will, with the new east/west rail and expressway, have good transport links with Oxford should be considered.  |
| PR-B-1005 | SP and SA              | McQuillan                |   | 3            |                         |               | Do not agree the GB should be compromised in such a major and random manner. However, should that decision become legal policy than any and all development into the GB must be managed fairly. CDC should not be able to decide to overrule GB legislation for thousands of homes yet a typical house owner in a similar area is refused permission, for example, for a modest extension to their home because of GB restrictions.  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth                   | Powles                   | Kirtlington Parish Council                                      | 3            |                         |               | New housing for Oxford's housing needs should be adjacent to or near Oxford City and linked with off-road cycle routes and good public transport.  |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel                 | Hatcher                  | Rosconn Group   | 3            |                         |               | No issues to consider.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver       | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 3            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew       | Hornsby-Smith |   | 3            |                         |               | Agrees, but should reassess the local transport issues, including congestion in the Kidlington to Oxford corridor, which was identified in the LTP as a major congestion area. Suggests phasing to reassess the actual need in 10 years to take account of economic growth post Brexit. Suggests a Rail Station near Oxford Airport if Areas A and B become the preferred option.   |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan     | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 3            |                         |               | Reference is made to the findings of the Taylor Review. Continued technological change means that working from home becomes more viable and commuting becomes more sustainable with zero emissions and self driving vehicles becoming more prevalent. This will reduce strain on existing infrastructure, whilst more home-workers and occasional commuters in rural areas will help support existing facilities to improve and maintain the vitality of rural settlements.   |
| PR-B-1032 | David        | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford           | 3            |                         |               | The challenge throughout the OHMA is the affordability of homes. A potential form of affordable housing could be the provision of key worker homes, particularly alongside employment sites. Such homes can be delivered alongside 'general market' housing to aid viability and ensure balanced and mixed communities. The need to demonstrate 'exceptional circumstances' to review green belt boundaries is also discussed.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments         | 3            |                         |               | No comment at this stage. We do however, reserve the right to comment on this topic in future rounds of consultation.   |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson         |   | 3            |                         |               | YES. As climate change has already begun, the principle of the GB is now more imperative than ever, as a buffer against any further environmental degradation and destruction.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP           | Lyes          |   | 3            |                         |               | Yes, Brexit is one. Another is having a defined plan for affordable housing. It seems disingenuous of councils to talk this up as a key justification for this development when there seems to be no real plan to address the issue.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F     | Hickman       | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 3            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val          | Russell       | Bodicote Parish Council   | 3            |                         |               | Support the release of Green Belt in principle if sites for housing cannot be found in or near Oxford. Suggest a new town concept with associated facilities and infrastructure rather than spoiling existing villages by continuing bolting on new areas of development. The Banbury Master Plan has only just been adopted. Local Plan Part 2, which is in preparation may have implications for the Cherwell area. Clarity is needed on Brexit, South Oxfordshire's apportionment (not agreed) and what will happen to Oxford's unmet need after 2031. |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg         | Blaquiere     | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 3            |                         |               | Para 2.37 of the Options Paper states that the 4,400 apportionment is based on 3 areas and that subsequent local plan work may bring other sites forward, and it is for each of the local plans to allocate sufficient sites. In the context of a greater scale of need and the presumption in favour of sustainable development other sites would be required at this stage to demonstrate ability to accommodate an increased contribution and meet the tests of soundness.   |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan         | Storah        | Oxford City Council   | 3            |                         |               | The Key issues to be given full consideration are: impact on the GB, impact on landscape (LUC report), integration with Northern Gateway project, Oxford's affordable housing need. Housing developments conveniently located for railway stations with services to London could introduce the risk that it would effectively serve to meet the needs of existing London residents rather than those of Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith        | Johnston      |   | 3            |                         |               | Infrastructure associated within areas of search, notably north of Oxford are already inadequate. Existing proposals regarding major road links in addition to major housebuilding programmes will inevitably lead to even less efficient transport, flooding and further uneconomic consequences in the county.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1110 | Iain       | Johnson    |   | 3            |                         |               | There is no mention in the consultation of the impact of Oxford Parkway station with its 1 hour commute time to London. This will skew the ownership of any nearby housing to commuters and exacerbate the housing shortage for local workers.  |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat        | Clissold   |   | 3            |                         |               | Oxfordshire County Council already has a traffic plan and certain routes should be fast tracked now for better access by bus/tram to the hospitals going every 10 minutes. The JR, Nuffield and Churchill Hospitals create congestion and elderly patients struggle to get to appointments on time. Bus lanes should also be a priority as additional housing in Cherwell will contribute to problems in the city.  |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie      | Lewis      | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate | 3            |                         |               | See 4   |
| PR-B-1127 | David      | Betts      |   | 3            |                         |               | Primarily interested landowners drive the issues and options paper and whilst deliverability is key to the soundness of the LP it should not be the primary driver for considering green belt issues. There is no reference to the Kidlington Master plan, which has recently been approved and is drafted on the premise that there is no development in the GB around Kidlington. It is important to retain the character and identity of Kidlington as a village as set out in the Master plan.  |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda      | Ward       | Kidlington Development Watch                          | 3            |                         |               | The Kidlington Masterplan SPD has not been taken into account, which is written on the basis that the surrounding Green Belt remains fundamentally unchanged. Attention is drawn to the objective to strengthen Kidlington's distinctive character of a 'village set in the landscape' and the objective to 'protect and enhance Kidlington's landscape and biodiversity assets'. Kidlington is already a separate, distinct, balanced and socially cohesive community. CDC has not satisfactorily considered the employment component of the growth including technology park at Langford Lane, Begbroke Science Park, the Northern Gateway and Eynsham, which indicates a lack of co-ordination between the authorities in Oxfordshire.   |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip     | Towler     |   | 3            |                         |               | The summary booklet shows a map of GB under threat and the purpose of GB, but none of the questions in this consultation make any reference to GB. How would concreting over GB land be sustainable? There is no discussion regarding the possible effects of Brexit which could impact on the country's housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1139 | Ken        | Martin     |   | 3            |                         |               | To meet Oxford's need, how will CDC ensure that all the houses go to satisfying the 'Unmet Housing need of Oxford'? If it does not propose a watertight solution, there will be another call on the District in 10 years' time.   |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine  | Richenburg |   | 3            |                         |               | Yes the effect of the Northern Gateway should be considered.  |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard    | Bennett    |   | 3            |                         |               | Road, traffic, schools, social services, doctors, utilities and other infrastructures need to be in place before development.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ         | French     | Deddington Development Watch                          | 3            |                         |               | Agrees, but question - How realistic or aspirational are the notional job creation projections on which the housing needs are based ?   |
| PR-B-1147 | Joan       | Tossell    |   | 3            |                         |               | Yes, Kidlington is not automatically the answer. It will not provide affordable housing as house prices in Kidlington are higher than Oxford, and the new railway station is attracting London commuters. Roads into Oxford are already congested and could not cope with the traffic increase. As recognised In the Cherwell Local Plan summary leaflet there is a need to move Park and Ride facilities away from the city and to the north of Kidlington. Commuters would not wish to drive away from the city to reach them. Houses should be built further away with strategically placed railway stations and Park and Ride to encourage use of public transport thus reducing congestion and pollution. 4,400 homes would double the size of Kidlington and schools and doctors are already at capacity. |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1148 | Terry            | Tossell   |  | 3            |                         |               | Yes. CDC needs to rethink its focus on Kidlington which would have a disastrous impact on transport, medical, education and other services. It is illogical in terms of the location of new housing in non-affordable areas and is out of step with your own local transport plan. It will not provide affordable housing as house prices in Kidlington are higher than Oxford, and the new railway station is attracting London commuters. Roads into Oxford are already congested and could not cope with the traffic increase. As recognised In the Cherwell Local Plan summary leaflet there is a need to move Park and Ride facilities away from the city and to the north of Kidlington. Commuters would not wish to drive away from the city to reach them. Houses should be built further away with strategically placed railway stations and Park and Ride to encourage use of public transport thus reducing congestion and pollution. |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |  | 3            |                         |               | yes, the announcement of the garden village in Eynsham makes it essential that transport infrastructure is completed first, including public transport.  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council                                      | 3            |                         |               | Oxford City should re-examine its priorities for development in accordance with achieving a better balance between different types of development that have been slow to bring into use.   |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |  | 3            |                         |               | Green Belt: paragraph 81 of the NPPF confers a legal obligation on local planning authorities 'to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity' .One of the NPPF is that of the permanence of GB. Brexit is an issue that needs consideration before any further decisions are made.   |
| PR-B-1158 | Elizabeth        | Leckie    |  | 3            |                         |               | The opening of the Oxford Parkway provides a quick and convenient route to London. Some of the assumptions made in the Partial Review were made on the findings of studies that were done well before Oxford Parkway opened. These assumptions need adjustment to take account of this change. See answers to questions 1 and 2.   |
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin           | Leckie    |  | 3            |                         |               | The opening of the Oxford Parkway provides a quick and convenient route to London. Some of the assumptions made in the Partial Review were made on the findings of studies that were done well before Oxford Parkway opened. These assumptions need adjustment to take account of this change. See answers to questions 1 and 2.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council                                       | 3            |                         |               | Yes. Changing National Migration Patterns. Overall Size and Placement Strategy. Transport Failings (current and future)  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |  | 3            |                         |               | The area of the lower Cherwell Valley is an area of significant biodiversity from deer and foxes to water voles, butterflies and wild flowers. What impact would building on such a scale have and how would it be mitigated?  |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson   |  | 3            |                         |               | Consideration needs to be given to preventing Kidlington, Yarnton and Oxford merging together and the need to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. The need for recycling of derelict and other urban land and the provision of transport connections, amenities and services.   |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands                                     | 3            |                         |               | The predominant issue is meeting the agreed Duty to Cooperate numbers from Oxford as well as locating this increase in housing in the most appropriate and sustainable locations. There must be regard given to ensure a sufficient supply of housing is provided. This not only requires a buffer above housing numbers but also the use of the reserve sites to ensure the plan does not fall out of date immediately.   |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis            | Davies    |  | 3            |                         |               | Ensure that much higher densities of housing are undertaken with low cost housing. Proper infrastructure planning before development is undertaken. Contributions from developers should be much higher.   |
| PR-B-1180 | RA               | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd | 3            |                         |               | Very careful consideration needs to be given to the capacity of the District to accept new development and the implications of doing so for its environmental character and quality.   |
| PR-B-1182 | Alison           | Noel      |  | 3            |                         |               | Possible reduction in housing need following Brexit  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1188 | Carol      | Matheson        |   | 3            |                         |               | Not developing in the GB has always been a strategy that has been respected by CDC and protection of this has always been included in their Local Plans. Developing in the GB around Gosford and Kidlington will lose their separate identities and the gap as they become part of Oxford urban sprawl. Local Plan Policy ESD 14 seeks to prevent the coalescence of settlements.  |
| PR-B-1192 | Robert     | Selway          |   | 3            |                         |               | Consider recalculating the figures for predicted housing needs as these were calculated prior to the decision to leave the EU. Housing and business will be dramatically effected by this decision and a predicted down turn in the economy could mean houses and commercial buildings aren't needed.  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss            | Adderbury Parish Council                                | 3            |                         |               | Not at this stage  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt            | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd   | 3            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway        | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm     | 3            |                         |               | Future sustainability of Oxford as a university city given severe constraints on growth.   |
| PR-B-1228 | Juliet     | West            | ICOMOS-UK   | 3            |                         |               | Paras 4.13 and 4.14 refer to Local Plan policies for the protection of the historic environment. Previous comments received on Cherwell Issues (para 4.18) include 'ensuring conservation of the historic environment and heritage assets'. It should be made explicit that these include heritage assets outside but immediately adjacent to the Cherwell boundary - in particular the Blenheim World Heritage site, part of whose setting lies within Cherwell. Impact of development on such assets and their setting should be included in Cherwell issues relating to the historic environment.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 3            |                         |               | None additional to those raised in response to Q1 and 2 above  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green           |   | 3            |                         |               | The new station at Oxford Parkway has changed the local area which could easily become a dormitory for people working in London. The new station should not be used as a prop to allow other unwanted development such as a football stadium. The area between North Oxford and Kidlington is largely GB and should be kept as such.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt    | 3            |                         |               | No further comments to make at this time.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd | 3            |                         |               | There is a general lack of clarity in the consultation documents as to whether the review document relates to the Part 1 review of the Local Plan or the new proposed Part 2 Local Plan.   |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies   | 3            |                         |               | No. The issues are comprehensive and wide ranging and provide an appropriate context within which consideration can be given as to how the District's share of Oxford's unmet need can be met.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 3            |                         |               | The draft vision should make reference to existing communities and the environment. Suggested rewording is "To provide new balanced communities that are well connected to Oxford, are of exemplar design and are supported by necessary infrastructure; that minimise impacts on existing communities and the environment that provide for a range of household types and incomes reflecting Oxford's diverse needs; that support the city's world-class economy and universities, that support its local employment base; and ensure that people have convenient, affordable and sustainable travel opportunities to the city's places of work, study and recreation and to its services and facilities." Has provided detailed comments on this question. |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip     | Boxall          |   | 3            |                         |               | Although there is mention of conservation of the historic environment, the importance of preserving villages as distinct, small settlements spread over Oxfordshire but with green space in between is not specifically acknowledged.  |
| PR-B-1254 | Philip     | Redpath         |   | 3            |                         |               | Local Planning Authorities will not, or are fearful to, address the fact that developers (and shareholders), universities, landowners and aspirational politicians are far too interested in making a profit. Giving total disregard to the nightmare scenarios that they are creating for our communities. Our communities need open space for wellbeing, clean air for our health and houses that are truly affordable.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard |   | 3            |                         |               | Traffic congestion along with how busy the new train station is making the area already very over crowded. The train station would attract London commuters, this will not solve or achieve Oxford's housing issue.   |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew     | Gant     | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 3            |                         |               | The principles of GB are permanent and must be maintained. This means, among other things, not closing the gap between Oxford and Kidlington (or indeed the gaps between Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton)  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells    | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 3            |                         |               | The character and future of Kidlington as an independent large village if large scale development was allocated to the village environs needs close study. The proposed scale of growth will overwhelm and be alien to the village, and create a dormitory extension to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1271 | Rebecca    | Hodgson  |   | 3            |                         |               | Oxford has a rural character. Any new developments must be in keeping with this character. Developments need to be placed together rather than spread around the whole surrounding area.  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 3            |                         |               | Have no comments at this stage, but do however reserve the right to comment on this topic in the future.  |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley     | Soanes   |   | 3            |                         |               | Maintaining the GB is critical to stop urban sprawl and unrelenting traffic. Has it been proven that in this instance to use GB is an exceptional need, because of Oxford City's failure to plan. Agree that housing is required but why on GB. The loss of North Oxford Golf Course and part of Otmoor, which is a green lung for the city along with surrounding land really impacts on the quality of life. Traffic danger and increased pollution from traffic now deemed to affect Dementia is also key. The current infrastructure isn't big enough to cope, if you restricted car ownership the issues moves to another area.  |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes   | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 3            |                         |               | There is need to consider the cumulative impact of options and growth in Cherwell together with that from planned growth in West Oxfordshire. Transport is a key issue. The two local planning authorities share the A44 corridor, and this together with the A40 feeds into the congested Wolvercote roundabout. Growth in Cherwell and West Oxfordshire may have implications for northern Oxford and for the A34. The impact on the A44 corridor needs to be carefully considered, and it is vital that both districts work together with the County Council to bring forward the proposed A40/A44 link. Education is another potential cross boundary issue given the lack of Primary School capacity in Woodstock. The two Councils should work together on their Infrastructure Delivery Plans.   |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy    | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd                       | 3            |                         |               | The proximity of the potential development options/Areas of Search to Oxford is a key consideration. The key issues for Cherwell to consider is the problems associated with highway capacity including on the A34. There is a possibility that a new link road could be created between the A44 and the A34 as an extension of Langford Lane (south of Oxford Airport) heading east above Kidlington and through parcels PR14 and PR27 (the latter being their client's land). This potential link road could provide significant highways benefits and divert traffic away from Peartree interchange where the A44 and A34 currently meet. This could in turn improve highway capacity along both of these trunk roads, at least the sections closest to the city where congestion is often at its worst. Development on parcels PR14 and PR27 could therefore provide highways benefits, as well as additional housing growth. |
| PR-B-1302 | Clare      | Creese   |   | 3            |                         |               | There is no way to ensure that Oxford's worker housing needs could be met. There is not enough affordable housing to meet those needs. Likely that wealthier Birmingham or London bound commuter needs would be served. Infrastructure such as schools, surgeries, utilities, transport and Wi-Fi needs to be put in place.   |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster   | Fritwell Parish Council   | 3            |                         |               | The issues on quality of life are supported. Achieving these aspirations should not be sacrificed to inflated, unnecessary housing and development targets.   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede   |   | 3            |                         |               | Yes, Brexit. The proposed development of a 2200 home garden village north of Eynsham.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric     | Rose        |  | 3            |                         |               | The residents of Kidlington are in need of affordable housing . Currently houses are over occupied, the only social housing is in Bicester or areas of Banbury. Kidlington residents need to have easy access to any new affordable, key worker and social housing. Would also like to see that the Oxford threshold of 50% affordable housing is put on developments rather than Cherwell's 35% (which is rarely implemented anyway).<br>Also, as any housing would be deemed to be helping Oxford meet its unmet housing needs, would Oxford City Council be making a CIL/Section 106 contribution?  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards    | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                         | 3            |                         |               | It is important that the Partial review seeks to build upon the adopted Local Plan, and apply additional growth requirements to this. The current development strategy needs to be re-assessed to ensure that the distribution of the Oxford overspill between the settlements is realistic and will be delivered. All sustainable settlements (including Cat A villages) are capable of making a positive contribution. Reference is also made to the Bromsgrove Local Plan Review.   |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle   | Land and Partners Ltd  | 3            |                         |               | The findings of the Taylor Report are increasingly relevant, this work outlines the change in working patterns, principally the increase in home working, and advocates sensible increases in housing supply in villages which would support their economic growth. The Taylor Report highlighted that "rural areas are no more unsustainable on the grounds of the environmental impacts of commuting to work than urban areas. The modes of travel and distance travelled are similar. Indeed although the distances are similar, rural journey times may be quicker (and therefore less polluting) due to less incidence of congestion compared to urban journeys." Continued technological change means that working from home becomes more viable and commuting becomes more sustainable with zero emissions and self driving vehicles becoming more prevalent. This will reduce strain on existing infrastructure, whilst more home-workers and occasional commuters in rural areas will help support existing facilities to improve and maintain the vitality of rural settlements. |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick       | Alston      | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd                | 3            |                         |               | Greater attention should be given to the potentially significant social, economic, and environmental benefits to the district of accommodating a proportion of Oxford's unmet housing needs in the district. It is important that these potential benefits are identified now, and that realising and optimising those benefits should be a key driver behind the identification of preferred options and subsequent policies in the partial review of Local Plan Part 1. Suggest a joined up approach between housing site selection and the support that this might be able to provide existing local economic assets such as London Oxford Airport.   |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden       | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                               | 3            |                         |               | Whilst it is noted that the Council has received comments on the importance of considering the GB as a major component of the district's natural capital and acknowledge that the GB is not sacrosanct and that there may be development opportunities within it; there will need to be a balance struck between GB release and the utilisation of land beyond the GB, such as that at Grange Farm to assist in meeting Oxford's unmet needs.  |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group  | 3            |                         |               | Feel very strongly that CDC should accept that the settlement on the former Upper Heyford airbase is underway and that further development at Upper Heyford and in the adjacent villages must be resisted.   |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert     | Davies      | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace | 4            |                         | 41            | It is particularly important that new homes are well connected to Oxford and supported by any necessary infrastructure. These sites would be located in close proximity to Oxford and connected to it via cycle super routes (Oxford Transport Strategy), premium bus routes, Oxford Parkway and Park and Ride. An essential infrastructure for new housing would be the use of A44, A40 corridor and the new link between A44 and A40 that could be funded by other developments within the area in order to reduce congestion along these routes into Wolvercote roundabouts.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1035 | Robert           | Davies    | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace  | 4            |                         | 124           | It is particularly important that new homes are well connected to Oxford and supported by any necessary infrastructure. These sites would be located in close proximity to Oxford and connected to it via cycle super routes (Oxford Transport Strategy), premium bus routes, Oxford Parkway and Park and Ride. An essential infrastructure for new housing would be the use of A44, A40 corridor and the new link between A44 and A40 that could be funded by other developments within the area in order to reduce congestion along these routes into Wolvercote roundabouts. |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert           | Davies    | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace  | 4            |                         | 177           | It is particularly important that new homes are well connected to Oxford and supported by any necessary infrastructure. These sites would be located in close proximity to Oxford and connected to it via cycle super routes (Oxford Transport Strategy), premium bus routes, Oxford Parkway and Park and Ride. An essential infrastructure for new housing would be the use of A44, A40 corridor and the new link between A44 and A40 that could be funded by other developments within the area in order to reduce congestion along these routes into Wolvercote roundabouts. |
| PR-B-1147 | Joan             | Tossell   |   | 4            |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 north of The Moors is a category 2 flood risk area and even if drainage is addressed the problem will only move down stream towards Kennington. Insurance premiums on houses will increase. This is an area of beauty enjoyed by walkers with views of open countryside and the conservation area of the village. This rep provides a detailed account and description of the area from the Ministry of the Environment Inspector and CDC's Kidlington Framework Master plan as to why it should be protected.  |
| PR-B-1148 | Terry            | Tossell   |   | 4            |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 north of The Moors is a category 2 flood risk area and even if drainage is addressed the problem will only move down stream towards Kennington. Insurance premiums on houses will increase. This is an area of beauty enjoyed by walkers with views of open countryside and the conservation area of the village. This rep provides a detailed account and description of the area from the Ministry of the Environment Inspector and CDC's Kidlington Framework Master plan as to why it should be protected.  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg             | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 4            |                         | PR22, PR25    | The draft vision expects exemplar design for housing to be delivered to assist Cherwell in meeting the housing needs of Oxford. The rep continues by outlining in some detail how the development of sites PR22 and PR25 will comply with this draft vision.  |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor    |   | 4            |                         | PR38, PR50    | No. don't believe Oxford's housing needs have been correctly assessed. They have been over-estimated on the basis of exaggerated forecasts of employment growth. Employment growth and housing should be encouraged away from Oxford. Building houses on sites PR38 and PR50, provides commuter housing.  |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward           | Dowler    | Middle Aston Parish Meeting   | 4            |                         |               | Yes, support, no changes required   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry            | Munday    |   | 4            |                         |               | If Cherwell does have to build, roads and railways need to be adequate, GB should be avoided and flats opposed to houses should be considered.  |
| PR-B-0039 | Susan            | Cooper    |   | 4            |                         |               | Yes, support it.  |
| PR-B-0041 | David            | Pratt     |   | 4            |                         |               | Wish to encourage anything that is adjacent to Oxford city in the first instance.   |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia          | Hall      |   | 4            |                         |               | No, the government's projected figures are unsupported by evidence. The unused houses should be used first.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew          | Taylor    | Aitchison Rafferty  | 4            |                         |               | In principle, yes. But also worth encouraging sustainable forms of transport from satellite towns rather than focussing on the direct connections from communities in to Oxford. The overriding objective should be to alleviate the wider traffic congestion Oxford suffers, whilst delivering housing growth. Site WG019 is within commutable distance of Bicester and its wider rail connections. It is also positioned off the proposed 'Park and Ride' premium bus service route between Bicester and Oxford City Centre.  |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony          | Hall      |   | 4            |                         |               | In principle yes.   |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue              | Mackrell  | Bicester Town Council   | 4            |                         |               | Agree, but consider that implementation is the issue.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A              | McCall    |   | 4            |                         |               | What can residents do in such a tight timescale? My primary concern is the threat to the GB.  |
| PR-B-0120 | E                | Tonkin    |   | 4            |                         |               | Further evaluation needed.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0153 | Paul                | Goulding QC |   | 4            |                         |               | Would like to see changes that preserve the traditional and peaceful character of village life, and foster the rural nature of the area surrounding Oxford. To maintain the countryside as a haven from the city and maintain the GB.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val                 | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                  | 4            |                         |               | Over 10,000 dwellings are allocated to Bicester in the adopted Local Plan. Bicester is already linked in part to Oxford and each serves its other needs in various ways. Support for the approach in the Partial Review to look throughout the district to accommodate the additional housing needs. There may otherwise be an imbalance of growth towards the south of the district placing pressure on infrastructure and services.   |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin               | Carrit      |   | 4            |                         |               | Yes, fully support the vision statement.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth       |   | 4            |                         |               | Mostly agreeable, however there are other land opportunities that could be considered which provide less than 100 houses. If other pieces of land were said to be suitable, some would become available due to the increase in land value.  |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                | Walker      | Oxford Bus Company                                      | 4            |                         |               | Suggests that in addition to promoting development on the urban edge of Oxford appropriate focus should also be given to smaller settlements. Many of these already benefit from the same regular bus services that link the larger towns. Consider that a commercially viable bus service is a good alternative to reliance on car travel. This is ever more important now that CDC has decided that no social needs are sufficiently great to warrant budgeting for financial support for bus services - all have to be sustained essentially through sufficient numbers of fare paying passengers.   |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings    |   | 4            |                         |               | Supportive of some aspects but would like to see amendments that support and compliment the city's world class economy, universities and outstanding environment. The vision should be clear that it aims to support existing local employment base opposed to encouraging further growth of Oxford by providing commuter housing for London workers.   |
| PR-B-0260 | Chris               | Pack        |   | 4            |                         |               | No because the housing need is exaggerated and lacks credible evidence. The housing figure is unrealistic and unsustainable and the infrastructure required would damage the countryside.   |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole              | Pack        |   | 4            |                         |               | No, the housing need is exaggerated and there is no evidence to support this amount.  |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright  |   | 4            |                         |               | No, it would be irresponsible to increase the population without the necessary infrastructure in place. Health services and schools would reach breaking point and traffic congestion increased.  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield    |   | 4            |                         |               | No, the vision is based on faulty premises, there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building on GB.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen       |   | 4            |                         |               | No, the vision statement needs to recognise that Oxford is not the only focus within Oxfordshire. There is a need to provide new balanced communities that are well connected to Oxford and other economic centres within Oxfordshire. They need to be of exemplary design, supported by the necessary infrastructure. Provide a range of household types that reflect Oxford's and Oxfordshire's diverse needs but not at the expense of the wildlife habitats and existing communities. Support our world class economy and ensure people have convenient, affordable and sustainable travel opportunities for work, recreation and services. |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber      |   | 4            |                         |               | This rep objects to the wording used in the draft vision. It doesn't reflect the need for there to be balanced communities connected to each other as well as Oxford. That Cherwell has its own attributes and its communities need to develop their own identities.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley     |   | 4            |                         |               | Additional unused industrial sites should be used.  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley     |   | 4            |                         |               | Yes, but unused industrial areas should be used first.  |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan               | Oldfield    |   | 4            |                         |               | No, it should be scrapped.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw     | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw | 4            |                         |               | Whilst disagreeing with the number of houses proposed to be located in Cherwell, broadly agree with the Council's redrafting of Oxford City Council's original vision.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname             | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small               | Stagecoach   | 4            |                         |               | Strongly and unequivocally supports the Vision. It may be worthwhile to refer to active and healthy lifestyle objectives. Use of sustainable travel modes makes a very important contribution to an active lifestyle.   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn     | Phillips            |  | 4            |                         |               | There is no doubt that Cherwell can accommodate this level of housing, but there are two questions that have to be asked. Why and where. Kidlington is either a suburb or a separate conurbation, building needs to be for the right reasons.   |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony    | Matthews            | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 4            |                         |               | Generally support the draft vision  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA         | Humphreys           | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 4            |                         |               | Have grave doubts that such as vision is achievable. In particular, the existing infrastructure, in terms of the local road network and provision for schools, healthcare and other essential services, is already under severe pressure.   |
| PR-B-0731 | Ioana      | Davies              |  | 4            |                         |               | No, do not support the draft version. Cherwell has a clear relationship with Oxford, but focusing on development to the North of Oxford will cause major problems. Already congested roads taking an hour to travel 5 miles into the city centre. The potential rapid transit illustration would not be built or approved in time to meet the need for those living in the North.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John       | Tremlett            |  | 4            |                         |               | Yes. support every word.  |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian     | Scargill            | Oxford Green Belt Network  | 4            |                         |               | Objects to this vision because Oxford's needs have not been correctly assessed and based on highly exaggerated forecasts of future employment growth. The approach to encourage growth away from Oxford should continue. Oxford City could make a contribution to the strategy and it could use some of the land it has currently allocated for employment, together with other previously developed land, for well planned high density housing.   |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian     | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories   | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the draft vision as development in Steeple Aston for people who work in Oxford is not sustainable development.   |
| PR-B-0747 | George A   | Doucas              |  | 4            |                         |               | No objection to the vision but it is the implementation that is the issue. Reasonable for CDC to support the University but there needs to be a clear limit to the University expansion. Unfair for the rest of the country to suffer with huge bites of the GB being destroyed, and this GB is a significant factor to living in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin     | Palmer              |  | 4            |                         |               | Some areas East near Webbs Way are important as they are flood plain that are vital now and to the future. The land acts as a healthy break between the A34 and where people live.  |
| PR-B-0765 | Layla      | Vidal-Martin        | NLP Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Taylor Wimpey      | 4            |                         |               | Broadly supported subject to the requirement for new communities to be 'well connected to Oxford' not being interpreted as precluding other opportunities resulting in sustainable development.   |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve      | Pickles             | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 4            |                         |               | Yes. It is considered to give a balanced overarching vision and is therefore strongly supported.  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane       | Olds                | Caversfield Parish Council   | 4            |                         |               | Acceptable  |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip     | Morley              | North Oxford Golf Club   | 4            |                         |               | The draft vision is a clear one for Oxford City. It emphasises the need for "balanced communities" and for "recreation", as well as other factors. Although the Green Belt is not explicitly mentioned in the draft vision, it would be an important part of the "balance". At NOGC we do our best to promote a friendly, accessible and professional image of a community golf club that is closely associated with the attractions of Oxford and so would regard ourselves as an important part of the "recreation" in the draft Vision as it extends to Cherwell District. |
| PR-B-0796 | David      | Tighe               |  | 4            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive      | Booth               | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                                  | 4            |                         |               | Support the draft vision for meeting Oxford's unmet needs in Cherwell   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian        | Sheppard            |  | 4            |                         |               | No, do not support the draft vision and changes are required.   |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris      | Robbins             |  | 4            |                         |               | In principle yes. A new balanced community might also encompass the possibility of a garden village type development similar to that proposed as Eynsham, perhaps located just outside the GB.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0819 | Tim        | Green     | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association                                 | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the draft vision because it is based on Oxford's housing 'needs' which have been exaggerated. Further employment growth and housing should be encouraged away from Oxford and the Green Belt.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam       | Ryder     | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 4            |                         |               | Gladman supports the draft vision in principle. There must be a clear decision making process within the SA to outline why certain sites will have been identified to contribute towards meeting Oxford City's unmet needs, and why other sites have been discounted.  |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon      | Joyce     | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire                            | 4            |                         |               | Yes, support the draft vision and do not consider that any changes are required. Client's site would fulfil the aspirations of the draft vision.   |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel      | Buttler   |  | 4            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha    | Eliot     | Oxford Preservation Trust  | 4            |                         |               | Consider that the draft vision lies at the heart of the consultation as the question is how many houses could be provided in the exemplary new balanced communities with the necessary infrastructure etc. that is described in Cherwell District Council's 'vision'. It is not enough just to provide housing numbers; Cherwell District Council must provide places which have people's health and well-being at their heart. OPT cannot support developing in a way that might create problems for the future and sees this as paramount in terms of the 'vision'.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard    | Hills     |  | 4            |                         |               | Support any plans for additional housing and infrastructure, including this one.   |
| PR-B-0837 | David      | Jackson   | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 4            |                         |               | The draft vision is supported in that it includes the key points of providing housing that is well related to Oxford City to serve its economy and which is in a sustainable location with good infrastructure links including transport.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike       | Gilbert   | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 4            |                         |               | Yes, with a suggested change to include '...and protect the identity and character of individual settlements.....'   |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren     | Bell      | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd              | 4            |                         |               | The draft vision should have a stronger emphasis on delivering the new housing to meet Oxford's needs. 'Ensuring new housing is delivered to provide balanced communities...' should be added at the beginning.  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard    | Cutler    | Bloombridge LLP  | 4            |                         |               | This is a detailed and lengthy response. Five points are suggested to be added to para 5.7. These mean that the Vision needs to change, to include references to deliverability, the integrity of the GB and the regeneration of Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David      | Smith     |  | 4            |                         |               | No. For "Oxford's diverse needs" substitute "Oxfordshire's diverse needs".   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim        | Perkins   | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC                   | 4            |                         |               | The draft vision should make reference to existing communities and the environment. Rewording is suggested. To achieve balanced communities, the needs of the existing villages, and their villagers, needs to be taken in to account. Local services are already under strain and cannot just deliver extra capacity for more inhabitants. The draft vision should recognise that meeting Oxford's needs must take account of the impact on the environment and local communities including: safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; loss of access to open countryside for the urban population; removing opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation near urban areas e.g. building on the North Oxford Golf Course; removing valuable agricultural land; and adding to parking problems and travel congestion, rather than providing sustainable travel opportunities for the existing and new villagers. |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter      | Nicholson |  | 4            |                         |               | Agrees with the Draft Vision except for the intention to build new accommodation in Cherwell. Has provided a more detailed statement in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt       | Todd      |  | 4            |                         |               | No. Too much focus on Oxford. Bicester has rail links and access to the M40. London commuters already in Oxford putting pressure onto housing, both availability and financial, without contributing necessarily to the city.  |
| PR-B-0871 | Patricia   | Redpath   |  | 4            |                         |               | Yes. Changes are required to the draft version. CDC appears to make no assessment of impacts of developing sites when combined with the proposed neighbouring authorities. Areas A and B intertwined with Oxford City and West Oxfordshire, the boundary of WO straddles the main A4260 and A44 routes, proposals can not be viewed in isolation. Numbers are supposedly to meet the housing need. Considered sites should be for housing, submissions for additional employment generation need to be discounted.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation                         | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin   | Oxfordshire County Council           | 4            |                         |               | Supports the draft vision - more detailed comment is provided in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds     | Wendlebury Parish Council            | 4            |                         |               | The Parish considers that this is not appropriate for Cherwell. Cherwell should be saying "lets develop the science parks here, create a high level high tech jobs to prevent the daily migration to Oxford and London".<br>Oxford- Cambridge technology corridor provides the opportunity.   |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia                  | Trowles  |                                      | 4            |                         |               | Do not support Oxford City's proposal that new communities should "form part of Oxford". This leads to development in the GB to which is strongly objected to. Rapid development in telecommunications will reduced the need to travel to work or study over the planning periods to 2031.  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter                  | Trowles  |                                      | 4            |                         |               | Do not support Oxford City's proposal that new communities should "form part of Oxford". This leads to development in the GB to which is strongly objected to. Rapid development in telecommunications will reduced the need to travel to work or study over the planning periods to 2031.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley  |                                      | 4            |                         |               | Changes are required, it's too vague on the provision of infrastructure and the protection of quality of life for current residents. This rep. provides suggestions to changing words on line four and replacing words on line ten of the draft vision.   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun                | Breith   | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust | 4            |                         |               | Support the draft vision. They consider that the its does not mention protection and enhancement of the natural environment. Ssuggest the following alteration (underlined) to the vision: To provide new balanced sustainable communities that are well connected to Oxford, are of exemplar design and are supported by necessary infrastructure; that provide for a range of household types and incomes reflecting Oxford's diverse needs; that support the city's world-class economy and universities, that support its local employment base; that conserve and enhance Oxford's and the District's natural environment; and ensure that people have convenient, affordable and sustainable travel opportunities to the city's places of work, study and recreation and to its services and facilities. Natural environment' |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks    |                                      | 4            |                         |               | In part yes, but not at the expense of the GB or loss of identity to surrounding villages. The statement needs to acknowledge those living and working in Cherwell and not just the needs of Oxford. There is little detail on how transport issues could be resolved and accommodate developments such as the Northern Gateway. Further housing at Bicester with its greatly improved transport links to Oxford should be considered before GB is lost.  |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |                                      | 4            |                         |               | Support the draft vision but urge the Council to prioritise the list with particular attention to. Sustaining present GB south of P and R at Oxford Parkway preventing urban sprawl. Minimising the need for use of private cars and congestion. Creating homes near to employment areas such as Langford Lane.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |                                      | 4            |                         |               | No do not support the draft vision. It does not place sufficient emphasis on Oxford upgrading it transport infrastructure as part of the vision.  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council               | 4            |                         |               | Supports the Draft Vision Statement. The final statement needs to be clearer on the housing type, e.g. suggest higher rented/shared ownership than presently in Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar   |                                      | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the plan in its current form. Not demonstrated sustainable travel opportunities for the proposed sites. Where are the plans for public transport, footpaths and cycle routes. This is crucial to reduce the pressure on the roads, the plans as they are only increase the pressure on local roads.  |
| PR-B-0912 | David                  | Mason    |                                      | 4            |                         |               | No comments   |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire                     | 4            |                         |               | Do not agree with the draft vision because of the underlying disagreement with the premise on which this question is founded, The draft vision surprisingly mentions nothing about preserving Oxford's unique natural setting, its heritage and preserving the environment which draws hundreds of thousands of people to visit each year. In this regard it is at odds with the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report. The business generated from visitors is something that benefits the people of Oxford and its surroundings - jobs, business rates etc.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux   | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 4            |                         |               | Support is given to the Draft Vision. Shipton Quarry will be capable of providing a new, balanced community, well connected to Oxford via existing and new transport routes.   |
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric    | Sidebottom |  | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the draft version.  |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie      | Lodwick    |  | 4            |                         |               | Objects to the Vision, predicted as it is on an exaggerated level of Oxford's unmet needs and it would change the character of their thriving and well linked communities. Not clear what the vision means. The range of household types in any future development should reflect the current socio-economic profile of Kidlington/Yarnton/Begbroke, not Oxford. Suggests that the Vision should provide "communities" .... "of exemplar design". Asks whether it is exemplar communities or physical design of buildings and places. If it is the latter, strongly agrees, however questions when and how this will happen. Suggests Co-op in Kidlington centre as a great example for a veritable carbuncle if ever there was one. |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds       | Fringford Parish Council   | 4            |                         |               | Acceptable   |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter      | Bateman    | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                             | 4            |                         |               | It is not considered sustainable development to simply locate new development as close to Oxford as possible as this will simply result in everyone commuting in to the City via the existing routes which are perceived to be at or near capacity. A better option is a dispersal strategy which will ease the bottle neck. It is not considered sound for housing growth to occur without proportionate employment and economic development occurring in parallel. Thus the OGB should be distributing employment sites as well as considering locations other than Oxford to reduce the need for commuting to the City.   |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle      | Greenlight Developments  | 4            |                         |               | It is important to have in mind the vision for Cherwell set out in Para A.8 of the adopted Local Plan. The nine bullet points in the adopted vision equally apply to the Partial Review.   |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone      |  | 4            |                         |               | YES changes are required and very necessary, see previous comments above. Do not build on GB around Kidlington and North Oxford. Do not support the draft vision. Economic figures do not provide cohesive communities and the present vision will not achieve the objectives desired. It will illegally destroy GB and damage the open setting of Cutteslowe Park. The number of houses suggested for Kidlington and North Oxford are unsustainable, the existing services and roads will not cope.   |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk       | Banbury Civic Society  | 4            |                         |               | The 'Draft Vision' is broadly supported within the constraints of the comment above, but previous experience indicates that, to succeed, such new communities must have access to, or facilities provided that will allow cultural, community, health and education activities to flourish. These aspects should be specified in the 'Vision'.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia    | Banbury Town Council   | 4            |                         |               | Supports the Draft Vision. It suggest that areas with immediate connectivity to Oxford should be explores as opposed to dormitory towns for Oxford. Support review of the Green Belt for outward expansion of Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small      | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 4            |                         |               | Objects to the draft vision. They consider that the Vision should include "that conserve or enhance the historic environment and heritage assets therein".   |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson  |  | 4            |                         |               | No, do not support building houses in Cherwell's GB for Oxford City. Economic and population growth should be restricted to levels which can be met from existing housing capacity, the re-use of brownfield sites and land destined for employment use within Oxford. It is not desirable for a city to grow to unsustainable proportions. Concerned over the vague wording in the Draft Vision to provide "necessary infrastructure".  |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle  | Land and Partners Ltd  | 4            |                         |               | The vision to contribute to Oxford's unmet need though new communities is unduly restrictive. It is an opportunity to maintain the vitality of rural settlements which could benefit from housing growth. A criteria based policy would ensure that sustainable development comes forward in the right places in an appropriate form. Also it would give greater flexibility to deliver any increase in housing requirement.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett       |                                   | 4            |                         |               | From my responses to Qs. 1 to 3 above it is clear that I regard the draft vision as unrealistic. An increase in the friction between the local authorities in the county seems inevitable.  |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter      | Collins       | Islip Parish Council              | 4            |                         |               | Supports the vision with a caveat that such developments must not be allowed to compromise the convenient, affordable and sustainable transport opportunities to the city's places of work, study and recreation and to its services and facilities, of the existing communities.   |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner        | Launton Parish Council            | 4            |                         |               | No. It should consider areas outside Oxfordshire with good transport links.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council        | 4            |                         |               | Supports CDC in its draft vision, but stresses that selecting sites adjacent to or near Oxford is essential.  |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher       | Rosconn Group                     | 4            |                         |               | Have raised a number a concerns regarding the draft vision. Reference is made to creating new balanced communities, suggesting that the preferred option for accommodating Oxford's unmet needs has already been decided through new freestanding settlements and/or urban extensions to existing settlements which are well-connected by public transport to Oxford. Some settlements are capable of taking additional growth having the benefit of a good range of existing services and facilities which where necessary can be enhanced/improved through developer contributions and which are therefore able to deliver housing quickly in order to meet an immediate need during the Plan period. Reference is also made to such new communities having access via sustainable transport options to the city's places of work, study and recreation, and its services and facilities. This appears to suggest that new housing within Cherwell will only be required to be accessible to Oxford's recreational opportunities and its services and facilities. In reality, residents of such housing are more or equally likely to want to have access to day to day services and facilities close to their home as opposed to their place of work or study. There therefore needs to be recognition that new housing within Cherwell should have convenient access to local services and facilities to ensure new sustainable communities are achieved, including locations such as existing settlements that are well-connected by public transport to Oxford. |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd | 4            |                         |               | Support the draft vision but emphasise that the important point for the spatial strategy is the quality of the connections to Oxford and the main centres of employment related to the City's economy. The Vision will fail if the Council simply selects locations that abut or are physically close to the City.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd          | 4            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                                   | 4            |                         |               | Disagrees, and considers that the draft vision should be reworded <i>'To provide new and extended existing communities that are of exemplar design and achieve high levels of sustainability based on the range of services and infrastructure available within Oxford and the Kidlington Housing Market Area, preserve the purposes of the Green Belt; that provide for a range of housing types and incomes reflecting Oxford and the Kidlington Housing Market Area's diverse needs; that support the city and neighbouring communities' economy and universities, that support the employment base within Oxford and the Kidlington Housing Market Area; and ensure that people have convenient, affordable and sustainable travel opportunities to Oxford and Cherwell District's places of work within the Kidlington Housing Market Area, major employment areas within and outside the city, study and recreation, and to Oxford and Cherwell's services and facilities. '</i> Suggests that this revision would recognise that people from Oxford work in Cherwell area and vice-versa. Also discusses the Kidlington Housing Market Area, which is the designation that includes Kidlington, Yarnton and settlements that share land values and characteristic of Oxford's housing market area, which are set out in Cherwell's own housing needs and viability assessment studies (2010, updated 2013) (SHLAA 2013?).  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1027 | Jonathan         | Porter     | Archstone Projects Ltd  | 4            |                         |               | The draft Vision refers to creating new communities and seems unduly skewed towards a vision for large strategic garden village type developments.  |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan         | Harbottle  | Land and Partners Ltd   | 4            |                         |               | The vision to contribute to Oxford's unmet need through new communities is unduly restrictive. A criteria based policy would ensure that sustainable development comes forward in the right places in an appropriate form. There are also indications from Oxford City that the unmet need could be 22,000 rather than 15,000. Criteria based policy would give greater flexibility to deliver any increase in housing requirement, and would be in the spirit of the NPPF.   |
| PR-B-1032 | David            | Burson     | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 4            |                         |               | The proposed vision is supported. It is considered fundamental that the proposed housing has a direct connection with Oxford both geographically and with the knowledge based economy which radiates from the City.   |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert           | Davies     | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford              | 4            |                         |               | The draft vision is currently not explicit spatially and is too heavily focussed upon "new" balanced communities. Whilst it is recognised that it is at an early stage, it is considered that "new" balanced communities may be required to accommodate Oxford's unmet needs, the balanced and sustainable expansion of the existing settlements in close proximity to Oxford will also be required. Suggest that the vision is amended to take account of this, as at present there is no mention of the balanced expansion of existing settlements in order to meet Oxford's unmet needs. |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice            | Suttie     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 4            |                         |               | This partial Review is intended as an Addendum to the already adopted Local Plan. It can only be considered an Addendum if the vision and spatial strategy of the adopted plan is continued here. The focus for the bulk of the development should be in and around Bicester (as well as Banbury).  |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret     | Sidebottom |   | 4            |                         |               | No do not support the draft version.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri     | Dyson      |   | 4            |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land, be affordable and house the current population first.   |
| PR-B-1069 | JP               | Lyes       |   | 4            |                         |               | No. This vision is just motherhood and apple pie. It needs to get real and be specific about preserving the identity and context of Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F         | Hickman    | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 4            |                         |               | This is the City's vision. Do not concede to meet their need; therefore there is no need for a vision. However, ultimately if it is conceded that Cherwell must meet part of City's need then it is suitable.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val              | Russell    | Bodicote Parish Council   | 4            |                         |               | Agrees on this vision.  |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan             | Storah     | Oxford City Council   | 4            |                         |               | Supports Cherwell's draft vision and it reflects the fact that the spatial relationship of new development to Oxford is vitally important.  |
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate   | Hamilton   |   | 4            |                         |               | Fully support the CDC aspiration for exemplar design, supported by necessary infrastructure, vigorously maintained and observed. There is no indication as to where essential infrastructure, schools, medical centres, shops might go in Kidlington. There is a natural anxiety about this as there are signs of failure to deliver a school and road at Bicester.   |
| PR-B-1104 | Lawrence Michael | Colvin     |   | 4            |                         |               | Not if it means doubling the size of Kidlington, which is already a balanced community with a cohesive social fabric. Adding 4,400 homes over a short period of time doesn't allow for social adjustment and increases pressure on traffic and schools already with difficulties. .   |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom              | Hockaday   |   | 4            |                         |               | The draft vision refers to developments in areas that are 'well connected to Oxford'. The key is physical proximity to Oxford. Banbury is not well connected as roads are congested, bus service poor and trains infrequent.  |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith            | Johnston   |   | 4            |                         |               | No. Not whilst the 'vision' is no clearer than accommodating an unsubstantiated need.   |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson    |   | 4            |                         |               | Do not support this vision, it is too high and relies too heavily on removing GB.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1111 | Pat              | Clissold   |   | 4            |                         |               | Oxford is unique in its history, architecture and universities. Priority must be given to providing housing for University staff, research staff, and conservationists of the fabric of Oxford's iconic buildings, the tourist trade (hotels, restaurants, museums etc.). Other forms of employment except for the motor industry at Cowley should be put on hold until Cherwell has sorted out its own plans  |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie            | Lewis      | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate | 4            |                         |               | As detailed in our response to Q2, the pressures on existing settlements and growth points should be examined, having key regard to the need to expand smaller settlements. Delivering sustainable development should be key for the vision document, not just the provision of housing within the district which supports the growth of the city.   |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward       | Kidlington Development Watch                          | 4            |                         |               | Objects to the draft Vision for reasons provided in questions 1, 2 and 3   |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip           | Towler     |   | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the draft vision as it makes no reference to the natural environment which attracts people to the area. The GB is a key part of the environment and must be respected   |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine        | Richenburg |   | 4            |                         |               | No, Oxford should not expand if it does not have the space. Research and innovation hubs should be developed elsewhere in England where jobs are needed, housing is cheap and there are excellent universities i.e. Durham and Newcastle. This is the approach by the CPRE in seeking to protect the historic city of Oxford from overdevelopment.   |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan             | Lodwick    |   | 4            |                         |               | No. Do not agree that Cherwell should subscribe to this vision because disagree with the assumption that Cherwell has to meet Oxford's needs as these have been incorrectly assessed by the SHMA.  |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard          | Bennett    |   | 4            |                         |               | Yes changes are required. Road, traffic, schools, social services, doctors, utilities and other infrastructures need to be in place before development.  |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French     | Deddington Development Watch                          | 4            |                         |               | Agrees with the draft vision, but consider that it needs amending to mention the protection and enhancement of the natural environment for future generations, including the Oxford Green Belt.  |
| PR-B-1147 | Joan             | Tossell    |   | 4            |                         |               | No for the reason given above and building on GB is unacceptable. The governments manifesto, the newly adopted Kidlington Framework Master plan agreed by CDC and the NPPF protect the GB. Oxford city is not willing to part with its own GB, so neither should we.   |
| PR-B-1148 | Terry            | Tossell    |   | 4            |                         |               | No for the reason given above and building on GB is unacceptable. The government's manifesto, the newly adopted Kidlington Framework Master plan agreed by CDC and the NPPF protect the GB. Oxford city is not willing to part with its own GB, so neither should we.  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer    |   | 4            |                         |               | Yes, whole heartedly   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright     | Begbroke Parish Council                               | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the draft vision and it is not exceptional case for the release of land next to Oxford in the Green Belt. Residents of villages affected will have their convenience affected and these properties will certainly not be balanced or affordable.  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis      |   | 4            |                         |               | The review of Cherwell's own plan has been imposed on it by the Growth Board and so does not accurately represent the situation. The vision should make it clear that GB will not be available for development and should encourage Oxford City to find its own housing provision for its own workers and to meet actual, evidence-based requirements not assumptions of future employment creation. It needs also to mention the need to preserve Oxford's own unique natural setting, its history and everything that makes it an attractive place to visit as expressed in objective 1 of the NPPF. Allowing Oxford to sprawl will destroy the historic character also as expressed in objective 4 of the NPPF. |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy    | Hornton Parish Council                                | 4            |                         |               | No and Yes   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine  | Arakelian |   | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the "draft vision". The statement does not qualify for a "vision". It is a quagmire of undefined jargon. In its disregard of the local people in Kidlington and District, it is the equivalent of a diktat. It has no merit and pays lip service to developer greed and pusillanimous politicians. The proposed Review does not provide "new balanced communities" and says little about "necessary infrastructure". The city's "world-class economy" is built on the backs of the workers unable to buy, and whose children cannot rent. It is a city which reflects the inequality of our age. There is little that is "convenient, affordable and sustainable" in the travel opportunities on offer. A vision for the city's future would need to include imagination and accountability – both lacking in this "vision" |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline   | Johnson   |   | 4            |                         |               | No, consider it to be based on subjective data and Cherwell should not adopt the vision. Oxford's needs have not been correctly assessed and are based on exaggerated forecasts of employment growth. At the consultation meeting the CDC's officers said they could not enforce mixed housing types. The vision should be to provide employment in the county to the benefit of its economy rather than Oxford city's.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi       | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 4            |                         |               | Support the draft vision.  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis      | Davies    |   | 4            |                         |               | No. Not at the expense of the GB. Poor bus services that fail to provide the needs of the communities and contribute to more use of cars and hence greater traffic volumes.  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi      | Lancaster |   | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the draft vision as it is built on flawed logic. If Cherwell is forced to meet some of Oxford's housing need, Kidlington should not bear the brunt of development. There are good transport links into Oxford from Banbury and Bicester. In rush hour, a bus journey from Kidlington to the city centre can take 45 minutes or more. Someone can travel from Banbury on the train in less than that time.   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol      | Matheson  |   | 4            |                         |               | In order to achieve balanced communities you need to take into account their needs. Amenities such as schools and doctors are already strained in Kidlington, Water Eaton and Gosford. There is traffic congestion and parking problems in Kidlington which would increase with 4,400 additional cars. Consideration needs to be given to losing agricultural land to housing when food production should be important.  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council  | 4            |                         |               | Supports CDC's draft vision and the preference for areas A and B and in case of further pressure Areas C to H. Area I is not considered sustainable.   |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt      | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 4            |                         |               | yes  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 4            |                         |               | Yes. It is in the best interests of both Kidlington and Oxford to focus spatial solutions in and around North Oxford. The concentration of development in this area will support greater infrastructure and service provision, reducing pressure on existing communities in both North Oxford and Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham  |   | 4            |                         |               | Support, but as these will be in GB the design should achieve high densities that minimise the impact on GB objectives with exemplary environmental standards.   |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green     |   | 4            |                         |               | No do not support this draft vision. The GB between Oxford and Kidlington should be respected and retained. It was put in place to stop the spread of suburbs and areas becoming merged together.  |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark       | Schmull   | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 4            |                         |               | Our client supports this draft vision and considers that their proposals for the land at Islip are deliverable and would meet the aims of this vision.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage    | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 4            |                         |               | Supports the view that any potential release of land from the GB would require site specific investigation and examination, and that as far as possible, sites that come forward are socially and economically linked to Oxford. The Council's preference for Areas A and B is noted. In the event that sites within Areas A and B cannot accommodate all Oxford's needs it is considered that sites within Area H, in the vicinity of Banbury, have the potential to make an important contribution, in keeping with the spirit of the draft vision.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett  | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 4            |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother  | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 4            |                         |               | Yes. The draft vision is supported.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor   |   | 4            |                         |               | This is not a vision it is an imposition. Our village communities have individual and historic antecedence which the proposals will wipe out forever. A huge Oxford urban sprawl would be created which would not agree with any vision that would enhance the city or the countryside. If it is absolutely necessary for housing to be built outside the city, infrastructure needs to be in place first and building on GB a last resort. Moreover, how can this plan be a "vision" if it is based on incomplete work; no proper assessment of demand, no infrastructure plan, no plan for exploiting brownfield sites etc. |
| PR-B-1254 | Philip     | Redpath  |   | 4            |                         |               | The draft Cherwell vision does not take into consideration the effect on communities that abut the North and West. With the combination of West Oxon Local Plan and Cherwell's proposals this will overload the current and any planned infrastructure. There needs to be disregard towards increased economic development. The numbers in themselves have been set specifically to provide for existing additional economic development proposals. We import half of our food and yet continue to build on productive farmland.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard |   | 4            |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola     | Mallows  | Gresswell Environmental Trust   | 4            |                         |               | It is completely inappropriate to even ask this question – since there is absolutely no reason for Cherwell to visualize this level of development. Oxford Growth Board and LEP may wish Oxford to become the central economic hub of England, but the residents do not. Small scale sustainable growth is one thing – but economic conjecture and developmental greed is quite another. Oxford needs to provide for its own housing sites rather than force 'new communities' on to the surrounding GB.  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew     | Gant     | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 4            |                         |               | Agrees with the objective, but not the detail as the range of households, types and incomes for teachers, nurses, young academics, etc. have relatively low incomes, not just social housing/market housing. The plans don't suggest how they will meet that need-in fact they will make it worse by creating more demand for school places, hospital visits, etc. and this must be built into plans now. Do not agree with the statement in a report to Oxford City Council CEB (19/1/2017) that "Didcot and Bicester are considered to be within reasonable commuting distance [to Oxford] for low-waged households"        |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells    | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 4            |                         |               | The Draft Vision is deficient in failing to consider the importance of impacts on existing communities. Suggest an additional phrase: "without unacceptable harm to the character and sustainability of existing communities and protected rural areas".  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling |   | 4            |                         |               | Do not accept Cherwell's draft vision which includes building and decimating on GB around Kidlington. There are no exceptional circumstances to warrant considering using GB. If part of GB has to be considered then there should be a GB "Passage" 200m wide between any present housing area and any other land offered for new development. This is particularly necessary along the West side of the Oxford canal, which would be ideally placed for a park for the Kidlington and Begbroke residents.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 4            |                         |               | LP P1 PR is an addendum to the adopted Cherwell LP. In this regard the spatial strategy for Cherwell is summarised as follows:<br>* Focusing the bulk of the proposed growth in and around Bicester and Banbury,<br>* Limiting growth in our rural areas and directing it towards larger and more sustainable villages.<br>* Aiming to strictly control development in open countryside.'<br>The wording of the draft vision of the LPP1 Addendum is considered to be capable of being compatible with the existing spatial strategy of the already adopted LPP1.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes   | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 4            |                         |               | Support CDC's draft vision  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname  | Organisation                                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1296 | Graciela Inglesias | Rogers   |   | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the draft version with the present wording. Do not deny that more accommodation is required. Object strongly to development in the GB. GB around Kidlington (option A and B) has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. There are credible and effective alternatives to housing development in the GB. Use proposed employment sites. Invest in lower polluting forms of public transport such as trams. Invest on the expansion and improvement of broadband networks. These ideas were undertaken by Strasbourg in 1990's with great success. |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon              | Handy    | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd | 4            |                         |               | Support the draft vision and do not consider that any changes are required. Consider that their client's land PR27 would fulfil the aspirations in the draft vision. These are detailed in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1298 | James              | Jocelyn  |   | 4            |                         |               | No. The Vision as written is redundant as it fails to address the specific nature of Oxford's unmet housing need, that it is overwhelmingly for affordable housing. The SHMA makes it clear that the 'new balanced communities' mentioned in the Vision would be unsustainable given the demographic and economic projections, and even considering 'committed economic growth'. All planning referring to Oxford's unmet need must be clear in that it is addressing a need for affordable housing, not a need for net growth in housing and that it conforms to the sustainability requirements of the NPPF.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel              | McGurk   | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust  | 4            |                         |               | The Vision should ensure that land allocated to meet Oxford's unmet need actually meets Oxford's unmet need. It should therefore emphasise that the land must be located within the A44 Corridor with excellent connectivity to Oxford/scope to continue to enhance such connectivity.   |
| PR-B-1303 | Steve              | Gerrish  |   | 4            |                         |               | This rep makes reference to the summary leaflet page 12 - "To provide new balanced communities ..." This is an opportunity to ensure that the new housing meets the highest environmental standards. Houses built to current Part L1A of the building regulations can be significantly improved upon. There are already example at North west Bicester and Graven Hill. The rep provides specific details of how this could be achieved.   |
| PR-B-1304 | Tim                | Wakeman  |   | 4            |                         |               | Do not support the draft version the vision is too narrow. It does not look at options of money available or address the needs of local people in this instance in Kidlington area.  |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly         | Foster   | Fritwell Parish Council                           | 4            |                         |               | Homes to benefit Oxford should be near to Oxford, not in the wider Cherwell area.  |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank              | Vreede   |   | 4            |                         |               | No. Do not see how building an additional 4400 homes will provide a balanced community anywhere in Cherwell if the houses are to be lived in by people commuting to Oxford. Commuters do not feel part of the community. A vision is needed for reducing Oxford's housing need and moving employment to where people already live.   |
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric             | Rose     |   | 4            |                         |               | Support the draft vision as long as points raised in the previous questions are addressed as the Draft Vision would support many of the residents.   |
| PR-B-1335 | Natalie            | Usher    |   | 4            |                         |               | The "vision" neglects to mention working with Cherwell and City residents, who must be included as active participants. This is a very serious oversight, and the document does not give any details on how local people will be involved beyond the legal consultation processes.   |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura              | Precious | Quod on behalf of Albion Land                     | 4            |                         |               | Supports the draft vision in principle. Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun              | Richards | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd    | 4            |                         |               | Support the draft vision if it includes a range of sites to meet the identified need, which may include modest expansions to existing villages, towns and a new settlement. The terms 'exemplar design' is queried.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle   | Land and Partners Ltd                                   | 4            |                         |               | The vision is unduly restrictive. The unmet need is an opportunity to maintain the vitality of rural settlements which could benefit from housing growth. Criteria based policy would ensure that sustainable development comes forward in the right places in an appropriate form. The apportionment of the unmet need between the districts has not been finalised; with South Oxfordshire disputing its recommended contribution. Furthermore, it has been indicated that the unmet figure could be higher than initially stated. Criteria-based policy would give greater flexibility to deliver any increase in housing requirement, and would be in the spirit of the NPPF and its aim to significantly boost the. supply of housing. |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick       | Alston      | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd | 4            |                         |               | The Vision should make reference to realising potentially significant local (social, economic, and environmental) benefits associated with accommodating a proportion of Oxford's unmet housing needs in the district   |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley       | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group               | 4            |                         |               | State that, 'it is not clear what is meant by balanced communities'. Support the vision and suggest that, if would benefit from being reworded to require that developments are well-designed and responsive to their surroundings.   |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden       | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                | 4            |                         |               | Support the Draft Vision. Launton has a close physical relationship with Bicester, which has good rail links and is therefore well connected to Oxford, meaning that the site at Grange Farm is very well placed to assist in meeting Oxford's unmet needs.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                             | 4            |                         |               | Greater emphasis is required to ensure the additional homes are located within the city boundary or very adjacent to Oxford, and that a much greater priority is given to providing homes for families on the housing register and young people hoping to buy or rent. This implies a need for social housing, since the market will not produce the really low-cost homes that are needed.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler      | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                             | 5            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday      |   | 5            |                         |               | Oxford City built at Kidlington in the 1960's it is unfair they now want the rest of Kidlington and Gosford. We pay Cherwell officers to look after Cherwell not Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0039 | Susan      | Cooper      |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes, support it.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall        |   | 5            |                         |               | No, do not believe that Oxford has an unmet housing need that would not be addressed by the 4,400 empty houses and brownfield development.  |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor      | Aitchison Rafferty                                      | 5            |                         |               | Yes. Co coordinating between the City and County Councils can help unlock development and maximise opportunities. This is relevant to the infrastructure improvements/requirements identified in the Interim Transport Assessment.  |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue        | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                                   | 5            |                         |               | Agrees to the Objective SO16.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A        | McCall      |   | 5            |                         |               | Have the district councils been hi-jacked into this objective?  |
| PR-B-0120 | E          | Tonkin      |   | 5            |                         |               | Why Kidlington and not perhaps Banbury's need for more economic development.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul       | Goulding QC |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes, subject to Cherwell's contribution being proportionate to that of Oxford and other districts. GB being preserved and protected and in keeping with unique character of village life.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val        | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                  | 5            |                         |               | Agree with this objective.  |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin      | Carrit      |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes, fully support the SO16 statement.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter      | Worth       |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes, it has be delivered due to the geographic relationship of Kidlington and Yarnton to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0184 | Roger      | Prince      |   | 5            |                         |               | It is hard to agree with this objective when the starting point is that "Oxford's unmet housing needs" are based on a flawed SHMA. It is not too late to dispute the figures. Co-operation is the only way forward, of course, but working with the City and County Councils should not mean giving in to their demands if the end result reduces the quality of life for many Cherwell residents.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                | Walker     | Oxford Bus Company   | 5            |                         |               | Request that the wording in the policy needs to be clear, it needs to state how three authorities will work together in delivering sustainable solutions of housing in the city. Consider that this policy is fragmented across three authorities. With no single authority responsible or meeting this housing need there is little political imperative to deliver the numbers identified in the way set out in the policy wording.<br>In addition there is a £1.7bn infrastructure investment gap in Oxfordshire and the actual amount needed to support the scale of development predicted up until 2030. Suggest amending the policy wording to outline how the infrastructure and housing can be jointly delivered with key stakeholders during the plan period. The wording as it stands is limited in its ability to deliver. |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings   |  | 5            |                         |               | Supportive of some aspects but would like to see amendments that support and compliment the city's world class economy, universities and outstanding environment. The vision should be clear that it aims to support existing local employment base opposed to encouraging further growth of Oxford by providing commuter housing for London workers. To work with Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council in delivering an appropriate contribution in the Cherwell Area to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs by 2031.   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |  | 5            |                         |               | ?   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield   |  | 5            |                         |               | No, changes are required to preserve the GB, Cherwell should not seek to accept the housing figures from Oxford, they are too high.   |
| PR-B-0641 | J                   | Willoughby |  | 5            |                         |               | No, I have not sufficient knowledge.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen      |  | 5            |                         |               | No, the existing local plan as agreed in 2015 should prevail. Suggest that reference to other district councils is included as it affects everyone not just Oxford and Oxford City.   |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber     |  | 5            |                         |               | Only if Oxford City can fully demonstrate its housing needs and has considered that it may have reached capacity. It may be more sustainable to create growth elsewhere in the region.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley    |  | 5            |                         |               | No, there are not sufficient doctors or emergency services.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley    |  | 5            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan               | Oldfield   |  | 5            |                         |               | No, it should be scrapped.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw    | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 5            |                         |               | The Localism Act 2011 introduced the Duty to Cooperate on strategic priorities with cross-boundary impacts. Such strategic priorities include policies concerning homes and jobs needed in the area. Given this statutory duty not sure why the Council feels it requires a further Strategic Objective. However, rep suggests an amended text.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick                | Small      | Stagecoach   | 5            |                         |               | Strongly supports and welcomes SO16   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn              | Phillips   |  | 5            |                         |               | It seems to be very one sided, it appears that Oxford is the lead agency for Oxfordshire. All of the councils should work together on the decision making it appears that we are being dictated to.   |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony             | Matthews   | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 5            |                         |               | Generally support the draft strategic objective SO16  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                  | Humphreys  | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 5            |                         |               | Have grave doubts that such as vision is achievable. In particular, the existing infrastructure, in terms of the local road network and provision for schools, healthcare and other essential services, is already under severe pressure.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John                | Tremlett   |  | 5            |                         |               | Yes. support SO16 very strongly   |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian              | Scargill   | Oxford Green Belt Network  | 5            |                         |               | Disagree with the basis on which the unmet housing need has been assessed and do not consider that Cherwell should have to meet the level as assessed (4,400). Rather it should work with the City and Council to develop a strategy which disperses realistically assessed growth away from Oxford and its GB. The City Council should itself discourage further employment generating development in Oxford and use some of the land it has currently allocated for employment, together with other previously developed land, for well planned high density housing.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0751 | Dr Katrin        | Kiessling |   | 5            |                         |               | Agree that the council should work together for a co-ordinated approach.  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin           | Palmer    |   | 5            |                         |               | No do not support, unless major infrastructure of transport, traffic, and roads can be achieved before large scale housing is built. Yes changes are required.  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve            | Pickles   | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd   | 5            |                         |               | The objective is supported  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane             | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council  | 5            |                         |               | Support the draft objective.  |
| PR-B-0796 | David            | Tighe     |   | 5            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive            | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group   | 5            |                         |               | Agree, it is in fact a statutory requirement under the Duty of Local Authorities to Cooperate.  |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard  |   | 5            |                         |               | Do not support the draft objectives.  |
| PR-B-0802 | Peter J          | Frampton  | Framptons on behalf of db Symmetry  | 5            |                         |               | Changes are required to ensure that the economic needs of Oxford are properly addressed - through provision of a regional distribution centre to serve manufacturers and the growth in electronic retailing.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris            | Robbins   |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes, it makes sense for local authorities to co-operate.  |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder     | Gladman Developments Ltd  | 5            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor    |   | 5            |                         |               | No. Economic growth can be focussed away from Oxford and its GB. Oxford City should use land that it has allocated for employment to build high-quality high-density housing.   |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce     | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbshire  | 5            |                         |               | Support this strategic objective and do not consider that any changes are required.   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson    |   | 5            |                         |               | SO16 is OK in principle, but.   |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel            | Buttler   |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha          | Eliot     | Oxford Preservation Trust   | 5            |                         |               | Supports SO16 and considers that the delivery of the new balanced communities described at Question 4 but must question whether the allocated housing numbers can be achieved until a proper assessment is made.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard          | Hills     |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes – see above for comments about Oxford's growing population.   |
| PR-B-0837 | David            | Jackson   | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP                                | 5            |                         |               | Draft SO16 is supported. The Partial Review should take in to account the County Council's Oxford Transport Strategy and how this can best be integrated with the bringing forward of strategic sites on the northern edge of Oxford. CDC will also need to work with a number of other key stakeholders, including landowners to ensure that the sites within the locations identified are deliverable. For completeness, it is suggested that the strategic objective should quantify the minimum housing contribution that Cherwell will make to Oxford's unmet need as prescribed by the OGB. |
| PR-B-0838 | David            | Jackson   | Savills on behalf of University of Oxford, Christ Church, Exeter, Magdalen, Merton and St John's Colleges | 5            |                         |               | SO16 is supported. It will be important for the Council to work with Oxford City Council to deliver housing that best meets Oxford's needs. It is also important to work with Oxfordshire County Council on transport matters. Reference is made to the Oxford Transport Strategy (OTS) and specific schemes in it. The Partial Review should take account of this range of transport interventions and how these can best be integrated with bringing forward strategic development sites in the district.   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike             | Gilbert   | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd   | 5            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex             | Wilson    | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd  | 5            |                         |               | SO16 should be amended to state that CDC will work with member districts and Oxford City in delivering Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs by 2031.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard          | Cutler    | Bloombridge LLP   | 5            |                         |               | Support SO16 but suggest that the overall approach could be enhanced by also continuing the Kidlington Master Plan process. The Partial Review deals with Oxford's unmet need, but the spatial consequences unavoidably require Kidlington to be part of the solution, unless it is thought sustainable to avoid Areas of Search A and B.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David            | Smith     |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes but without giving priority to Oxford's needs over any others.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | 5            |                         |               | Whilst the objective can be supported, the PC has major concerns about how the unmet housing need and apportionment has been determined. Suggest rewording 'To work with Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council in delivering Cherwell's appropriate contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs by 2031'.  |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt                   | Todd       |  | 5            |                         |               | No. Do not support. Disagree on how the unmet housing has been assessed, Cherwell should not have to meet the 4,400 requirement. Need to work with the City and County Councils to develop a strategy to realistically assess growth away from Oxford and its GB. City Council needs to discourage further employment generating development in Oxford. Use land currently allocated to employment along with previously developed land for well planned high density housing. |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter                  | Hainsworth |  | 5            |                         |               | No, because it has been inadequately thought through and consultation has been exceptionally poor.   |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council                               | 5            |                         |               | Supports SO16 - more detailed comment is provided in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council                                | 5            |                         |               | Unable to respond - Insufficient time to consider the issues in detail   |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley    |  | 5            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks      |  | 5            |                         |               | Yes, but not at the expense of the GB or loss of identity to surrounding villages. The statement needs to acknowledge those living and working in Cherwell and not just the needs of Oxford. There is little detail on how transport issues could be resolved and accommodate developments such as the Northern Gateway. Further housing at Bicester with its greatly improved transport links to Oxford should be considered before GB is lost.                               |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street     |  | 5            |                         |               | Would support the objective if Cherwell is satisfied that Oxford City has realised the full potential within its own boundaries. Would support it if there can be a proviso clause inserted. The number, density and location needs periodically reviewed to ensure that the need is evident, with particular reference to social infrastructure in Kidlington due to the aging population needs to be taken into consideration.   |
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard       | Miles      |  | 5            |                         |               | How can Cherwell work with Oxford City given that it seems that Oxford is imposing its demands on Cherwell?  |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence   |  | 5            |                         |               | No. It needs to change to include action by Oxford to deal with the completely inadequate transport links to and around the city (NOT more buses).   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss       | Bloxham Parish Council                                   | 5            |                         |               | Suggest that the Strategic Objective should be on sustainable sites rather than increase pressure on surrounding infrastructure  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar     |  | 5            |                         |               | Oxford should look to use all its own land especially brownfield before asking other areas to support their needs. Building in surrounding areas will increase traffic and increase air pollution which is detrimental to the health of the population in Cherwell. Inadequate public transport and to get into Oxford by public transport you have to drive a distance to get onto a bus or train.  |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark                   | Lowen      |  | 5            |                         |               | Agree with draft strategic objective SO16 , however Oxford City needs to cooperate with Cherwell and avoid commercial development within the city boundaries which hampers their ability to build houses. Consideration should be given to using the Northern Gateway for housing and greater commercial development at Begbroke Science Park, Langford Lane and Kidlington Airport to reduce traffic going into Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton     |  | 5            |                         |               | The question presupposes that Cherwell should make a contribution. I don't think it should.  |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew                 | Smith      | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                     | 5            |                         |               | Understand the economic and cultural importance for Oxfordshire, but Kidlington should not be sacrificed for Oxford. Retaining the green gap, recreational value of the Countryside, etc. are important to Kidlington residents. Oxford City's housing strategy should be revisited. Considerations should be given to moving current facilities out of the City, where they can more easily be accommodated in the countryside and free up land for redevelopment.            |
| PR-B-0912 | David                  | Mason      |  | 5            |                         |               | Yes and no.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall   | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 5            |                         |               | Disagree with SO16. Consider that CDC should work with the other Oxfordshire authorities to divert growth away from Oxford and that Oxford City Council should do much more to meet its own genuine needs, for example by not proposing further large-scale employment-generating development, by re-allocating employment sites for housing and by increasing density of development.  |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux   | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 5            |                         |               | The strategic objective is reasonable and does not require changes.   |
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric    | Sidebottom |  | 5            |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie      | Lodwick    |  | 5            |                         |               | Objects to SO16. There is a legal duty for local authorities to cooperate, but Oxford should look within its own boundaries for future development, on brownfield as well as greenfield sites, and by using higher building densities. It should use land for housing, not employment. By allocating land to employment instead of housing within Oxford City, even more "unmet needs" are generated. The Northern Gateway area, and any other areas now zoned for employment, should be rezoned for housing. Promotes new town/settlement concept. |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds       | Fringford Parish Council   | 5            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter      | Bateman    | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                             | 5            |                         |               | Ye, this objective accords with the emphasis of the Framework.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle      | Greenlight Developments  | 5            |                         |               | The OGB apportionments relates to all four of the Oxfordshire districts, therefore they should all be referred to in this objective. This would also be consistent with the requirements of the Duty to Co-Operate.   |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone      |  | 5            |                         |               | Yes, this is rhetorical question? The obligations of Oxford City and Cherwell mean co-operation is necessary and essential. But this should not result in collusion and underhand practice by avoidance in full engagement with residents most affected in North Oxford, Cutteslowe and Kidlington? The needs should not mean that these Councils have right to ride roughshod over the needs and rights of residents or indeed destroy as a consequence existing community cohesion.   |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo   |  | 5            |                         |               | Yes, clearly all the local councils need to work together but very rarely do so for political reasons.  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk       | Banbury Civic Society  | 5            |                         |               | Agree to SO16, but only within the framework outlined above. Transparent, accurate and timely monitoring of relevance of need is essential to ensure that sites are brought forward in good time to meet the required demand.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia    | Banbury Town Council   | 5            |                         |               | Supports Objective SO16, however would also welcome an explicit reference to town and parish councils' roles, in delivering Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs by 2031.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small      | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 5            |                         |               | Supports SO16.  |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle  | Land and Partners Ltd  | 5            |                         |               | Yes, however, the council should also work with neighbouring authorities to help deliver contributions towards Oxford's unmet housing need. It is noted that SODC's contribution has not been agreed and it is unclear how this need will be met.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0984 | Jane         | Burrett       |   | 5            |                         |               | By 2021 there will be another census, understand the assessment of housing need is based in part of the 2011 census. We're in 2017 my comments on Q3, the situation in Oxford City employment may change. The Express Way between Oxford and Cambridge. The outcome of the feasibility study for an additional junction between 8 and 9 on the M40. Changes to employment like at Cowley before the Brexit vote and housing need from the social economic changes in the region which will arise from Brexit., this will take time to become clear. Unclear to educational institutions because of Brexit as immigration decision are yet to be made. 2031 seems unrealistic, interim reviews of targets have to be built into this objective. The birth rate in Bicester is on the raise which will lead to a high demand for local employment and local infrastructure, what serious challenges will they face in 2031. |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter        | Collins       | Islip Parish Council  | 5            |                         |               | Objective SO16 does not make reference to the need to avoid sacrificing the quality of life enjoyed by Cherwell residents and businesses.   |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon        | Turner        | Launton Parish Council  | 5            |                         |               | Yes, no changes required.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth         | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council                                      | 5            |                         |               | Supporting SO16 seems necessary, but hope that CDC will take a robust line.   |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben          | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                               | 5            |                         |               | Support SO16 and our new community at New Alchester will assist in the achievement of this Objective.   |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver       | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 5            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew       | Hornsby-Smith |   | 5            |                         |               | There is a legal duty to collaborate (co-operate), but considers that Oxford City should not predetermine or have a veto on where Cherwell delivers the unmet housing need, nor the weighting of the criteria that go to inform that allocation.  |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan     | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 5            |                         |               | Yes, however the council should also work with neighbouring authorities to help deliver contributions towards Oxford's unmet needs. It is noted that SODC's contribution has not been agreed and it is unclear how this need will be met.   |
| PR-B-1032 | David        | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 5            |                         |               | The suggested cooperation with Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council is welcome. The objective should also include cooperative working with other Oxfordshire district councils, this is particularly important due to the uncertainty surrounding the role of South Oxfordshire in delivering homes required for Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert       | Davies        | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford              | 5            |                         |               | Support Draft Objective SO16 in principle, and consider that it is of critical importance that CDC continues to work with Oxford City and County in delivering Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs by 2031. However, consider that Cherwell should make a firmer commitment to deliver a minimum of 4,400 net additional new homes or more within the Strategic Objective. Provide a more detailed argument in the representation to make a case for Cherwell to provide 5000+ homes.   |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 5            |                         |               | SO16 is supported.  |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret | Sidebottom    |   | 5            |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson         |   | 5            |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land, be affordable and house the current population first.   |
| PR-B-1069 | JP           | Lyes          |   | 5            |                         |               | No. It is not an objective but rather a method. The objective for Kidlington should be about protection of its strengths and attributes as a pleasant place to live and work.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F     | Hickman       | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 5            |                         |               | The wording is satisfactory if Cherwell concedes to City's need under joint working.  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val          | Russell       | Bodicote Parish Council   | 5            |                         |               | Agrees on this vision.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1096 | Greg             | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 5            |                         |               | Draft SO16 is a requirement of NPPF para 178 and is therefore supported. The provision of at least 1,100 new homes on Land NW of Oxford Airport and Land E of Marlborough School will provide for the sustainable development of new homes to support Oxford City's unmet need.  |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan             | Storah    | Oxford City Council   | 5            |                         |               | Supports SO16.   |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom              | Hockaday  |   | 5            |                         |               | It is sensible and reasonable to work together. The change that is required is for Oxford to find ways of allowing development in the GB   |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith            | Johnston  |   | 5            |                         |               | There is an urgent need to explore all options to accommodate Oxford City's housing need within its boundary and thus determine the urban capacity of the city. Oxford City's website states that 52% of Oxford is open space. This should be no more, or less precious than GB surrounding the city which acts as a buffer to prevent over-urbanisation.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson   |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes but Oxford City needs to take a greater role in planning for the growth of the city. Working with existing landowners in the city, identifying brownfield as well as greenfield sites and perhaps considering boosting jobs in surrounding towns rather than in an overcrowded city.   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat              | Clissold  |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes, if the number of houses proposed is reduced and the number of commuters is reduced. If public transport to the hospitals is fast tracked and bus lanes precede any development. Oxford has to find a way to live within its means and avoid growing into a mega city losing its historic attractive character.  |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie            | Lewis     | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                   | 5            |                         |               | The draft objectives are supported, however, the key focus should be to deliver sustainable development across the Cherwell district. As well as responding to the unmet housing need of Oxford, this should ensure that development is brought about in a sustainable manner, supporting the district of Cherwell as a whole.   |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward      | Kidlington Development Watch  | 5            |                         |               | Objects to SO16 for reasons provided in questions 1, 2 and 3   |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip           | Towler    |   | 5            |                         |               | Do not support it in its current form, because Cherwell's contribution has been set too high relative to that apportioned to Oxford City.  |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan             | Lodwick   |   | 5            |                         |               | No. Do not support Strategic Objective SO16 because disagree with the assumption that Cherwell has to meet Oxford's needs as these have been incorrectly assessed by the SHMA.   |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard          | Bennett   |   | 5            |                         |               | Not fully. It needs to include all districts and be joined up with other districts.  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |   | 5            |                         |               | Yes, given the far reaching implications close working between the different authorities is essential  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council   | 5            |                         |               | Do not support this objective. Support the interactive Local Plan adopted in 2015.   |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |   | 5            |                         |               | Have no objection to councils working together as long as the interests of those living in the relevant district are protected and their interests given priority. Strategic Objective SO16 should be subject to a review in five years when there is a clearer view of actual employment growth, especially following Brexit. It should also prioritise brownfield development and CDC should do its utmost to uphold GB policy. Cherwell and other district councils should divert employment growth away from Oxford and that Oxford City should use land for current housing needs rather than employment. |
| PR-B-1158 | Elizabeth        | Leckie    |   | 5            |                         |               | Cherwell, not Oxford, should decide where Cherwell's apportionment is to be sited. There is a significant conflict of interests: Oxford city, in insisting on putting the vast majority of its own 'unmet housing needs' outside the city, is prioritizing its own desire for growth and prestige developments over both the quality of life and wellbeing of the residents of Gosford and Kidlington. The GB benefits the residents of Oxford as well.  |
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin           | Leckie    |   | 5            |                         |               | Cherwell, not Oxford, should decide where Cherwell's apportionment is to be sited. There is a significant conflict of interests: Oxford city, in insisting on putting the vast majority of its own 'unmet housing needs' outside the city, is prioritizing its own desire for growth and prestige developments over both the quality of life and wellbeing of the residents of Gosford and Kidlington. The GB benefits the residents of Oxford as well.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1162 | Roger      | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council                                | 5            |                         |               | No and Yes. Oxford has to meet its own needs and allotted targets.   |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine  | Arakelian |   | 5            |                         |               | No. Cherwell should act as a critical friend to its neighbouring councils and challenge them to recognise that these would be the wrong houses in the wrong place, for the wrong people at the wrong price. I understand that Oxford desperately needs housing for its key workers young people, but estate agents and developers view Oxfordshire countryside as prime land for large gated communities. This "vision" is without any genuine attempt to protect the homes for the people who need them. An allocation of 90% of these houses to key workers and young people is needed but would be unviable to developers. These premium houses, if built, would contribute to a spiral of rising house prices pushing even more people out of the area, worsening traffic flows, air pollution, and having damaged the countryside irreparably. SO16 will contribute nothing to sustaining the local economy, it is growth without sustainability. |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline   | Johnson   |   | 5            |                         |               | Disagree with the strategic objective SO16. The basis for the unmet housing need is not firmly based. Do not agree that Cherwell should have to meet the unmet "need" for 4,400 houses. Cherwell should work with Oxfordshire and Oxford to develop a coherent strategy to have a sustainable distribution of employment and housing across the county.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi       | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands                              | 5            |                         |               | Support SO16. However, it is vital that all of the OGB authorities work together to ensure that all of Oxford's DC numbers are met and that the 2,750 apportionment to South Oxon does not fail to be provided.  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis      | Davies    |   | 5            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi      | Lancaster |   | 5            |                         |               | No, do not support SO16. Oxford should work harder to meet their own housing needs by building on brownfield sites and limiting business expansion so as to not cause further demand for housing.  |
| PR-B-1182 | Alison     | Noel      |   | 5            |                         |               | No, do not support this objective.   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol      | Matheson  |   | 5            |                         |               | Am in favour of working with Oxford City to meet Oxford's housing needs but it needs to be a genuine requirement based on verified and validated figures. If development goes ahead at North Oxford Golf course the same should happen at South Oxford Golf course.  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council                              | 5            |                         |               | Supports SO16  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt      | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd | 5            |                         |               | No. Changes are required to reflect para B95 of the Local Plan Part 1 (which commits the Council to seeking to address the unmet housing needs arising from elsewhere in the OHMA particularly Oxford City) and para 17 of the Inspector's 9 June 2015 report on the examination into the Local Plan ('Clearly a joint approach involving all the relevant Councils is required on a co-operative basis to fully address the OANs of the whole county as one overall strategic housing market areas.') SO1 should therefore read: 'To work with all the relevant Councils in delivering Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs by 2031'.  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm   | 5            |                         |               | Yes. It is universally accepted amongst Oxfordshire's district councils and Oxfordshire County Council that Oxford cannot fully meet its own housing need, due to the compact nature of the city's urban area and the green belt and environmental constraints which surround the city.  |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard    | Silvester |   | 5            |                         |               | Do not support this – Cherwell, Oxford and the county councils should be developing a joint strategy which disperses realistically assessed growth away from Oxford and its GB.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham  |   | 5            |                         |               | Support. No changes required.  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green     |   | 5            |                         |               | No do not support this. Economic growth should be focussed away from Oxford and its GB. Oxford City should use land that it has allocated for employment to build high-quality high-density housing.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 5            |                         |               | Supports SO16. Do not, however, agree with the conclusion at para 7.21 of the SA in respect of how Area H performs against SO16. Area H is well connected by public transport, with Oxford (18 mins by train). As a major town Banbury is socially and historically linked to Oxford and presents a realistic origin point for commuting to Oxford, for economic and leisure purposes. Directing development towards Area H would likely have a neutral effect on the delivery of SO16. |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 5            |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 5            |                         |               | Yes. Draft SO16 is supported.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 5            |                         |               | Whilst the objective itself can be supported the Parish Council has major concerns about how the unmet housing need and apportionment has been determined. A suggested amendment to the Objective would be: "To work with Oxford City Council and Oxfordshire County Council in delivering Cherwell's appropriate contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs by 2031."  |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 5            |                         |               | Only if it actually means that Councils work collaboratively together and plan the development thoroughly, gradually and carefully. Work should start on brownfield sites and infrastructure should precede the building of houses. Leaving the infrastructure to a random developers' levy is unacceptable.  |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan      | Silvester       |   | 5            |                         |               | Do not support this as Oxford and the county councils should be developing a joint strategy which disperses realistically assessed growth away from Oxford and its GB.  |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip     | Boxall          |   | 5            |                         |               | Some sense of Oxford City Council's reciprocity needs to be added and also a qualifier about sustainability of the planned growth to be supported.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 5            |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola     | Mallows         | Gresswell Environmental Trust   | 5            |                         |               | Does not support SO16. Consider that Cherwell should work with Oxford City Council to keep development away from the Oxford Green Belt. Oxford should build for Oxford, within the city. Oxford does not need to be the economic hub of England. It does not need to further increase its business or commercial development, no increase its student capacity. Oxford needs to build houses to service its present need. These houses should be as close to the centre as possible.    |
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard        |   | 5            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew     | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 5            |                         |               | Agrees with SO16. The record of Councils working is woeful and wants this to work better in the medium term, and be replaced by a more efficient system of local government as soon as possible.  |
| PR-B-1263 | Katie      | Silvester       |   | 5            |                         |               | Do not support this. Cherwell, Oxford and the county councils should be developing a joint strategy which disperses realistically assessed growth away from Oxford and its GB.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 5            |                         |               | Recommend a change to allow flexibility/away from the agreed 4,400 as 'the contribution' as this quantum has yet to be fully assessed in terms of deliverability. E.g. 'To work with Oxford City and Oxfordshire County Council in delivering an appropriate contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs by 2031, within Cherwell District.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling        |   | 5            |                         |               | Changes are required to SO16. Limitations on number of houses in line with my comments in answers to questions 1 and 2. Conditions of cooperation with Oxford should be in terms of agreement to the conditions set out in answers to questions 3 and 4.  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry           | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 5            |                         |               | Support SO16. Without a robust approach to this matter, the plan cannot be found sound. Indeed it was only on the basis of the paragraphs confirming how this unmet need would be addressed within the adopted Local Plan (in particular paragraph B.95) that the Cherwell LPP1 was found sound and the Inspector considered that CDC had appropriately met their duty to cooperate requirements  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley     | Soanes      |  | 5            |                         |               | Agree about building on Pear Tree Park and Ride – but sort out A40 as well or the transport congestion in Kidlington and A44 will be hideous as people attempt to avoid A40.  |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes      | West Oxfordshire District Council                    | 5            |                         |               | Support effective delivery arrangements for Cherwell's contribution towards Oxford's unmet housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha    | Blackmore   | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family | 5            |                         |               | Supports SO16, and considers that this objective accords with the NPPF Duty to Cooperate as an authority within the Oxford Housing Market Area. Collaborating with other stakeholders will ensure that not only are the housing numbers met, the dwellings are located in accessible and appropriate areas.   |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy       | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd    | 5            |                         |               | Support SO16 and do not consider that any changes are required.   |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn     |  | 5            |                         |               | Yes.  |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk      | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust     | 5            |                         |               | Supports SO16 . Para 178 of the NPPF requires public bodies to co-operate on cross-boundary planning issues, particularly those that relate to strategic priorities. It is a statutory duty and not a matter of choice.   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede      |  | 5            |                         |               | No. Cherwell's local plan is exactly that. The four additional draft objectives do not address local issues, as evidenced by the outcry of local residents to these proposals. The additional draft objectives do not in any way complement the local plan, nor do they benefit the local residents. Yes, changes are required. The additional draft objectives should be scrapped.                                 |
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric     | Rose        |  | 5            |                         |               | Support the draft vision as long as points raised in the previous questions are addressed as the Draft Vision would support many of the residents.  |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura      | Precious    | Quod on behalf of Albion Land                        | 5            |                         |               | Support SO16. Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards    | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd       | 5            |                         |               | Support SO16.   |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle   | Land and Partners Ltd                                | 5            |                         |               | Support SO16. The council should also work with neighbouring authorities to help deliver contributions towards Oxford's unmet housing need. It is noted that South Oxfordshire's contribution has not been agreed and it is unclear how this need will be met.  |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley       | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group            | 5            |                         |               | Welcome Objective SO16. However, the commitment to joint working should also make reference to the other districts in order to ensure that the housing needs are met at the most appropriate locations across Oxfordshire.  |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden       | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates             | 5            |                         |               | Richborough Estates are fully supportive of SO16 and acknowledge that co-operation between all the authorities will be necessary to deliver Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs. In addition, it is essential that CDC engage with landowners and developers to ensure the deliverability of housing land in meeting the required housing targets for the District and for Oxford City. |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                          | 5            |                         |               | Spreading 4400 new homes across Cherwell District will not meet the needs of those on low incomes, or key workers with jobs in Oxford; it will just add to the many thousands already commuting to London and Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler      | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                          | 6            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday      |  | 6            |                         |               | More employment is needed in Cherwell not Oxford. City. Don't join Kidlington/Gosford with Oxford, or Kidlington to Begbroke or Yarnton.  |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford   | Jones       |  | 6            |                         |               | Do not support this objective because it is based on the "projected economic growth which underpins the agreed Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014". A revised assessment is required following the results of the United Kingdom European Union membership referendum, 23 June 2016.  |
| PR-B-0039 | Susan      | Cooper      |  | 6            |                         |               | Yes, support it.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall        |  | 6            |                         |               | Oxford has full employment and as it's surrounded by flood plains cannot safely expand. Bicester would benefit from large scale commercial development.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor      | Aitchison Rafferty                                   | 6            |                         |               | Yes. Housing growth should support the rural economy, and the role of Local Enterprise Partnerships can help ensure this.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony             | Hall        |   | 6            |                         |               | No. Further economic growth in Oxford is clearly unsustainable – as witness all the problems that are created by the present overheated economy and about to be exacerbated by the Northern Gateway.   |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue                 | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                                   | 6            |                         |               | Agrees to the Objective SO17.  |
| PR-B-0119 | C A                 | McCall      |   | 6            |                         |               | It is all being done in a rush, and are CDC committing to something future generations will regret.  |
| PR-B-0120 | E                   | Tonkin      |   | 6            |                         |               | Why Kidlington and not perhaps Banbury's need for more economic development.   |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul                | Goulding QC |   | 6            |                         |               | No. The projected economic growth is insufficiently supported by robust evidence, of doubtful sustainability, and of questionable validity when measured against the potential harm to the countryside and the cohesion of existing communities.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val                 | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                  | 6            |                         |               | Agree, provided it is accepted that the current adopted Local Plan in part already achieves a level of support to Oxford by the extent of allocations at Bicester.   |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin               | Carrit      |   | 6            |                         |               | Yes, fully support the SO17 statement.   |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth       |   | 6            |                         |               | Yes, it has to be delivered due to the geographic relationship of Kidlington and Yarnton to Oxford   |
| PR-B-0184 | Roger               | Prince      |   | 6            |                         |               | Do not support this objective, as the figures in the SHMA are unrealistically optimistic and have been criticised in the past by several council leaders, MPs, and planning expert .One independent planning expert concluded that the estimated figures in the SHMA are likely to be “grossly overstated” by a factor of over two. The only people who seem still to be giving the SHMA any credibility are the commercial property consultants who prepared it, property developers and landowners who see an opportunity to make some significant profits and, regrettably, some members of the local councils. The fact that the Inspector has accepted the figures should be no barrier to local politicians disputing the validity of the SHMA on behalf of the people they represent. |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                | Walker      | Oxford Bus Company                                      | 6            |                         |               | Support SO17   |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings    |   | 6            |                         |               | Agree that the plan should aim to provide a significantly reduced Cherwell contribution to Oxford's current unmet housing needs, but not to support uncontrolled economic growth for Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright  |   | 6            |                         |               | Cannot support any contribution to meeting Oxford's housing needs when the figures are based on the dubious 2014 SHMA. Supporting projected economic growth will produce any open-ended commitment to providing houses with infrastructure requirements.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield    |   | 6            |                         |               | No, changes are required to preserve the GB.   |
| PR-B-0641 | J                   | Willoughby  |   | 6            |                         |               | No, I have not sufficient knowledge.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen       |   | 6            |                         |               | No, concentration should be on developing other industries across Oxfordshire and remove the need to travel to Oxford. Oxfordshire is well placed to allow travel to other areas - London, Midlands, south coast and South Wales.  |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber      |   | 6            |                         |               | Only if Oxford City can demonstrate its housing needs are genuine and if Cherwell's economic growth is promoted as well.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley     |   | 6            |                         |               | No, do not wish to live on a housing estate.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley     |   | 6            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan               | Oldfield    |   | 6            |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw     | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw | 6            |                         |               | The projected economic growth underpinning the SHMA needs to be reassessed by 2022 so that any further housing requirements for Oxford better reflects the actual economic situation. No-one knows the effect that Brexit will have on the UK economy therefore it would be prudent to reassess the situation when the UK has exited the EU.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick                | Small       | Stagecoach  | 6            |                         |               | Strongly supports and welcomes SO17  |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn              | Phillips    |   | 6            |                         |               | Is the growth assessment still a reasonable projection. The future for Kidlington seems to be a medium style town. Oxford sprawl is not a satisfactory growth strategy.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony             | Matthews    | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council           | 6            |                         |               | Generally support the draft strategic objective SO17   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0723 | RA               | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 6            |                         |               | Have grave doubts that such as vision is achievable. In particular, the existing infrastructure, in terms of the local road network and provision for schools, healthcare and other essential services, is already under severe pressure.<br>These facilities are limited in Yarnton and, are not capable of accommodating additional housing development on the scale proposed. Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest that realistic and deliverable plans are in place to provide the necessary infrastructure improvements. LTP seeks to reduce pressure on the local road network by encouraging the location of housing close to jobs where people can more easily walk or cycle to work and in places where people will be able to use high quality public transport to get to work. |
| PR-B-0743 | John             | Tremlett  |  | 6            |                         |               | Yes. support SO17 very strongly   |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian           | Scargill  | Oxford Green Belt Network  | 6            |                         |               | Strongly oppose draft Strategic Objective SO17. The projected economic growth has been put forward by the Ox (LEP) to support its bids for external funding. It relies on a large number of commercial property development proposals actually coming to fruition and ignores the possibility of job losses and competition from other areas. It is unlikely that anything like the estimated numbers of jobs will be created in practice and, therefore, the housing requirement for the putative new employees is also much too high.   |
| PR-B-0751 | Dr Katrin        | Kiessling |  | 6            |                         |               | The projections appear optimistic in the light of the Brexit vote and should be revised after Brexit has been initiated and its effects can be better evaluated.  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin           | Palmer    |  | 6            |                         |               | Only if current transport problems are addressed and no development to join Kidlington with Oxford is considered.   |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve            | Pickles   | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 6            |                         |               | The objective is supported  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane             | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council   | 6            |                         |               | Yes, if Oxford cannot be persuaded to change their employment policy.   |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip           | Morley    | North Oxford Golf Club   | 6            |                         |               | SO17 relates to economic growth. Figure 5 of the consultation shows that more people in 2011 worked on the east of the City (Headington and Cowley) than in the City Centre. Economic, social and technology trends are likely to mean that proportionately fewer people will work in the City Centre in fifteen years' time. Suggest that CDC revisits the housing and transport assumptions behind SO17.  |
| PR-B-0796 | David            | Tighe     |  | 6            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive            | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                                  | 6            |                         |               | Oxford's unmet housing need is more underpinned by issues of unaffordability than by economic growth, as evidenced by the SHMA. This point is partially addressed by SO18, but is not identified as a key driver.   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard  |  | 6            |                         |               | Do not support the draft objectives.  |
| PR-B-0802 | Peter J          | Frampton  | Framptons on behalf of db Symmetry                                   | 6            |                         |               | For the same justification as the submission in response to Q5, SO17 to be extended to include the economic needs of Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris            | Robbins   |  | 6            |                         |               | Reservations about the SHMA. Failure to meet Oxford's unmet needs will impact adversely on Oxfordshire's economy. Have doubts about the precise figures, Accept the general desirability of ensuring housing development matches economic growth.   |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim              | Green     | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association                           | 6            |                         |               | Do not support SO17 because the economic growth forecasts are exaggerated and over-estimated the housing.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder     | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 6            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor    |  | 6            |                         |               | No. The economic growth forecasts are exaggerated and over-estimate the housing requirement.  |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce     | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire                      | 6            |                         |               | Support this strategic objective and do not consider that any changes are required.   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson    |  | 6            |                         |               | ?   |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel            | Buttler   |  | 6            |                         |               | Yes   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha    | Eliot      | Oxford Preservation Trust  | 6            |                         |               | Supports SO17, and considers that the drive for economic growth at Oxford is putting unprecedented pressure on Oxford to expand beyond its current boundaries. OPT is not in a position to stop this but it does want to play its part in ensuring that the place we all leave for future generations is an Oxford/shire of which we can be justly proud. OPT's aims and objectives are to protect and enhance Oxford and its green setting. Principles of good strategic planning should be embedded in and central to the development plan process – cannot have the economic growth without the housing and the housing should only be allowed where sustainable and balanced communities can be achieved (Question 3 and 4). In short, OPT believes that planning should be part of the economic plan and not following on its coat tails as at present. It encourages Cherwell District Council to put pressure on the LEP to do this. |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard    | Hills      |  | 6            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0837 | David      | Jackson    | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 6            |                         |               | Draft Strategic Objective SO17 is supported. This is a robust approach endorsed by NPPF, which requires that the evidence base and policies for housing and employment should be aligned. Having a strategic objective which supports the projected economic growth and which underpins the SHMA is therefore supported. The strategic objective should though more explicitly reflect the need to locate housing in a way that best serves the Oxford economy.   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike       | Gilbert    | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 6            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex       | Wilson     | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                         | 6            |                         |               | In considering housing sites careful thought must be given to economic links with Oxford City and the wider area. NW Bicester is consistent with this spatial pattern.  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard    | Cutler     | Bloombridge LLP  | 6            |                         |               | Support SO17 but suggest the addition of the following wording at the end '.....as well as assisting the growth and regeneration of Kidlington' A detailed justification for this amendment, including references to the Alan Baxter study, is provided.  |
| PR-B-0856 | David      | Smith      |  | 6            |                         |               | Insufficient knowledge to speak but gut reaction "No".  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim        | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC                   | 6            |                         |               | The objective is unbalanced in that it takes no account of environmental or social factors which need to be weighed in any decision about supporting economic growth. Reword 'To provide Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs so that it supports the projected economic growth which underpins the agreed Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 and the local economies of Oxford and Cherwell whilst ensuring that this is balanced with the needs of existing communities and protection of the environment.'  |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter      | Nicholson  |  | 6            |                         |               | Objects to SO17. Considers that economic growth from Oxford City which adversely affects the environment and quality of life in neighbouring districts should not be welcomed. Does not think that the projected growth of Oxford is at all desirable if it means that Cherwell would be swamped with 4,400 extra dwellings to support it. Concerned about the harm to the landscape, rural character and the GB. Has provided a detailed statement in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt       | Todd       |  | 6            |                         |               | No. Strongly oppose. Projected economic growth has been put forward by Oxfordshire LEP to support bids for external funding. Relies on large number of commercial proposals coming into fruition, ignoring job loss and competition from other areas. Unlikely the estimated jobs will be created and the housing requirement is too high. Focus on the welfare of the Oxfordshire residents and not commercial opportunities.  |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter      | Hainsworth |  | 6            |                         |               | No, because it has been inadequately thought through and consultation has been exceptionally poor.  |
| PR-B-0877 | David      | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council   | 6            |                         |               | Supports SO17   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 6            |                         |               | Unable to respond - Insufficient time to consider the issues in detail  |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia      | Trowles    |  | 6            |                         |               | No. The projected economic growth that underpins the agreed Oxfordshire SHMA 2014 is unrealistically high and exaggerates the housing need, Cherwell's allocation of Oxford's unmet housing need is disproportionately high, compared to other district councils.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0883 | Peter                  | Trowles  |  | 6            |                         |               | No. The projected economic growth that underpins the agreed Oxfordshire SHMA 2014 is unrealistically high and exaggerates the housing need, Cherwell's allocation of Oxford's unmet housing need is disproportionately high, compared to other district councils.   |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley  |  | 6            |                         |               | The number is too high, partly based on Oxford's needs and their natural evolution up to 2031, which has been amplified by their predicted employment growth, which depends on future planning decisions made by Oxford City with the priority they give to land for houses versus employment. The SHMA assumes that employment growth will replicate what various employers in Oxford wish for without consideration to sustainability the consequences in terms of housing required. Destruction of GB and increased commuter traffic. This is an unacceptable approach. Sustainability consequences of housing required should be central to any planning decisions to provide building for further employment in Oxford. If this were the case, Oxford's future 'unmet housing need' would definitely be lower than the SHMA predicts. The rep. has made suggestions to where changes are required. Economic growth, avoiding urban sprawl and merging of district communities and levels of commuting. |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks    |  | 6            |                         |               | In part, but Oxford's growth should not be at the expense of the GB. There are opportunities for housing in Oxford and opportunities for business elsewhere in Oxfordshire, such as Bicester, Kidlington Langford Locks and Milton Park. The statement needs to acknowledge those living and working in Cherwell and not just the needs of Oxford. There is little detail on how transport issues could be resolved and accommodate developments such as the Northern Gateway.  |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |  | 6            |                         |               | Prefer to see housing is envisaged to support growth in Cherwell as a priority, rather than economic growth, as the latter will add to congested roads and extra pollution.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |  | 6            |                         |               | No. do not support this. The burden has fallen unfairly on Cherwell. It is based on SHMA which is itself inaccurate.  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council   | 6            |                         |               | Support   |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar   |  | 6            |                         |               | No because economic growth projections underlying the estimate for the housing need in Oxford has been exaggerated to attract investment. This is not the basis for concreting over the Cherwell area. It needs to be realistic and only proceed if economic growth thresholds are achieved.  |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton   |  | 6            |                         |               | Again the question presupposes that Oxford has an unmet housing need and Cherwell should meet it. Disagree with both these assumptions.   |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew                 | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                 | 6            |                         |               | Understand the economic and cultural importance for Oxfordshire, but Kidlington should not be sacrificed for Oxford. Retaining the green gap, recreational value of the Countryside, etc. are important to Kidlington residents. Oxford City's housing strategy should be revisited. Considerations should be given to moving current facilities out of the City, where they can more easily be accommodated in the countryside and free up land for redevelopment.   |
| PR-B-0912 | David                  | Mason    |  | 6            |                         |               | No, it is based on an old survey of assessed housing needs, this needs to be updated next year.   |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 6            |                         |               | Fundamentally object to SO17. The employment growth will be substantially lower than projected. Note that a large number of employment sites in and around Oxford currently remain undeveloped or incomplete, e.g. Oxford Science Park and Business Park. Have listed the top 10 employers as set on County Council's website, and seven of these are heavily dependent on Govt. funding which is under severe pressure. Question the evidence behind the envisaged growth by these organisations and 'accelerated economic growth' claimed by the City Council, as this does not mean anything. Have provided a more detailed statement on economic growth and SHMA in response to this question in their representation.  |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 6            |                         |               | The strategic objective is reasonable and does not require changes.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric    | Sidebottom    |   | 6            |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie      | Lodwick       |   | 6            |                         |               | Objects to SO17 and considers that Cherwell should not support the projected economic growth and therefore the SHMA. Cherwell should question the assumptions upon which the projections are based. Any development, whether for employment or housing, should be planned incrementally, as and when required. By planning 15 years ahead, future land use is set in concrete, whatever happens to the local or national economy.   |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds          | Fringford Parish Council                                      | 6            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter      | Bateman       | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                      | 6            |                         |               | Housing delivery should complement employment delivery and in this sense clients supportive of housing supporting projected economic growth. But needs to consistent with the Framework.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle         | Greenlight Developments                                       | 6            |                         |               | It should be Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's full, objectively assessed unmet housing needs. SO17 should be referring to the 'Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine'.   |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone         |   | 6            |                         |               | This seems remarkably like previous questions! It would appear repetition of similar questions are introduced to provide selective interpretation of results? I do not believe the projections given by OSHMA 2014 it provides a form of guidance which is excessively overplayed and it completely counterproductive to rural communities, cities and towns. Equally it is causing "overdevelopment of South East England which will destroy communities and harmonious social integration. Future economic circumstances may vary and needs to be treated with caution and not destroy the GB causing coalescence and urban sprawl. |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo      |   | 6            |                         |               | No do not. See little need for Oxford to grow so much.  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk          | Banbury Civic Society   | 6            |                         |               | This must be an obvious prerequisite within the framework outlined above. The viability of the economies of both areas is an essential requirement, otherwise the demand for additional housing will not materialise - unless commuter dormitories are envisaged and we do not wish that outcome.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council  | 6            |                         |               | Supports SO17 and considers that every effort is made to ensure that any prospective development brings benefits to both Oxford and Cherwell  |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson     |   | 6            |                         |               | The main focus of this objective is unclear. I support creating accommodation to meet demands of economic growth but not past the point which threatens the environment, GB, transport capacity and health and school provision. That point has now been reached. New houses north of Oxford would not serve Oxford's predicted industrial growth but attract London commuters.   |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 6            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett       |   | 6            |                         |               | Clearly do not. The SHM Assessment cannot be considered fixed.  |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner        | Launton Parish Council  | 6            |                         |               | No, we do not believe that the supposedly agreed, but widely criticised, SHMA is correct.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council                                    | 6            |                         |               | The economic growth in the SHMA was exaggerated , but at this stage, this is not discussed, as perhaps it should be, but support CDC's effort to find sites near Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                             | 6            |                         |               | Yes, support SO17 and new community at New Alchester will assist in the achievement of this Objective.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd                                      | 6            |                         |               | Yes if South Oxfordshire meet its portion. No otherwise.  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | 6            |                         |               | Agrees, but only in a provisional sense. Suggests that the Council should build in 'subject to a process of review after a period of 10 years' or equivalent clause, which would take into consideration the real growth and the release of land at Pear Tree Park and Ride.  |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan   | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 6            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1032 | David      | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford | 6            |                         |               | This is supported including a commitment to support the projected economic growth which underpins the Oxfordshire SHMA.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1035 | Robert       | Davies     | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace  | 6            |                         |               | Supports Objective SO17 in principle, however consider that there is a need to balance new housing need and new infrastructure alongside the approach to help boost the local economies of Oxford and Cherwell. As housing numbers are needed to support economic growth; to support the delivery of affordable housing, they consider that the Strategic objective should be amended to state the need for Cherwell's contribution to be located in sustainable location in proximity to Oxford, as the key issue is to meet Oxford's unmet housing need and help deliver the economic objectives in the Local Plans. Therefore, location of housing growth along the A44 and A40 corridors should be supported by initiatives to improvements to it. |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert       | Davies     | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford                      | 6            |                         |               | Support SO17 in principle, and consider that it is critical that Cherwell contributes to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs so that it supports economic growth which underpins the agreed Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 and the local economies of Oxford and Cherwell. Consider that the Strategic Objective should be amended to state the need for Cherwell's contribution to be located in sustainable locations in proximity to Oxford, as this is the key issue for the Local Plan in supplying housing that will meet the demands of Oxford's and therefore help to deliver the economic objectives set out above.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments         | 6            |                         |               | Yes, this is broadly supported. It is however important to provide an appropriate evidence base to justify the level of Oxford's unmet housing needs.  |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret | Sidebottom |   | 6            |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson      |   | 6            |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land, be affordable and house the current population first.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP           | Lyes       |   | 6            |                         |               | Not a credible objective if it is founded on the widely discredited SHMA.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F     | Hickman    | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 6            |                         |               | The wording is satisfactory if Cherwell concedes to City's need.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val          | Russell    | Bodicote Parish Council   | 6            |                         |               | Cherwell's contribution is too high - more homes should be provided by Oxford itself, as this is where the unmet housing need has been identified.   |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg         | Blaquiere  | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 6            |                         |               | Draft SO17 aims to provide Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet needs so that it supports the projected economic growth which underpins the agreed Oxfordshire SHMA and local economies of Oxford and Cherwell. The delivery of the promoted sites at Woodstock will provide c1,100 new homes and a subsequent increase in the population of the local area. Situated close to Oxford, and with strategic employment sites on the route in between, the sites are exceptionally well located to support the economic growth of the area.  |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan         | Storah     | Oxford City Council   | 6            |                         |               | Supports SO17.   |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith        | Johnston   |   | 6            |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain         | Johnson    |   | 6            |                         |               | No, basing housing on "expected" growth in such an uncertain economic climate is a strategic risk and it has not been considered carefully enough. Groups such as the Oxford GB network and CPRE have disputed this figure. Also, a high proportion of any new housing in Oxford is not bought by people working in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat          | Clissold   |   | 6            |                         |               | Oxford is a unique city. It is a huge tourist attraction and the tourist industry provides much employment of all grades. It must maintain its historic centre, museums, colleges and parks first and foremost. There are few cities in the UK with such a history, to allow this to be diluted by creation of jobs unrelated to the character of Oxford would be a mistake.   |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie        | Lewis      | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                   | 6            |                         |               | See Q5 above.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation                 | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward      | Kidlington Development Watch | 6            |                         |               | Objects to SO17 because the projected economic growth referred to is hugely overestimated for reasons given in our answers to questions 1, 2 and 3. These projections of jobs growth are highly exaggerated in order to support funding bids from the unelected and unaccountable Local Enterprise Partnership. What jobs growth does occur can and should be directed away from the City to areas which would welcome it wherever possible. The economical considerations have been overemphasised and the outcome of this will be an unbalanced and unsound plan. |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip           | Towler    |                              | 6            |                         |               | No. The SHMA is inherently flawed. The projections are inflated, and Oxfordshire cannot accommodate the numbers of houses claimed to be needed without substantial and irreparable damage to the environment.   |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan             | Lodwick   |                              | 6            |                         |               | No. Object to the basis for allocating this number, namely the SHMA. Support and refer to criticisms in a report for the CPRE criticising the validity of The SHMA. Employment figures are based on highly exaggerated estimates in an area that has almost full employment. Some of the actual growth that will occur should be diverted elsewhere to the mutual benefit of every location.  |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard          | Bennett   |                              | 6            |                         |               | Don't know, this question is not clear to us.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French    | Deddington Development Watch | 6            |                         |               | Objects to SO17. The economic growth projections which underpin the 2014 SHMA are only forecasts which pre-date Brexit and the current economic uncertainty. It is questionable whether this ambitious level of growth can be achieved.   |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |                              | 6            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council      | 6            |                         |               | Objects to Objective SO17. It supports local economic growth reducing demand on Oxford City in terms of employment and travelling.  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |                              | 6            |                         |               | No, economic growth is only projected and is likely to be unrealistic. The GB shouldn't be sacrificed for a mistaken and exaggerated economic forecast driven by an alliance between the unelected LEP and developers. There is growing national concern about the issue of building on GB and the undemocratic process that's driving it. Given that there is virtually full employment in and around Oxford land should be used to meet current housing needs.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council       | 6            |                         |               | No. Cherwell cannot meet Oxford's growth needs without a huge infrastructure investment that currently could not be funded.   |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |                              | 6            |                         |               | No. The projected economic growth is based on unfounded and unsustainable premises. Much has happened since the SHMA, including the process of exiting the EU, the growth forecast should be rethought basing it on the constraints of the City. The City should not increase the strain by encouraging employment without houses. Our own CDC seems to have a poor record of mixed development where houses and jobs are co-located.   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson   |                              | 6            |                         |               | Do not support the SO17. The projected growth figures were arrived at to support bids by the LEP for funding. It is optimistic and takes no account of reductions in some areas of employment or of competition from other areas or universities. In practice the employment created is liable to be below the estimates and thus the projected unmet housing need is also over estimated.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands     | 6            |                         |               | As per our response to Q5, it is vital that all OGB authorities work together to ensure that all of Oxford's Duty to Cooperate numbers are met.   |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis            | Davies    |                              | 6            |                         |               | No. Should be reducing expansion of Oxford city. There are other regions of the country that have far greater needs of development. Employment should be local to the area, thus reducing commuting.  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi            | Lancaster |                              | 6            |                         |               | No, do not support SO17.  |
| PR-B-1182 | Alison           | Noel      |                              | 6            |                         |               | No, do not support this objective.  |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol            | Matheson  |                              | 6            |                         |               | This objective fails to take into account the existing communities needs and protecting the environment. Consideration needs to be given to the existing traffic problems in Kidlington and the local medical centres and schools which could not accommodate an extra 8,000 people. Building on the GB which is used as water catchment will increase the risk of flooding in both Kidlington and Oxford.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss            | Adderbury Parish Council                                | 6            |                         |               | Supports SO17 with the proviso that it should also benefit Cherwell's economic growth. It suggests CDC consider reinforcing this element within SO 17.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt            | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd   | 6            |                         |               | Yes. No changes are required.   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway        | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm     | 6            |                         |               | Yes. Given the position of South Oxfordshire there exists the opportunity for Cherwell to grasp some of this additional unmet need to further enhance the local economy in the District, and increase the range and quality of services available to local people, focusing on sustainable locations which support Oxford and Cherwell's future strategic growth in accordance with SO17.   |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard    | Silvester       |   | 6            |                         |               | Do not support this because it is based on questionable projected economic growth patterns from the LEP which will inevitably prioritise commercial interests rather than unmet housing need for the local population   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 6            |                         |               | Do not support as it stands. The projected economic growth and the housing needs should be reviewed in the light of post-BREXIT forecasts of lower growth.  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green           |   | 6            |                         |               | No, do not support this.  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt    | 6            |                         |               | Supports SO17 and the conclusion that all the Areas of search would make a minor positive contribution towards the delivery of SO17, namely sustaining and developing economic growth and innovation, an educated/skilled workforce and support the long term competitiveness of the district.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd | 6            |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies   | 6            |                         |               | Yes. Draft SO17 is supported.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 6            |                         |               | The objective is unbalanced in that it does not take account of environmental or social factors. Suggestion is, "To provide Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs so that it supports the projected economic growth which underpins the agreed Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 and the local economies of Oxford and Cherwell whilst ensuring that this is balanced with the needs of existing communities and protection of the environment."   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 6            |                         |               | No. The irretrievable loss of the GB on the back of ill-founded demand estimates is unacceptable.   |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan      | Silvester       |   | 6            |                         |               | Do not support this because it is based on questionable projected economic growth patterns from the LEP which will inevitably prioritise commercial interests rather than unmet housing need for the local population.  |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip     | Boxall          |   | 6            |                         |               | Qualify the objective to support a sustainable portion of the projected economic.   |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 6            |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola     | Mallows         | Gresswell Environmental Trust                           | 6            |                         |               | Strongly oppose SO17. They consider that the SHMA 2014 and the LEP figures are grossly exaggerated: pure economic conjecture drummed up by a development lobby. Undemocratic in practice, with no respect for the planning guidelines regarding the preservation and value of the Green Belt, as set out in the NPPF. The Oxford Green Belt is a planning constraint with a purpose: its aim is to stop urban sprawl, and to keep historic Oxford in scale with its historic surrounding landscape. It is supported by the NPPF and should be non negotiable. |
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard        |   | 6            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew     | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                       | 6            |                         |               | Agrees with SO17, as long as the growth figures are still objectively robust in the light of e.g. Brexit.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1263 | Katie      | Silvester |   | 6            |                         |               | Do not support this because it is based on questionable projected economic growth patterns from the LEP which will inevitably prioritise commercial interests rather than unmet housing need for the local population.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells     | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 6            |                         |               | Has serious concerns regarding this objective, with Brexit the 2014 data needs to be reviewed and forecasts revised. This objective should be widened or an additional objective including character, landscape, settlement identity and other assets in Cherwell. Suggested addition to the objective: 'without unacceptable harm to the predominantly rural character of the District and its settlements'.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling  |   | 6            |                         |               | Only within the constraints of all the answers to questions 1 to 4.  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 6            |                         |               | Support SO17. It is however important to provide an appropriate evidence base to justify the level of Oxford's unmet housing needs, i.e. 4,400 as a minimum.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes    | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 6            |                         |               | Support CDC's draft objective SO17 and the link to projected economic growth. There will be a need to strengthen the local economy of Cherwell to support the increased population.  |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy     | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd                       | 6            |                         |               | Support SO17 and do not consider that any changes are required.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn   |   | 6            |                         |               | No. This is entirely redundant. Cherwell's Local Plan 2011-2031 already supports the projected economic growth which underpins the SHMA and the local economies of Oxford and Cherwell. The extent to which availability of affordable housing may constrain or be affected by the consequences of the economic growth projected in the SHMA is at no point considered in detail in the SHMA or in related documentation. Indeed, the SHMA states in relation to its assessment of affordable housing need: 'the figures derived should be used with caution.' |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk    | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 6            |                         |               | Supports SO17, subject to ensuring that land is allocated within the A44 Corridor, as otherwise they would not necessarily support the local economies of Cherwell and Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1304 | Tim        | Wakeman   |   | 6            |                         |               | Nothing in this draft is supported.  |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster    | Fritwell Parish Council   | 6            |                         |               | Objects. The Oxfordshire SHMA 2014 should be robustly challenged. It should also be more clearly recognised that housing built in the Bicester area is likely to be used by workers in London, not meeting Oxfordshire's needs.  |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede    |   | 6            |                         |               | Providing Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing need may well support the local economies of Oxford and Cherwell, but to the cost of the local quality of life in Cherwell. No, do not support this objective.   |
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric     | Rose      |   | 6            |                         |               | Do not believe the projected economic growth figures are relative or accurate since the EU referendum result has put funding in jeopardy.  |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura      | Precious  | Quod on behalf of Albion Land   | 6            |                         |               | Have provided a detailed statement on the Oxfordshire HMA and Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's housing needs in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards  | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                          | 6            |                         |               | Support SO17.  |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd   | 6            |                         |               | Support SO17   |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick       | Alston    | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd                 | 6            |                         |               | Supports SO17 and consider that, greater attention should be given to the opportunity to boost/support the local and county-wide economy as a consequence of accommodating a proportion of Oxford's housing need in the district.  |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley     | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                               | 6            |                         |               | SO17 is unclear whether it is seeking to deliver 4,400 homes, or the economic growth in the SHMA or the OAN identified in the SHMA (which is at least 150 homes greater than the identified unmet needs); or sufficient housing to support the economies of Oxford and Cherwell. Each of these objectives are distinct and would necessitate a different policy response in the Local Plan Part 1 Partial Review. This would benefit from clarification.   |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden     | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                                | 6            |                         |               | Supports SO17. Grange Farm at Launton would assist in contributing towards meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname     | Organisation                           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| PR-B-1358 | Ian               | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group            | 6            |                         |  | Spreading 4400 new homes across Cherwell District will not meet the needs of those on low incomes, or key workers with jobs in Oxford; it will just add to the many thousands already commuting to London and Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0944 | David             | Stone       |  | 7            |                         | PR38, PR41, PR178, PR177, PR168, PR167, PR126, PR128, PR124, PR1243, PR12, PR122, PR118, PR9 | The object in it's present form is not realistic and it unsustainable. It relies on a flawed assumption of geographic proximity enhancing the 'relationship to Oxford. New houses north of Oxford will not provide affordable houses, healthy living conditions or economic bliss. I strongly object to plans to build in areas specified. Oxford Parkway is close to these sites and will provide houses for London commuters not affordable houses that are needed. Developers will maximise their returns and traffic congestion will result in detrimental declining health for existing residents. |
| PR-B-0002 | Kerry             | Wilce       |  | 7            |                         |  | This is meaningless and imprecise. It should specify, sustainable developments located where environmental standards and public transport links to centres of employment already exist. Any development should enhance and compliment existing communities.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward            | Dowler      | Middle Aston Parish Meeting            | 7            |                         |  | Yes, Supports the provision of new affordable housing that can remain permanently affordable  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry             | Munday      |  | 7            |                         |  | Don't agree with people in Cherwell paying for Oxford houses and it will increase the land prices in Cherwell.  |
| PR-B-0039 | Susan             | Cooper      |  | 7            |                         |  | Yes, support it, but feel it needs strengthening .Housing needs to be affordable and for people who work locally not commuting into London. Affordable needs clarification and a mechanism in place to keep it affordable in years to come.   |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia           | Hall        |  | 7            |                         |  | Would like to see affordable housing in Oxford, but without government incentives don't believe this will be delivered, due to buy-to-let.  |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew           | Taylor      | Aitchison Rafferty                     | 7            |                         |  | It is important to encourage affordable access to the housing market for new entrants, key workers and key employment areas and ensure that development responds to both need and local context.  |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony           | Hall        |  | 7            |                         |  | Yes in principle, but since developers never honour their initial promises to provide affordable housing, and are always let off the hook by complaisant local authorities, I don't believe it has any meaning  |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue               | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                  | 7            |                         |  | Suggest that the employment could be moved away from the city and reduce demand and consider Bicester for employment sites.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A               | McCall      |  | 7            |                         |  | This is to support Oxford city's need and not Kidlington's. It is a rushed decision that may be regretted.  |
| PR-B-0120 | E                 | Tonkin      |  | 7            |                         |  | No, CDC needs to develop less economically successful locations.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul              | Goulding QC |  | 7            |                         |  | Agree to providing access to the housing market for new entrants and key workers -NHS workers and state school teachers. Not however those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas sine this is insufficiently defined. Particular weight should be attached to 'developments that respond to local context' meaning the existing character of properties in GB. Cherwell's' contribution should also be proportionate.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val               | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK | 7            |                         |  | Agree, provided it is accepted that the current adopted Local Plan in part already achieves a level of support to Oxford by the extent of allocations at Bicester.  |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin             | Carrit      |  | 7            |                         |  | Yes, fully support the SO18 statement.  |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul              | Walker      | Oxford Bus Company                     | 7            |                         |  | It is critical that any new affordable housing to facilitate economic growth with the transport network designed to enhance this. It needs to be of suitable density to enable viable public transport connections from where affordable housing in located to areas of employment so that residents can be economically active.  |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia | Jennings    |  | 7            |                         |  | Agree with the statement, but not the extent of the contribution.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |  | 7            |                         |               | Cannot support any contribution to meeting Oxford's housing needs when the figures are based on the dubious 2014 SHMA. Supporting projected economic growth will produce any open-ended commitment to providing houses with infrastructure requirements.  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield   |  | 7            |                         |               | No, changes are required to preserve the GB.  |
| PR-B-0641 | J                   | Willoughby |  | 7            |                         |               | No, I have not sufficient knowledge.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen      |  | 7            |                         |               | No, the vision is not achievable due to market forces beyond the control of councils and is inversely influenced by the presence of good transport and other facilities. The opening of the London link via Water Eaton is a prime example. However council houses would offer a solution despite being a long payback for any developers or investors.   |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber     |  | 7            |                         |               | Only if Oxford City can demonstrate its housing needs are genuine and if Cherwell's economic growth is promoted as well.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley    |  | 7            |                         |               | No, it will create urban sprawl and unhappy neighbourhoods  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley    |  | 7            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan               | Oldfield   |  | 7            |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw    | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 7            |                         |               | The City Council has provided a wholly inadequate level of affordable housing. Fail to see how any housing situated near the City can be built to an affordable level, especially in the Kidlington area with its access to Oxford Parkway station. Whilst the objective is welcome it is unachievable.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick                | Small      | Stagecoach   | 7            |                         |               | Strongly supports and welcomes SO18   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn              | Phillips   |  | 7            |                         |               | Kidlington will become an extension of North Oxford. There is no chance that key workers will be able to afford to live there, try Bicester. Key workers need to live in areas that are away from the centre with provision of good transport links. All areas around Oxford city with the exception of Blackbird Leys would be too expensive.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony             | Matthews   | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 7            |                         |               | Generally support the draft strategic objective SO18  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                  | Humphreys  | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 7            |                         |               | Have grave doubts that such as vision is achievable. In particular, the existing infrastructure, in terms of the local road network and provision for schools, healthcare and other essential services, is already under severe pressure.<br>These facilities are limited in Yarnton and, are not capable of accommodating additional housing development on the scale proposed. Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest that realistic and deliverable plans are in place to provide the necessary infrastructure improvements. LTP seeks to reduce pressure on the local road network by encouraging the location of housing close to jobs where people can more easily walk or cycle to work and in places where people will be able to use high quality public transport to get to work. |
| PR-B-0743 | John                | Tremlett   |  | 7            |                         |               | Yes. support SO18. Think it would be improved by incorporating a reference to a range of household types and incomes as in the draft vision before Q4.  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin              | Palmer     |  | 7            |                         |               | Only if it does not mean Kidlington becoming part of Oxford. As long as it does not gridlock Kidlington, a certain amount of commuting into Oxford will be acceptable.  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve               | Pickles    | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 7            |                         |               | The objective is supported  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane                | Olds       | Caversfield Parish Council   | 7            |                         |               | Yes, if Oxford cannot be persuaded to change their employment policy.   |
| PR-B-0796 | David               | Tighe      |  | 7            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive               | Booth      | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                                  | 7            |                         |               | Agrees as SO18 is, on the basis of the SHMA, more important than SO17.  |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian                 | Sheppard   |  | 7            |                         |               | Do not support the draft objectives.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris               | Robbins    |  | 7            |                         |               | Affordable housing should be a significant element in any development resulting from this review. Consideration should be given to adopting Oxford City's requirement of 50% affordable housing in any development intended to provide for Oxford's needs.  |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim                 | Green      | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association                           | 7            |                         |               | Do not support SO18   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder      | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 7            |                         |               | Yes, although the objective should make it clear that a wide range of market housing is needed as well as affordable housing.  |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor     |  | 7            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce      | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbshire                             | 7            |                         |               | Strongly support this strategic objective and do not consider that any changes are required.   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson     |  | 7            |                         |               | Yes in principle, but have little confidence that this development would meet the needs of the target groups for affordable housing.   |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus           | Campbell   | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group                                   | 7            |                         |               | Key worker housing is an issue for Health and would welcome a discussion across the health economy on how this can best be achieved. Have provided a detailed response in a separate statement as part of their representation.  |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel            | Buttler    |  | 7            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha          | Eliot      | Oxford Preservation Trust  | 7            |                         |               | Supports SO18 and considers that the aim of providing housing that is affordable and well-designed responding to local needs and the local context in sustainable and balanced communities once it is known that sites can be found and weighed against the previous criteria described above.   |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard          | Hills      |  | 7            |                         |               | Yes – but need to make housing cheaper for all, not just new entrants and key workers.   |
| PR-B-0837 | David            | Jackson    | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 7            |                         |               | SO18 is supported. But would add clarity if the plan were to have separate objectives relating to firstly providing housing to serve those employed in Oxford and secondly having well designed development that responds to needs and the local context. Housing should be provided to serve all those with a need to live close to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike             | Gilbert    | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 7            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex             | Wilson     | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                         | 7            |                         |               | The viability of housing development must also be considered. Homes should be provided where existing services and employment opportunities exist or can be enhanced.  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard          | Cutler     | Bloombridge LLP  | 7            |                         |               | Suggest the addition of the following text '.....in a way that maximises the benefits to Cherwell residents and the district's economy, whilst maintaining the integrity of the Green Belt.'   |
| PR-B-0856 | David            | Smith      |  | 7            |                         |               | No. Yes if you delete "for Oxford".  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim              | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC                   | 7            |                         |               | The PC supports this objective, and agrees that this needs to be fully addressed in any development proposals. As the main impetus is to deliver a supply of affordable homes for local employees - then the Plan should consider specific affordable housing quotas of at least 50% as applies within Oxford. The PC would like to deliver a small number of low cost, affordable housing within its urban gaps to meet the needs of key workers. Reference is made to adopted policies ESD 14 and H6. Affordability will be an issue especially if company and landlord purchases are allowed. Housing within new developments should not only be about affordability but accessibility to individuals and families. |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter            | Nicholson  |  | 7            |                         |               | Objects to SO18 .Concerned that the 'key workers' etc. this housing is aimed at would not necessarily be potential buyers. The Oxford Parkway Station offers good connections to London, which would attract London commuters. Has provided a detailed statement in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter            | Hainsworth |  | 7            |                         |               | No, because it has been inadequately thought through and consultation has been exceptionally poor.   |
| PR-B-0877 | David            | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council   | 7            |                         |               | Supports SO18 - more detailed comment is provided in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane             | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 7            |                         |               | Unable to respond - Insufficient time to consider the issues in detail   |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia            | Trowles    |  | 7            |                         |               | No. Providing affordable access to the housing market for new entrants and key workers should be an objective relating to all housing provided in Cherwell, not only housing provided for Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter            | Trowles    |  | 7            |                         |               | No. Providing affordable access to the housing market for new entrants and key workers should be an objective relating to all housing provided in Cherwell, not only housing provided for Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul             | Buckley    |  | 7            |                         |               | Yes  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks    |  | 7            |                         |               | Yes, but not at the expense of the GB. The key statement of SO18 is "local context" – Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke are separate entities with valuable rural space around them and it must be respected. There is little detail on how transport issues could be resolved and accommodate developments such as the Northern Gateway. Further housing at Bicester with its greatly improved transport links to Oxford should be considered.  |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |  | 7            |                         |               | Prefer to have the clause focused on design as a separate sentence. The design and layout is important, any development should be of mixed housing so as to be affordable for a range of people.  |
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard       | Miles    |  | 7            |                         |               | Support the principle of SO18, but fail to see how Cherwell can provide this housing as key workers and employment areas are a distance from Cherwell, which puts pressure on existing infrastructure within and outside of Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |  | 7            |                         |               | No. do not support this. It needs to change to include action by Oxford to deal with the completely inadequate transport links to and around the city (NOT more busses).  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council   | 7            |                         |               | Suggest inserting "sustainable" housing for Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar   |  | 7            |                         |               | If the objective is to be affordable for new entrants the housing needs to be in Oxford as the cost of travelling into Oxford from Cherwell negatively impacts affordability.   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton   |  | 7            |                         |               | What does "substantively" mean. If Cherwell provides additional housing it should reflect the mix that local communities would like to see. Any housing in Cherwell should be appropriate for the employment in Cherwell whilst Oxford should offer the housing mix that Oxford employees need.   |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew                 | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                 | 7            |                         |               | Broadly agrees that wherever housing allocation is identified in Cherwell it should provide affordable access to the housing market for key workers in the long term. They are concerned that housing between Kidlington and Cutteslowe would become a commuter belt for London workers using the new Oxford Parkway station.   |
| PR-B-0912 | David                  | Mason    |  | 7            |                         |               | On its own no do not support this, it should not be regarded as a separate strategic objective, it must be considered along with the infrastructure requirements.   |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 7            |                         |               | It would be helpful to them to understand what mechanisms CDC believes it has at its disposal, under current planning law, to restrict the building of new homes to those that are key workers or those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas. Without such mechanisms, it is clear that any new housing built will not meet this objective.  |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 7            |                         |               | The strategic objective is reasonable and does not require changes.   |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie                  | Lodwick  |  | 7            |                         |               | Objects to SO18 as it implies that development will be well designed, but id development is determined by profits, it almost ensures low design quality.Oxford already has sufficient brownfield and greenfield (e.g. Northern Gateway) sites to absorb its need. Questions how Cherwell proposes to limit new homes to those "requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas"? The new train station will be a honey pot to London commuters, and far from lowering the cost of housing, is already pushing up the cost of housing in the area. |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane                   | Olds     | Fringford Parish Council   | 7            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter                  | Bateman  | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                             | 7            |                         |               | The Strategy should not limit itself to housing in locations geographically close to Oxford as alternative sustainable options can ensure new entrants to the housing market, key workers and all those commuting to Oxford have realistic alternatives.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip                 | Rawle    | Greenlight Developments  | 7            |                         |               | Oxford's future housing requirements, in terms of house types, is the same as that of the wider HMA. SO18 should reflect these points and not continue to assume that Oxford has significantly different housing market characteristics and issues relating to it than the rest of the HMA.   |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim                    | del Nevo |  | 7            |                         |               | No do not. Fear that the houses will be occupied by commuters.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk          | Banbury Civic Society   | 7            |                         |               | Strongly object to SO18. They consider that the means of achieving this object are not specified and more clarity is required on this point. Reliance on private sector developers is not enough and a 'lead' by the public sector via some mechanism is necessary in order to prioritise dwellings for rental and / or shared rent / buy is an absolute MUST.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council  | 7            |                         |               | Supports SO18 and feels it is important that key workers reside close to Oxford. It should also be viewed as a successful means of providing affordable housing.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 7            |                         |               | Supports SO18  |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson     |   | 7            |                         |               | Agree with providing key workers with affordable housing but not where it sacrifices GB, particularly GB of another district.  |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 7            |                         |               | Yes, although it should be noted that a significant amount of existing local stock can already serve those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas. New development to serve local needs can release this existing stock.  |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett       |   | 7            |                         |               | Where you build the houses commuters will require affordable and rapid transport into Oxford's key employment areas. CDC documents note that employment in Headington and Cowley in the 2011 Census accounted for 35,300 jobs. If South Oxfordshire district will not contribute to the need it places an impossible burden for sustainable transport into Oxford from the other districts. It will mean more and more car journeys.   |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter      | Collins       | Islip Parish Council  | 7            |                         |               | Supports the need to provide affordable access to the housing market. The Low Cost Housing Survey in 2010 undertaken by the Parish identified the need for 11 homes. They are now looking for suitable rural exception sites.  |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner        | Launton Parish Council  | 7            |                         |               | Yes, no changes required.  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council                                      | 7            |                         |               | Supports SO18.   |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                               | 7            |                         |               | Yes and proposed new community at New Alchester will assist in the achievement of this Objective.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 7            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | 7            |                         |               | Disagrees and considers that the wording should be amended to reflect the fact that Oxford residents also work in Kidlington area, and that there is economically a close link between Oxford and the Kidlington area. It is this relationship that has facilitated the employment growth at Begbroke Science Park and the Oxford Technology Park. Suggests that this should be amended to read: '.... <i>those requiring access to Oxford's and the Kidlington housing area's key employment areas,</i> ... ..' Also suggests that what should be reinforced is the fact that several other district council's bordering Oxford enforce far higher affordable housing targets. Discusses in more detail the different affordable housing requirements of the neighbouring authorities; therefore considers that it is reasonable to expect that a 50% affordable homes target should and could be achieved. |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan   | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 7            |                         |               | Yes, although it should be noted that a significant amount of existing local stock can already serve those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas. New development to serve local needs can release the existing stock.   |
| PR-B-1032 | David      | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 7            |                         |               | This is supported. It is imperative that the Plan provides affordable access to housing, particularly for key workers in order that the vision for the District, City and County are realised. Support the provision of access from new housing to Oxford's employment areas to encourage delivery of sustainable transport links.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1036 | Robert       | Davies     | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford                      | 7            |                         |               | Support SO18 in principle, and consider that it should take account of the fact that in substantively providing affordable access to the housing market for new entrants, key workers and those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas, additional growth needs to be directed to sustainable locations within proximity to the City of Oxford, associated infrastructure and sustainable transport links. Furthermore the provisions of housing should not be limited to new entrants, key workers and those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas but also the wider Oxford community with aspirations for a home. Key worker accommodation on an allocated site should be considered to fully meet any requirement to provide affordable housing. Key worker housing could be defined as follows: Key worker housing is intermediate housing that includes a condition of tenancy or lease that at least one full-time occupier of each unit or sub-unit, at the point of that person's first occupation, be in paid employment with one or more of the following occupations:<br>Universities and colleges: academic staff, early career research staff and other priority staff (both technical and support) at any College, Division or the Administration within the University of Oxford. |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments         | 7            |                         |               | A clear evidence base to justify the approach being taken, including appropriately justifying the level of Oxford's unmet need is required to provide a response to this question. Without such an evidence base, it is not possible to confirm whether the plan and proposed approach is sound or otherwise.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson      |   | 7            |                         |               | Agree that there is a need for affordable housing for Oxford's existing residents, but not at the expense of the existing GB. The Westgate Shopping Centre should have been allocated for affordable housing.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP           | Lyes       |   | 7            |                         |               | No. Surely this is the job of Oxford City?   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F     | Hickman    | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 7            |                         |               | The wording is satisfactory if Cherwell concedes to City's need.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val          | Russell    | Bodicote Parish Council   | 7            |                         |               | Agrees.  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg         | Blaquiere  | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 7            |                         |               | Draft SO18 seeks to provide housing for Oxford so that it provides access to the housing market for new entrants, key workers and those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas, together with development that responds to needs and local context. The development of the promoted sites at Woodstock meets this objective.  |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan         | Storah     | Oxford City Council   | 7            |                         |               | Supports SO18 and shares these laudable intentions   |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith        | Johnston   |   | 7            |                         |               | No. More than 50% of employment within Oxford City is to the East and South. With four other authorities bordering the city and feeding the centre with its 'external' employment base, It is disproportionate to expect CDC to accept 30% of the city's 'unmet' housing need.   |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain         | Johnson    |   | 7            |                         |               | Yes. Agree that affordable housing is needed but past experience shows that developers will follow profit and am sceptical that the affordable houses will get built in the numbers required   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat          | Clissold   |   | 7            |                         |               | Yes, with the provisos already stated above.   |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie        | Lewis      | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                   | 7            |                         |               | See Q5 above.  |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip       | Towler     |   | 7            |                         |               | Partially. It is important to provide affordable access to housing for key workers in and around Oxford. However, the commitment to provide affordable housing is not being met – recent developments have fallen far short of the stated % of affordable housing set as a target by Cherwell. Is it not acceptable for developers to seek to avoid their responsibilities in this respect by pleading 'non-viability'.  |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine    | Richenburg |   | 7            |                         |               | Much of the new housing may end up in the buy-to-let market and so will not provide affordable housing for new entrants. Measures should be taken to prevent this.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1145 | Richard          | Bennett   |   | 7            |                         |               | As long as it's supported with good infrastructure plans and it helps to provide not solely provide.   |
| PR-B-1152 | Helen            | Pattison  |   | 7            |                         |               | It would be best if most to the houses being built in and for Oxford were defined as affordable to help alleviate the housing crisis.  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |   | 7            |                         |               | Yes, genuinely affordable housing is a key driver.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council                               | 7            |                         |               | Accommodation anywhere is bound to be expensive especially near to Oxford Parkway. This particular provision is for London and other city commuters - not for Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |   | 7            |                         |               | In principle, yes, as long as previous objectives have been amended to ensure protection of the GB. Such housing should be genuinely 'affordable' to those earning less than £50,000, this is unlikely to be achievable, to the north of the city with its access to Oxford Parkway station. Developers are consistently seen to fall short of their promised quota of affordable housing – as seen in the Coop development in Kidlington where only 15% has been provided due to it not being viable. And presumably due to the realisation that proximity to the station can command higher prices.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council                                | 7            |                         |               | No. As outlined above, one of the reasons too much of Oxford's current housing is unaffordable is due to low levels of house building. Building this housing in outlying areas (even if enough truly sustainable sites could be found) would only add transport costs and travelling time to those working in Oxford, and adding congestion overall. Oxford's private housing stock would only increase in cost overall, due to the law of supply-and-demand.  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |   | 7            |                         |               | No. The phrase "substantively provides affordable access to the housing market" is not adequately defined. 90% affordable would be substantive. Only 35% seems to be on offer at present – although the City has 50%. Why would any council planner, knowing that developers want the smallest percentage of affordable homes allow this selling off of land? Because the government has relaxed the law and prevented Councils from building council houses. Without such safeguards as public ownership, the strategic objective is unobtainable and thus meaningless. If the Growth Board, the LEP and individual councils are aware that this land will not "substantively provide affordable housing", then they are misleading the public. |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson   |   | 7            |                         |               | Council Officers told me that they could not force this. Conceded that housing by Oxford Parkway would be developed for people commuting to London. New entrants, key workers and those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas needs are best met by location near those employment areas not by being located in a "dormitory".  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands                              | 7            |                         |               | Support SO18.  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi            | Lancaster |   | 7            |                         |               | No, do not support SO18.   |
| PR-B-1182 | Alison           | Noel      |   | 7            |                         |               | No, do not support this objective.   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol            | Matheson  |   | 7            |                         |               | Low cost affordable housing for new entrants and key workers can be provided by building on cheaper land not commuter belt land. Expensive land would render the building of cheap affordable houses as not viable as outlined in Policy H6 - Local Plan chapter 2: Housing. Brownfield sites close to Oxford need looking at as need to house key worker and young people rather than those commuting to London.  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa          | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council                              | 7            |                         |               | Supports SO18 with the proviso that particularly for more affordable housing and starter homes. However APC hopes planners will avoid the creation of affordable 'ghettos' where housing is of poor quality and which creates issues for the future.   |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul             | Butt      | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd | 7            |                         |               | Yes. Whilst changes are not required it would be helpful if 'new entrants', 'key workers' and 'key employment areas' are defined.  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew           | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm   | 7            |                         |               | Yes. The College would like to enter in to a dialogue with CDC on how collegiate accommodation can serve as key worker affordable housing, similar to NW Cambridge. The acceptance of discretionary charitable relief on CIL for charitable investment purposes would assist in maximising the provision and delivery of affordable housing to support the development of the wider University.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 7            |                         |               | Support, but as these will be in GB the design should achieve high densities that minimise the impact on GB objectives with exemplary environmental standards.   |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green           |   | 7            |                         |               | No,do not support this.  |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark       | Schmull         | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 7            |                         |               | Request that it is amended as follows: 'To provide housing for Oxford so that it substantially provides affordable access to the housing market for new entrants, key workers and those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas, in locations that, in the first instance, are located on existing strategic transport corridors, and well designed development that responds to both needs and local context...'  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 7            |                         |               | No comments to make.   |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 7            |                         |               | No comments at this stage.   |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 7            |                         |               | Yes. Draft SO18 is supported.  |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 7            |                         |               | Supports SO18 and agrees that this needs to be fully addressed in any development proposals. Suggests 50% affordable should apply. Has provided a detailed response.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 7            |                         |               | Only if it preserves the GB and is based on properly constructed demand figures. If there is a need for workers in Oxford then should provide such homes in Oxford and construct properties commensurate with the workers financial abilities.   |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip     | Boxall          |   | 7            |                         |               | Agree with well designed developments. However the objective of providing housing "for those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas" seems to be hard to focus meaningfully. The design, price and financing of housing can directly be aimed at new housing and key workers but then how can housing be distinguished between those who require access to Oxford and those who don't.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 7            |                         |               | No do not support.   |
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard        |   | 7            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew     | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 7            |                         |               | Agrees with SO18, and considers that the plans don't propose how the unmet need will be met through the plans for key workers who are on low incomes. Suggest considering imaginative models such as, 'Smart homes', 'Pocket homes' and the willingness to rethink assumptions around definitions of affordable housing and pooling of decision-making in Cambridge, creating a new model of cooperation with the University. These plans must not proceed on the basis of the old Local Plan assumptions around policies like Balance of Dwellings, percentages of affordable/ market/ mixed ownership; height; density. Openness to creative thinking will also allow better use to be made both of existing sites and of any that are brought forward, both within CDC and within Oxford. "Well-designed development" means factoring in health and well-being: footpaths, cycle lanes and real community centres to encourage healthy life-styles and interaction between all generations and residents. In design terms, this is an opportunity to create a vision for our part of the history of our region. |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 7            |                         |               | Request that the affordable housing quota be 50% prioritising key workers, etc. These affordable homes should also be available to residents in need within Kidlington, as these are equally important local employees. Suggested revision: 'Seek a quota of 50% Affordable Housing on all new strategic sites designated for the purpose of meeting Oxford's needs in Cherwell'.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling        |   | 7            |                         |               | Cherwell should only be providing low cost housing, 100% for Oxford key workers. There is already an abundance of medium to high cost housing in Kidlington and rest of the Cherwell.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation                                       | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                                   | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry       | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes            | 7            |                         |   | Object to SO18. The apportionment is likely to be increased and therefore the apportionment of 4,400 to CDC can only be treated as a minimum.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes      | West Oxfordshire District Council                  | 7            |                         |   | Support SO18 and consider that affordability is a key aspect.   |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy       | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd  | 7            |                         |   | Support SO18 and do not consider that any changes are required. New housing on sites PR14 and PR27 would be ideal for new entrants, key workers and those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas due to the close proximity of the land to the city and the good location of the land in relation to the existing and emerging transport network.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn     |  | 7            |                         |   | The word 'substantively' should be removed. Consider its insertion here to be a deliberate attempt to fudge the issue of Oxford's unmet need being overwhelmingly for affordable housing and thereby enable the pursuit of inappropriate and unsustainable development as long as it can be shown in some way to 'provide affordable access to the housing market.'   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk      | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust   | 7            |                         |   | Supports SO18. Sites PR23 and PR24 can provide for a range of housing, including affordable housing, key worker housing and Starter Homes.  |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster      | Fritwell Parish Council                            | 7            |                         |   | Supports this objective, but to achieve this housing must be located close to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede      |  | 7            |                         |   | No. Commuting into Oxford from the north, is not efficient, enjoyable, affordable or even safe, and providing housing for more commuters will make it even less so.   |
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric     | Rose        |  | 7            |                         |   | Support the draft vision as long as points, particularly the 50% threshold for affordable/keyworker/social housing, raised in the previous questions are addressed.   |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards    | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd     | 7            |                         |   | Support SO18.   |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle   | Land and Partners Ltd                              | 7            |                         |   | Support SO18, and it should be noted that a significant amount of existing local stock can already serve those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas. New development to serve local needs can release this existing stock.   |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley       | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group          | 7            |                         |   | SO18 is not sufficiently clear whether this refers to provision of affordable housing or to an overall improvement of the affordability of the housing market. It only seeks to provide affordable access to certain groups, so for example, it would not address the affordable needs or affordability problems (whichever it relates to) of established households who work outside the key employment areas in Oxford City or who do not work. This would be both contrary to national policy and would also not be enforceable. Suggest rewording the objective to "To provide a mix of affordable and market housing for Oxford City which meets the needs of the population in locations which are accessible to the employment offer and services of Oxford City." |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden       | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates           | 7            |                         |   | Supports SO18. Grange Farm at Launton would assist in providing a range of housing to assist in contributing towards Oxford's unmet housing needs.  |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                        | 7            |                         |   | Spreading 4400 new homes across Cherwell District will not meet the needs of those on low incomes, or key workers with jobs in Oxford; it will just add to the many thousands already to commuting London and Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson   |  | 8            | A, B                    | PR20, PR48, PR51, PR75, PR92, PR23, PR24, PR74, | Improvements to the transport network should be ongoing and not contingent on new housing developments. Oxford and its environs have significant congestion that needs addressing. It's encouraging to see ideas in the transport strategy but concerning to note the OTS high forecasts for additional traffic. This rep provides a detailed analysis of the OTS and its provision at sites within search areas A and B.   |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert     | Davies      | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford | 8            |                         | PR51  | Support SO19 in principle given that it seeks to meet Oxford's need in such a way that it complements the LTP, which promotes sustainable transport initiatives including Park and Ride facilities. PR51 is an unconstrained site which is highly suitable and logical for housing to meet Oxford's needs and could also potentially include an appropriately situated Park and Ride facility, as set out in the Oxfordshire County Council Report - Oxford Park and Ride - Future Strategy Report (May 2016). The location of housing, Park and Ride and other complementary uses is provided on an attached masterplan.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler      | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                        | 8            |                         |   | Yes   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname     | Organisation                           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0033 | Henry               | Munday      |  | 8            |                         |               | Have not read the local transport plan, but before building commences rail and roads need widening. Suggest a new ring road further out from Oxford and an elevated road if Wendlebury is built over   |
| PR-B-0039 | Susan               | Cooper      |  | 8            |                         |               | Yes, support it and would like to see more emphasis on efficient public transport as opposed to Park and Rides.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia             | Hall        |  | 8            |                         |               | Oxfordshire County Council needs to invest in public transport for commuters, to ease congestion on the roads.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew             | Taylor      | Aitchison Rafferty                     | 8            |                         |               | Yes. The proposed transport schemes within the Connecting Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan to deliver A41 infrastructure improvements and bus priority, together with Park and Ride facilities would be welcomed.  |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony             | Hall        |  | 8            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue                 | Mackrell    | Bicester Town Council                  | 8            |                         |               | Concerned that the Strategic Transport Plan is not robust enough and traffic issues will continue to escalate.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A                 | McCall      |  | 8            |                         |               | This is Oxford city's unmet housing needs which is being foisted onto vulnerable villages in the district.   |
| PR-B-0120 | E                   | Tonkin      |  | 8            |                         |               | No, CDC needs to develop less economically successful locations. Congestion would increase in Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul                | Goulding QC |  | 8            |                         |               | Yes, subject to improvement of public transport services and links in and around Oxford. However, there has to be a realistic assessment of the lack of public transport links (e.g. bus services) to villages in the Cherwell District (e.g. Noke) and the improbability of any material improvement in the future. This is a strong reason not to build more houses in those villages with poor transport links.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val                 | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK | 8            |                         |               | Agree, provided it is accepted that the current adopted Local Plan in part already achieves a level of support to Oxford by the extent of allocations at Bicester.   |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin               | Carrit      |  | 8            |                         |               | Yes, fully support the SO19 statement.   |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth       |  | 8            |                         |               | Yes, it has to be delivered due to the geographic relationship of Kidlington and Yarnton to Oxford. It will help key workers, it may need additional bus routes i.e. direct to the JR hospital.  |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                | Walker      | Oxford Bus Company                     | 8            |                         |               | Have concerns about the aspirations of these plans. They question its ability to deliver infrastructure required against the clear gap between aspiration and funding.<br>Oxfordshire County Council's Bus Rapid Transit schemes to help buses to get to the city more quickly are not mature enough to demonstrate how the highway will be used to facilitate this and therefore what journey time improvements can be made that would be sufficient and deliverable alternative to what is being proposed by the applicant. Suggest phasing to allow infrastructure to be delivered that enables development to be sustainable. This includes how developments will be connected and initiatives to ensure journey times are reduced and journey time reliability if enhanced. |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings    |  | 8            |                         |               | Agree that any contribution should be integrated with a Transport Plan, but in the absence of more detail cannot currently agree that the Transport plan looks sound. Still argue that it is better to locate jobs in another hub away from Oxford and locate affordable housing closer to where people can walk or cycle to work (Headington and Cowley) rather than increasing traffic around ring roads.  |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright  |  | 8            |                         |               | Any contribution by CDC to meet Oxford's housing needs would have to be conditional on the Local Transport Plan. As it stands it is inadequate for coping with the transport needs of a vastly increased population in Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield    |  | 8            |                         |               | No, changes are required to preserve the GB.   |
| PR-B-0641 | J                   | Willoughby  |  | 8            |                         |               | No.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname             | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|---------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0643 | L              | Allen               |  | 8            |                         |               | No, at present there appears to be no achievable transport plan. The councils do not have the ability to influence commercial operators as is seen with the bus services running between Oxford and Kidlington, which miss out Begbroke and Yarnton. Emphasis would also be better focused on diverting traffic that is passing through Oxfordshire, away from the congested areas around the city.  |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter          | Webber              |  | 8            |                         |               | Only if there is continual investment in transport within and around local communities, and it gives access to Oxford, Banbury and Bicester. Housing added to existing sites with Park and Ride facilities will only reduce rural community bus services.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary | Shirley             |  | 8            |                         |               | No, there has been insufficient thought. Do not wish to live like Bicester. Each new house will have two or three cars, increasing pollution and causing gridlock.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G         | Shirley             |  | 8            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan          | Oldfield            |  | 8            |                         |               | Not sure how currently insoluble traffic problems can be solved by adding more cars.   |
| PR-B-0704 | J              | Kershaw             | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 8            |                         |               | Capacity improvements are needed on the A34, A40 and A44 to deal with the current levels of traffic let alone in relation to the future provision of housing. These key strategic roads require a vast level of investment alongside the initiatives outlined in the LTP because these initiatives alone are not going to make much difference to current residents. It would be wrong for the Council to act like some banks where the best deals are reserved for new customers leaving existing customers to a large extent ignored.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick           | Small               | Stagecoach   | 8            |                         |               | Strongly supports and welcomes SO19. In addition the Plan should take full advantage of suitable additional opportunities presented by the selected development strategy and specific development schemes supported by the strategy, to effectively and sustainably enhance the operation and sustainability of the local transport network.   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn         | Phillips            |  | 8            |                         |               | Oxford city has been unable to demonstrate a sound transport strategy and continue to carry out a piecemeal approach to working. This level of building requires national support to improve the transport arteries.   |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony        | Matthews            | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 8            |                         |               | Generally support the draft strategic objective SO19   |
| PR-B-0723 | RA             | Humphreys           | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 8            |                         |               | Have grave doubts that such as vision is achievable. In particular, the existing infrastructure, in terms of the local road network and provision for schools, healthcare and other essential services, is already under severe pressure. These facilities are limited in Yarnton and, are not capable of accommodating additional housing development on the scale proposed. Furthermore, there is nothing to suggest that realistic and deliverable plans are in place to provide the necessary infrastructure improvements. LTP seeks to reduce pressure on the local road network by encouraging the location of housing close to jobs where people can more easily walk or cycle to work and in places where people will be able to use high quality public transport to get to work. |
| PR-B-0743 | John           | Tremlett            |  | 8            |                         |               | Yes. support SO19  |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian         | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories   | 8            |                         |               | It is difficult to understand how supporting housing development in Steeple Aston could contribute to a sustainable transport aspiration even with a S106 contribution towards public transport provision if public transport is not then used.  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin         | Palmer              |  | 8            |                         |               | Should be asking why Oxford is not addressing much of its requirement, rather than allowing vast business parks to be built such as that at Cowley.  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve          | Pickles             | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 8            |                         |               | The objective is supported   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane           | Olds                | Caversfield Parish Council   | 8            |                         |               | Yes  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation                                    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0793 | Philip           | Morley   | North Oxford Golf Club                          | 8            |                         |               | SO19 relates to the Local Transport Plan. Have a concern that this consultation, the Local Plan before it, and the Local Transport Plan, are not taking sufficient account of the rapid changes in transport that are arising from social and technology changes. As an example would draw CDC's attention to the deal, already live, between Uber and a city in New Jersey. Its aim is to reduce the need for future carparks to be built. Such changes are mentioned in the Local Transport Plan, but only in a cursory way. Indeed, local companies, such as Oxbotica, are at the core of these technology changes. 2031 could see dramatically fewer vehicles on the road than 2017. Also believe that the consultation and related documents may not be taking enough account of the ageing population and the consequent growth in requirements for hospital and specialist care, even allowing for adoption of new technologies and medical knowledge. Oxford hospitals are clustered on the east side of the City, and so sites to the east of the Banbury Road could have more significance for housing. |
| PR-B-0796 | David            | Tighe    |   | 8            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive            | Booth    | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group             | 8            |                         |               | Agree, but state that, SO19 should also recognise ongoing work by the Oxfordshire Growth Board to evaluate existing transport infrastructure capacity.  |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard |   | 8            |                         |               | Do not support the draft objectives.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris            | Robbins  |   | 8            |                         |               | Reservations about some of the County Council transport plans. It does make sense for housing developments and transport improvements to be mutually compatible.  |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim              | Green    | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association      | 8            |                         |               | Do not support SO19. Traffic around this area is already very congested. At times the traffic queues back for miles in many directions. There are already very significant housing developments in the pipeline all of which will add to this traffic - e.g. Northern Gateway, Barton Park, Elsfield Way, Wolvercote Paper Mill etc. The effect of these on traffic should be measured before any further large scale development is planned on one of the main routes into Oxford. In addition the well documented problems on the A34 and A40 have not yet been resolved and it is by no means certain that planned measures to deal with these roads will help. Recent multi-million pound works to the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts have not improved the traffic flow. Will however have increased pollution due to the amount of stationary traffic.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder    | Gladman Developments Ltd                        | 8            |                         |               | Rewording suggested as follows ' To provide Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet needs in such a way that it complements the County Council's LTP, including where applicable, its Oxford Transport Strategy and so that it facilitates wherever possible and appropriate, demonstrable and deliverable improvements to the availability of sustainable transport for access to Oxford'  |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor   |   | 8            |                         |               | No. Transport plan is unrealistic and sound. Traffic around Oxford is extremely congested, building more houses will make it worse. Recent "improvements" to the Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts have not significantly improved the traffic flow. Large number of traffic lights, always stationary traffic at these roundabouts increasing air pollution. A4144 and A4165 into Oxford already congested. Your reports suggesting to the contrary are incorrect and misleading.  |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce    | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire | 8            |                         |               | Support this strategic objective and do not consider that any changes are required.   |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus           | Campbell | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group        | 8            |                         |               | Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in their representation. They highlight the proportionate need for primary care, including all types of assisted living, extra care housing, care/nursing homes, etc. would be needed with an increase in population and some secondary care too!. They consider that the growth in population is likely to represent a significant additional workload for GPs and will exponentially impact on the capacity of a practice to accommodate growth. It would be helpful for CCG to engage in discussions relating to any of these development as early as possible.  |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel            | Buttler  |   | 8            |                         |               | More homes should be provided by Oxford.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha                | Eliot      | Oxford Preservation Trust   | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO19 and considers that sustainable transport, public transport, cycling and walking as well as cars, lies at the heart of the success of any housing development in Cherwell district and this should be a key criterion in assessing where development can go (Question 3 and 4).  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard                | Hills      |   | 8            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0837 | David                  | Jackson    | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP                                | 8            |                         |               | This is supported. It should also be recognised that the identification of sites should be informed by additional criteria that define sustainable development. It should also refer to the NIC Interim Report on the Oxford-Milton Keynes-Cambridge Corridor. There is also opportunity to contribute towards Cherwell's own housing need in locations that will benefit from investment in the east West Rail Line and the Oxford-Cambridge Expressway.   |
| PR-B-0838 | David                  | Jackson    | Savills on behalf of University of Oxford, Christ Church, Exeter, Magdalen, Merton and St John's Colleges | 8            |                         |               | SO19 is supported. The report should also refer to the NIC interim report on the Oxford-Milton Keynes-Cambridge Corridor and the commitment to an Oxford to Cambridge Expressway; and the East West rail line. The NIC states that this could be the UK's Silicon Valley  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike                   | Gilbert    | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd   | 8            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex                   | Wilson     | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd  | 8            |                         |               | This is in general accordance with para 30 of the NPPF.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler     | Bloombridge LLP   | 8            |                         |               | SO19 should be more specific. It needs to refer to the delivery of public transport improvements to Langford Lane and Banbury Road. This needs to be set up as the principal axis for travelling in to Oxford. This approach will preserve the countryside (and GB) setting of the A44 south of the airport.  |
| PR-B-0856 | David                  | Smith      |   | 8            |                         |               | Yes.  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC  | 8            |                         |               | The Parish supports this objective, however very concerned about the potential impact of large scale development on existing transport infrastructure given the congestion on the road network at peak times, the cutting of bus services by Oxfordshire County Council and existing parking problems. Question how new development can be successfully accommodated without exacerbating these problems.   |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter                  | Nicholson  |   | 8            |                         |               | The objective implies that only through meeting City's unmet housing will new sustainable transport measures be delivered in the Oxford area. Not confident that Oxfordshire County Council will deliver the transport improvements. Therefore difficult to believe that "demonstrable and deliverable improvements to the availability of sustainable transport for access to Oxford really will happen with the extra new housing. Discusses in more detail the ITA and transport issues in the representation. |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter                  | Hainsworth |   | 8            |                         |               | No, because it has been inadequately thought through and consultation has been exceptionally poor.  |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council  | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO19   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council   | 8            |                         |               | Unable to respond - Insufficient time to consider the issues in detail  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley    |   | 8            |                         |               | Yes. But actually it's meaning is obscure so it is difficult to be sure. It is unclear what 'it' is in the 5th line up. If it is 'Cherwell's contribution' then it is hard to see how that can facilitate 'improvements to the availability of sustainable transport'.  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks      |   | 8            |                         |               | The importance is how this can actually be achieved as the A44, A34, Banbury Road corridor is already at capacity. Oxford Parkway provides good access to Oxford but must be reached on the same road network. The Local Transport plan should be revised in light of the cuts to rural bus services and poor management of the North ring road improvements.   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street     |   | 8            |                         |               | Yes. Sustainable transport links are key. Links between centres within Cherwell, for example Banbury to Bicester to Kidlington should be given as much importance as their access to Oxford, by consideration of areas of employment growth outside the city.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0897 | Rob        | Lawrence |  | 8            |                         |               | No. do not support this because It is not fit for purpose from the perspective of Cherwell residents. Radical changes are needed by Oxford with public transport to and within the city. Road access to Banbury railway station car park is convoluted and need streamlining to prevent traffic congestion at peak times. Banbury to Oxford train is overcrowded at peak times. Park and Ride requires a direct metro link to Oxford and not rely on buses.  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa    | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council   | 8            |                         |               | Support  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison     | Forfar   |  | 8            |                         |               | The objective is not meet by the local plan. To complement the transport plan, sites for development need to have safe walking and cycling and have a bus service to the nearest transport hub. No evidence to make the roads safer for cycling or provide local bus services.   |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark       | Lowen    |  | 8            |                         |               | This appears to be the wrong way around as transport strategy should follow the housing strategy. However it's questionable that Oxfordshire County Council can deliver any such transport strategy.   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton   |  | 8            |                         |               | Criticism towards the lack of a transport strategy now and for the future. The prospect of the rapid transit links being built is little, if it is just more buses these would compete with the cars on the inadequate roads at peak times. A34 northbound and A40 eastbound are slow with no fix in place. The Parkway to Marylebone rail link is tremendous but to along time to implement, any new rapid transit link will take time to develop, housing will get built and there will be gridlock. People will still want to use cars as they are convenient and flexible, not to be forced to use public transport. Cycling should be encouraged and enjoyed with a safer provision around in and around Oxford.                            |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew     | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                 | 8            |                         |               | Does not have confidence that the Oxfordshire County Council LTP will deliver sustainable transport to deliver improvements to the current situation as well as handling the additional burden of those needing access to Oxford from the new housing developments.  |
| PR-B-0912 | David      | Mason    |  | 8            |                         |               | Yes, but only if Oxfordshire County Council's transport strategy does not adversely impact on CDC in comparison with other District Councils.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 8            |                         |               | The LTP does not put forward proposals to sort out Oxford transport issues. Have discussed some of the issues with the roads and rail in the LTP in their representation. Consider that the reference to Rapid Transport is vague, and are concerned that there is no planned infrastructure for the planned growth. Transport is a huge problem and is unlikely to resolved. They question how CDC proposes to solve this problem within the proposed timeline for the increased housing, when the means of improvement are not even at planning stage.   |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 8            |                         |               | Yes, the draft SO19 complements the LTP and the Oxford Transport Strategy.   |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie      | Lodwick  |  | 8            |                         |               | Objects to SO19 and does not believe that this can be implemented. The existing transport infrastructure for access to Oxford from surrounding settlements is already over-stretched. There are plans for Rapid Transit public transport, but has not seen any evidence of upgrading road systems and any rapid transit. On the contrary the traffic system should be used to take traffic away form Oxford centre. Suggests that a retail park be built at the Northern Gateway area. This would act as a pressure valve for Oxford city centre, helping to stem the ever increasing number of buses, cars and pedestrians that currently clog it. That would welcomed by the residents of north Oxford, Kidlington and many outlying villages. |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds     | Fringford Parish Council   | 8            |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter      | Bateman  | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                             | 8            |                         |               | Linking the housing growth to the LTP is a suitable objective, however it should be considered with the evidence of a complete county wide IDP to be robust.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle         | Greenlight Developments   | 8            |                         |               | Should refer to Cherwell's contribution to meet Oxford's needs. SO19 could be extended to state that it will build upon existing public transport and capacity improvements. Examples are given. Trying to emphasise that Oxford's local area of influence is greater than perhaps SO19 suggests. Bicester is highlighted as an example.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone         |   | 8            |                         |               | Totally disagree with this assertion. Any proposals from Oxfordshire County Council will not meet the needs of the present horrendous traffic congestion around Oxford and will completely exacerbate limited capacity reducing vehicle movement and journey times to work especially as a majority of employment sites are south of the City of Oxford. The sites proposed in areas A and B do nothing to reduce over whelming traffic conditions.   |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo      |   | 8            |                         |               | Fear that this will just not be delivered. There is a crying need for there to be a relief or link road between the A40 from Witney through to Peartree. See no sign of it. What is said in your document are just fine words but with no prospect of delivery.   |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk          | Banbury Civic Society   | 8            |                         |               | So far as can be ascertained LTP 4 does not make provision for increased movement into / out of Oxford City from sites to the north and therefore a modification to LTP 4 will be necessary when the 'unmet needs' sites have been selected. Given that the employment focus will be the City area ( or to the south of the City) it is obvious that the site search must be in the south of the District (i.e. south of a line from Bicester to Woodstock) if the sustainability criteria is to be met.  |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council  | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO19, the ongoing review of the bus subsidies to reduce services does not complement Oxford Transport Strategy and is likely to increase in private car travel from Banbury to Oxford. This will not facilitate sustainable transport improvements to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO19   |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 8            |                         |               | The contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet need should be delivered in a way that ensures sustainable transport is available for access to Oxford. This might be delivered through improvements not already envisioned through the LTP.   |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett       |   | 8            |                         |               | Support this, as it is a key element in the whole partial review. Good bus service from Bicester to Oxford via the dual carriageway, despite the improvements to the A41 and A34 crossing at J9 of the M40 there are still long delays at peak times and you do not know when you will arrive in Oxford. To gain access to the bus to Oxford you walk via a churchyard, but on the way have you to walk across four lanes of fast moving busy traffic on the A41, often in the dark.  |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner        | Launton Parish Council  | 8            |                         |               | Yes, no changes required.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council                                      | 8            |                         |               | Support improvements to on and off-road links to Oxford from new sites near Oxford. Do not support improvements to the road networks just for the purpose of new developments at greater distances in Cherwell district, thus encouraging more commuter traffic into Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                               | 8            |                         |               | Should be amended to refer to connections to key employment areas in the Science Vale. We suggest the following wording be added to the end of SO19: 'and core Science Vale locations at Culham, Milton Park and Harwell'.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 8            |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | 8            |                         |               | Agrees in principle, but considers that LTP rationale for building new Park and Rides north of Oxford to reduce congestion at Pear Tree Interchange has now to be amended to keep the Park and Ride at Pear Tree open, which would have provided an opportunity to free up brownfield land for housing rather than encroaching on the Green Belt. Also refers to the direct links between Kidlington/Begbroke and East Oxford employment areas in the LTP, but considers that Peartree undermines the viability of the replacement sites and discusses these issues in more detail in the representation. |



| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan     | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd   | 8            |                         |               | The contribution to meeting Oxford's needs should be delivered in a way which ensures sustainable transport is available for access to Oxford. This might be delivered through improvements and in locations, not already envisioned through Oxfordshire County Council's Local Transport Plan.   |
| PR-B-1032 | David        | Burson    | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford           | 8            |                         |               | The LTP also encourages a reduction in the need to travel, and effective transport systems. It is fundamentally important that housing built outside the City in Cherwell to meet Oxford's housing needs is easily accessible to Oxford. In order to avoid worsening the existing traffic congestion and transport emissions of pollutants this accessibility needs to be provided via sustainable transport means. The LTP4 and Oxford Transport Strategy provides the means to achieve this.  |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert       | Davies    | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace  | 8            |                         |               | Agree to Objective SO18. Consider that the need to provide housing in a way that complements the County Council's Local Transport Plan and the Oxford Transport Strategy is recognised and supported. The provision of existing and potential new sustainable transport links into and out of the city of Oxford should be a key consideration in the identification of sites for housing to meet Oxford's unmet need.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments         | 8            |                         |               | Yes, this is broadly supported. It is clear that the strong sustainable transport connections (outlined in the rep) between Bicester and Oxford which have been and are proposed to be delivered, facilitate the ability to meet Oxford's unmet needs in a way which complements the aims and objectives of the LTP.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson     |   | 8            |                         |               | Using low or zero emission transport is good. Sustainable transport always respects the integrity of the existing natural environment and heritage with the inclusion of GB. Encourage communication technology to minimise commuting and enabling dispersed employment.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP           | Lyes      |   | 8            |                         |               | Yes. Essential regardless of number of homes to be built.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F     | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 8            |                         |               | The wording is satisfactory if Cherwell concedes to City's need.  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val          | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council   | 8            |                         |               | Agrees, but considers that Cherwell's contribution is too high and Oxford should provide more housing within the City.  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg         | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 8            |                         |               | The development of land NW of Oxford Airport and Land E of Marlborough School will support the aims of SO19. The rep includes detailed Transport Strategy documents in support of the promoted sites which provide a detailed assessment of the transport implications on existing and future networks.   |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan         | Storah    | Oxford City Council   | 8            |                         |               | Suggests an amendment to SO19 to state: "To provide Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs in such a way that its locations complement the County Council's Local Transport Plan, including where applicable, its Oxford Transport Strategy, so that it minimises the need to travel and maximises the use of sustainable modes of transport whilst also facilitating demonstrable and deliverable improvements to the availability of sustainable transport for access to jobs and services in Oxford." to adhere to the principle of minimising the need to travel in this particular context. |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith        | Johnston  |   | 8            |                         |               | No. It appears CDC is being held to ransom with no infrastructure improvement without accommodating an unsubstantiated, unmet housing need.   |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain         | Johnson   |   | 8            |                         |               | Yes agree that a sustainable transport plan is needed. But must not add to the traffic problems around Oxford without additional infrastructure being in place first.   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat          | Clissold  |   | 8            |                         |               | Put intra city transport first.   |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie        | Lewis     | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                   | 8            |                         |               | See Q5 above.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1132 | Linda      | Ward      | Kidlington Development Watch                                 | 8            |                         |               | Objects to SO19 and question how building 4400 houses can “facilitate demonstrable and deliverable improvements to the availability of sustainable transport for access to Oxford.” This is meaningless. The Local Transport Plan is full of impressive sounding terms which will mean little in reality. See little hard evidence that it will be possible to satisfactorily deal with existing problems let alone accommodate the traffic growth implied by 15,000 additional houses around Oxford (of which the 4,400 is just part). |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip     | Towler    |  | 8            |                         |               | The transport infrastructure in North Oxford and Kidlington has regular gridlock, particularly around Pear Tree and access to the A34. Any development will make the situation worse. Improvements at Cutteslowe and Kidlington roundabouts were poorly planned, badly managed and have delivered little improvement. Have no confidence in the count council's ability to deliver its Local Transport plan.  |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard    | Bennett   |  | 8            |                         |               | Yes support this objective. Again though infrastructure plans are essential before development.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ         | French    | Deddington Development Watch                                 | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO19, but consider that providing it positively promotes the use of sustainable modes of transport (i.e. high quality "welcoming" public transport, cycling, walking) and reduces dependence on the private motor car.   |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim        | Spencer   |  | 8            |                         |               | Yes, although strategic changes will be required.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey    | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council                                      | 8            |                         |               | Objects to Objective SO19 - The current service is between Woodstock, Kidlington, Oxford Parkway, and Summertown. No consideration is given to Begbroke and Yarnton. Loss of K2 bus service have not been addressed by Oxfordshire County Council. Current transport issues are unmanageable with little scope for future improvement. The recent "improvements" on the A40 at Cutteslowe and Wolvercote will only be short term.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger      | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council                                       | 8            |                         |               | No. There is nothing in the County Council Local Transport Plan's Oxford Transport Strategy that could suggest several thousand additional cars per day at commuter peaks from outlying districts could be adequately handled. With reduced resources for buses and greater distances mitigating against cycling it is hard to see any new way of bringing commuters into central Oxford from outlying areas. Increased numbers = unsustainable transport demand.   |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine  | Arakelian |  | 8            |                         |               | No. Traffic flow down the A34, A44 and A4126, have not been properly assessed and additional traffic would be a disaster. Both the County Local Transport Plan and the Oxford Transport Strategy appear to be chronically underfunded, over-ambitious and so unachievable in the current climate. It is highly likely that infrastructure needed to support housing and jobs would not be built before the houses.  |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline   | Johnson   |  | 8            |                         |               | The Local Transport Plan has no substance. Before additional housing and employment is added to Oxford there needs to be delivery of transport improvements. Oxford City can barely contain the current transport movements and any perturbation results in major disruption. Any contribution that Cherwell makes will be exacerbating the transport issues in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi       | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands                                     | 8            |                         |               | Support SO19  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis      | Davies    |  | 8            |                         |               | Am not sure County Council's Local Transport Plan is anything to go by when it has cut bus services forcing people to use cars.   |
| PR-B-1180 | RA         | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd | 8            |                         |               | The LTP and Oxford Transport Strategy seek to reduce pressure on the local road network by encouraging the location of housing close to jobs where people can more easily walk or cycle to work and in places where people will be able to use high quality public transport to get to work. Yarnton is a relatively small rural settlement and, in sustainability terms, is not well located in relation to main employment and public transport facilities.   |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi      | Lancaster |  | 8            |                         |               | No, do not support SO19. If there was no additional development the transport plan would still probably not meet the transport needs.   |
| PR-B-1182 | Alison     | Noel      |  | 8            |                         |               | No, do not support this objective.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1188 | Carol      | Matheson        |   | 8            |                         |               | Support a linked up transport system that serves all, however there is already congestion in and around Kidlington and parking is a problem. The new station and parking charges at Water Eaton Park and Ride has exacerbated the parking problems before additional cars are added. Having a good public transport link from a new development area into Oxford would alleviate the current congestion.              |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss            | Adderbury Parish Council  | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO 19 but also requests that, should other Search areas be used for the apportionment, that areas H and E are considered due to their public transport connections with Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt            | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 8            |                         |               | Yes. No changes are required.   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway        | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 8            |                         |               | Yes. This is a long and detailed response which refers to Oxfordshire County Council's Local Transport Plan and questions the findings of the Council's preliminary Transport and Sustainability Assessments. It goes on to state that the site has been designed to reduce car use and is located in a sustainable location for fast and direct commuting in to central Oxford and to other destinations.            |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 8            |                         |               | Support. It is critical that links between development sites in Cherwell and employment areas of heading ton and Cowley are in place early in the plan. Rapid Transit Line 3 and Chiltern Railways proposed service to East Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green           |   | 8            |                         |               | No, do not support this. The transport plan is unrealistic. Traffic around Oxford is extremely congested and building more houses will make this worse, especially when the Northern Gateway is taken into account. The A4144 and A4165 routes into Oxford are already very congested and your reports that suggest the contrary are incorrect and misleading.  |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark       | Schmull         | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 8            |                         |               | Request that it is amended as follows: 'To provide Cherwell's contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs in such a way that it complements the County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP) including where applicable, its Oxford Transport Strategy, and/or that takes opportunities to provide new transport connections that are identified outside of the LTP or Transport Strategy, and so that it.... |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 8            |                         |               | No comments to make.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 8            |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 8            |                         |               | Yes. Draft SO19 is supported.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO19, however is concerned about the potential impact of large scale development on existing transport infrastructure given the congestion on the road network at peak times, cutting of bus services by Oxfordshire CC and parking problems. Questions how new development can be successfully accommodated without exacerbating these problems.  |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 8            |                         |               | Only if the objectives includes the provision of infrastructure prior to building more homes and if there is clarity regarding the protection of the GB. The provision of 4400 homes which could result in over 10,000 additional adults and children in the area requires consideration to facilities, such as roads, transport, schools, and medical facilities.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 8            |                         |               | No do not support.  |
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard        |   | 8            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew     | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 8            |                         |               | Agrees with SO19, but the plans should not just "complement" LTP4, they should enhance it. If you build segregated, well-lit cycle lines along wish-lines and dedicated bus lanes which will be quicker than driving, people will use them. If you don't, they will take their car. This needs to be hard-wired into the plans now.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells       | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 8            |                         |               | Supports this objective, but considers that this requires genuine and certain delivery of the transport infrastructure in parallel with new housing.   |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling    |   | 8            |                         |               | Only under the transport conditions. Developments should only be allowed if they are situated outside Oxford's GB and a fast green public transport system is in place before any the houses are completed. Currently the route from Oxford along the Banbury Road doesn't cope. Dedicated bus and cycle lanes are needed from North Kidlington to the centre of Oxford, present journey times are not acceptable. An electric bus or tram system is required as a matter of urgency   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry       | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO19, and consider that focussing growth within and adjacent to the key urban areas also supports the delivery of new bus services, allowing new routes to be concentrated along key corridors, maximising the viability of investment in these services.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes      | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 8            |                         |               | Support SO19, and the link to the County Council's Local Transport Plan and the Oxford Transport Strategy. The impact on the A44 corridor needs to be carefully considered, and it is vital that both districts work together with the County Council to bring forward the proposed A40/A44 link.  |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha    | Blackmore   | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family                    | 8            |                         |               | Support SO19, and consider that Cherwell's contribution complements LTP, including where applicable, its Oxford Transport Strategy, so that its facilitates demonstrable and deliverable improvements to the availability of sustainable transport for access to Oxford. Distributing housing allocations so that they complement the Transport Plan will ensure that the residents of any new developments are connected to the existing and proposed transport network to reduce isolation and ensure ease of access to Oxford City where many residents will be commuting to. |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy       | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd                       | 8            |                         |               | Support SO19 and do not consider that any changes are required.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn     |   | 8            |                         |               | Yes.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk      | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO19. Sites PR23 and PR24 complement wider strategic plans of the County Council. The A44 provides a direct, major and largely dual route to Oxford incorporating premium bus routes, connecting Oxford City with Begbroke and beyond. Have provided a detailed comment in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster      | Fritwell Parish Council   | 8            |                         |               | Broadly supports this objective.   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede      |   | 8            |                         |               | Having commuted for many years and tried all transport options available, they are all either time consuming, expensive, inconvenient, dangerous or a combination of these. Recently upgraded train line and roundabouts have improved but not solved the situation. Short of creating a new direct bidirectional bus or tram lane through Kidlington into Oxford any additional commuters would overwhelm any "sustainable transport" routes.   |
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric     | Rose        |   | 8            |                         |               | Support the draft vision as long as points raised in the previous questions are addressed as the Draft Vision would support many of the residents. However, the transport must be in place before any housing is built.  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards    | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                          | 8            |                         |               | Support SO19.  |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle   | Land and Partners Ltd   | 8            |                         |               | Support SO19. The contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs should be delivered in a way which ensures sustainable transport is available for access to Oxford. This might be delivered through improvements not already envisioned through the County Council's Local Transport Plan. Reliance on the transport plan should not prejudice sustainable development in locations not considered by the County Council.   |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden       | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                                | 8            |                         |               | Supports SO19.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group   | 8            |                         |               | Spreading 4400 new homes across Cherwell District will not meet the needs of those on low incomes, or key workers with jobs in Oxford; it will just add to the many thousands already commuting to London and Oxford.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0731 | Ioana      | Davies     |   | 9            | A                       |               | Yes. Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Option A closest to Oxford. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB.   |
| PR-B-0828 | Roger      | Smith      | Savills on behalf of Croudace Homes   | 9            | A                       |               | Croudace Homes controls land at St Frideswide Farm which is owned by Christ Church. A site plan is provided. The site is located within the administrative boundary of Oxford City Council, but it adjoins the boundary with CDC and therefore land east of Banbury Road which forms part of Area A. The merits of this site are described in the rep. Area A is considered the most appropriate location for strategic housing development to help meet Oxford's unmet needs. |
| PR-B-0837 | David      | Jackson    | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP                                | 9            | A                       |               | The general approach to identifying areas of search is considered acceptable. Area A represents the most sustainable location for sites to meet Oxford's unmet need.   |
| PR-B-0838 | David      | Jackson    | Savills on behalf of University of Oxford, Christ Church, Exeter, Magdalen, Merton and St John's Colleges | 9            | A                       |               | As a general approach to identifying areas of search this may be valid, but it overlooks the key consideration in the context of looking for sites to meet Oxford's unmet need. i.e. proximity to the City. Locations close to Oxford are the most sustainable. Area of search A is best suited to meet Oxford's unmet needs. After that the preferred area of search would be Area B  |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux   | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd                                      | 9            | A                       |               | Many of the sites proposed occupy the strategic gap between Oxford and Kidlington. This gap contains a major transport hub. East-west routes through this area are already congested and would be further slowed by local traffic from additional development within this area.  |
| PR-B-0930 | Philip     | Marsh      | Knights on behalf of Philip King Homes and Oxford City Charity  | 9            | A                       |               | Area A is supported as the most appropriate location for strategic housing development to meet Oxford's unmet need. The site east of Kidlington and west of the A34 is a sustainable location with excellent access to public transport to a range of destinations such as Oxford and Bicester.  |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo   |   | 9            | A                       |               | If you develop area A, Kidlington it will become part of Oxford. GB and the green lung needs to be maintained between these two. Developing on the land close to Cutteslowe Park will have a significant and detrimental effect on this wonderful open space.  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles     | Kirtlington Parish Council  | 9            | A                       |               | Option A is considered appropriate for Oxford's unmet need, in particular the southern parts. Every effort should be made for good road and off-road links to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine  | Richenburg |   | 9            | A                       |               | Option A is especially inappropriate as development will damage Kidlington as a distinct and separate community, affect the GB and compound traffic problems on the A4165.   |
| PR-B-1158 | Elizabeth  | Leckie     |   | 9            | A                       |               | Area A is GB and am opposed to development in the Oxford GB which absorbs harmful pollution, supports a wide range of wildlife and provides a space for healthy leisure activities. The GB in area A ensures that Gosford and Kidlington retain a clear identity from Oxford allowing a sense of community and social cohesion. Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a legitimate reason to build on GB and CDC's policy to protect it must be upheld.    |
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin     | Leckie     |   | 9            | A                       |               | Area A is GB and am opposed to development in the Oxford GB which absorbs harmful pollution, supports a wide range of wildlife and provides a space for healthy leisure activities. The GB in area A ensures that Gosford and Kidlington retain a clear identity from Oxford allowing a sense of community and social cohesion. Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a legitimate reason to build on GB and CDC's policy to protect it must be upheld.    |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname                  | Organisation                                       | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0751 | Dr Katrin              | Kiessling                |  | 9            | A                       |               | Area A needs revision as this is GB which needs to be protected for many reasons. More sense to build on the Headington and Cowley side of Oxford. The traffic description in the Kidlington development plan is incorrect, there is congestion on a few routes already and building will only exacerbate the problem. Concerns with the flood plains and already existing flooding in the area, this will increase if built upon. New houses near the Oxford Parkway station/Kidlington etc. are not going to be more affordable as local estate agents are selling and advertising already houses to London commuters. This does not help Oxford nor local residents.   |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon                  | Handy                    | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd  | 9            | A                       |               | Area of Search A is the most suitable location to accommodate Oxford's unmet need, excluding the land immediately to the north of Oxford which is likely to result in coalescence between Kidlington and the city. Any housing growth not met just to the north of Oxford could be met through a combination of sites PR14 and PR27.  |
| PR-B-0747 | George A               | Doucas                   |  | 9            | A, B                    |               | CDC favours areas A and B, which are entirely in the GB. If released this would lead to coalescence of Oxford, Kidlington, Yarnton, Begbroke and possibly Woodstock, thus a violation almost of the purpose of the existence of the GB. To use the GB is unjustified and the Council should reject this.  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks                    |  | 9            | A, B                    |               | Search areas A and B are fundamentally flawed as they will have a significant and unjustified impact on the GB and rural setting. Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke will lose their identities and all suffer from insufficient amenities at present. Local roads are limited and trunk roads are at capacity with Oxford Parkway contributing to this. The rural setting of the canal and river will be impacted and there is limited local employment.   |
| PR-B-0959 | Cllrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |  | 9            | A, B                    |               | Agree with the Areas of Search A and B. However consider that when choosing the sites the Council needs to ensure that Oxford does not surround any of the settlements to the north of Oxford, and that none of these settlements join together by leaving enough green space around all of them.   |
| PR-B-0966 | E                      | Nicholson                |  | 9            | A, B                    |               | Search areas A and B are for the most part within the GB and totally disagree with the proposal to build there. The Government's NPPF states that GB is to prevent urban sprawl and safeguard the countryside from encroachment, this must be respected. Development could threaten the SSSI, Special Area of Conservation and local wildlife sites. Villages such as Islip, Shipton-on-Cherwell, Begbroke and Yarnton would become disproportionately large, saturated with traffic and pollution. They lack the infrastructure and amenities for a large development. There is no justifiable exception for building on the GB and CDC's policy to protect it must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon                  | Turner                   | Launton Parish Council                             | 9            | A, B                    |               | Options A and B are most suitable in all respects except green belt restrictions.   |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert                 | Davies                   | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford | 9            | A, B                    |               | Gerald Eve support the recognition of the defined area A on the basis that it is a sustainable location. Area B is not appropriate as it does not offer sustainable locations suitable to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs and would increase travel times and congestion to areas of employment in Oxford, in turn impacting upon economic efficiency and quality of life. On the basis that Oxford's unmet housing needs need to be met in sustainable locations in close proximity to Oxford, Area A is the only appropriate option as an area for housing growth to meet the identified need. Do not consider that the introduction of more regular buses to Oxford would provide a suitable alternative means of sustainable transport for housing delivered in Area of Search A. |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan                   | Storah                   | Oxford City Council                                | 9            | A, B                    |               | Agree with the Areas of Search A (immediately north of Oxford) and B (key transport corridors).   |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip                 | Towler                   |  | 9            | A, B                    |               | Too much focus has been placed on areas A and B, areas outside the GB should be investigated more. If the bulk of the 4,400 homes were to be sited in areas A and B the character of Kidlington village would change beyond recognition. They need to be dispersed among different areas to reduce the impact.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname     | Organisation                                    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1143 | Dr Pamela          | Roberts     |   | 9            | A, B                    |               | The majority of sites in areas A and B are in the Oxford GB and should remain protected by CDC's policy ESD14. The GB shelters wildlife, stores carbon, removes pollutants and absorbs rainwater. It also provides recreation and views for our well-being.   |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine          | Arakelian   |   | 9            | A, B                    |               | Support the objections to Areas A and B submitted by the parish councils of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington and the objections raised by Kidlington Development Watch. "We object strongly to development in the GB around Kidlington which is pleasant, unspoilt countryside with many well-used footpaths appreciated and enjoyed by the residents. It protects the historic city of Oxford from overdevelopment and unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and CDC's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld." Local residents are custodians of this countryside. Were consulted at length over the creation of the Kidlington Masterplan adopted by CDC in 2016, this should be the basis for future development. Giving up areas around Kidlington will damage our opportunities to provide for our own needs in the future. |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline           | Johnson     |   | 9            | A, B                    |               | The document favours areas A and B for further investigation. Most of these sites are in the Oxford GB this should not be the preferred area for development. Strongly object.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G                | Wakeling    |   | 9            | A, B                    |               | Only parts of Area A and very limited sections of Area B make sense, and then these should only be consider within the constraints of responses to questions 1 to 5 and question 7 above.   |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley             | Soanes      |   | 9            | A, B                    |               | Seems like areas A and B are the done deal. Make sure that all the options are looked at properly and at same level of detail and rigour as the A and B.  |
| PR-B-1296 | Graciela Inglesias | Rogers      |   | 9            | A, B                    |               | Yes. Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington (option A and B) has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1317 | Rachel             | Walton      |   | 9            | A, B                    |               | Strongly to development in search areas A and B around Kidlington which are in GB which is a permanent designation. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. The Government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Brownfield sites should be inexhaustibly researched for development before the GB. There has been no assessment on the impact to Kidlington's transport, local facilities and services or the flood risk.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian                | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                     | 9            | A, B                    |               | Considered to be the most suitable because of their closeness to the City and the best location for public transport.   |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve              | Pickles     | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd | 9            | A, B, C, D, G, H, I     |               | Areas A and B close to Kidlington are by far the best related to Oxford in terms of proximity. Given the good public transport connections they are also the most sustainable locations in terms of accessibility. Many of the other locations are very poorly related to Oxford including Options D, G, H and I. It would be difficult to provide good public transport links to these locations. Option C is closer to Oxford than some other options but is in a location where there are existing congestion issues.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| PR-B-1268 | Garry      | Lancaster   |   | 9            | A,B                     | PR167, PR178, PR50, PR122, PR125, PR23, PR24, PR34, PR74, PR91, PR92 | As a Kidlington resident my comments concern areas A and B. Many of the sites are in GB, to which only exceptional circumstances can this be developed on. Pressure to build can not be viewed as exceptional. The character of existing urban areas needs to be preserved. Kidlington is one of the UK's largest villages and we are proud of this. GB also prevents the joining of urban areas, to develop on sites PR167, PR178, PR50, PR122 and PR125 between Kidlington and Cutteslowe would effectively join Kidlington to Oxford. Also sites PR23, PR24, PR34, PR74, PR91 and PR92 west of Kidlington and near to Begbroke would merge these two separate villages. Many sites in areas A and B are in flood zones. There are current developments already in a flood prone zone south-east of Kidlington, further developments will affect drainage and increase the risk of flooding to all residents. Traffic on the Banbury and Oxford Road towards Oxford during rush hour often reaches near standstill and also other routes into Oxford. Cycling is often quicker than taking the car or bus. It's too soon to see the affect of the new train route and the improvements made to the Oxford ring road. Would welcome a modest increase in affordable housing, however the sheer scale of the plan which seems to indicate that development will be near Kidlington make it impossible to do anything but other than object robustly. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux    | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd    | 9            | B                       |  | Development to the north of Kidlington would avoid the exacerbation of the transportation issues created by Option A sites as it does not constitute development within the strategic transport gap between Kidlington and Oxford. The rep sets out the benefits of developing the Quarry site.  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg       | Blaquiere   | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 9            | B                       |  | Whilst parts of Option B are within GB, it is significant to note that the promoted sites are not. They are also the first locations to be arrived at from Oxford outside the designation. Land NW of Oxford airport would have the potential to form a new garden neighbourhood community served by its own local facilities to meet the needs of the community, with the Land East of Marlborough School extending the existing Woodstock settlement.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris      | Robbins     |   | 9            | B, I                    |  | Bletchington and Kirtlington which lie outside or on the edge of the GB to be included in area B rather than area I. They lie on a public transport route to Oxford which could increase if Upper Heyford proposals proceed. 100-200 houses in these villages could help sustain the viability and contribute to Oxford's unmet need.  |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett     |   | 9            | C                       |  | Area C is of particular relevance for the village of Wendlebury because of J9 of the M40. Since the M40 extension in 1992, and the dual carriage of the A34 and A41 section to Bicester, there is now an air quality problem, resulting in children and adults using asthma halers. The rep. provides a quote from Weston Front Group of Villages referring to air pollution at the Weston Otmoor proposal in 2008. There would be a threat to new residents health.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group   | 9            | C, D, E, G, H           |  | All too far from Oxford and totally unsuitable on environmental and transport grounds.   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane       | Olds        | Caversfield Parish Council  | 9            | C, E                    |  | Option C should be avoided due to the potential traffic challenges.<br>Option E should be avoided coalescence between the town of Bicester and the surrounding villages.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris      | Dicks       |   | 9            | C, E                    |  | Search areas C and E provide a better and more sustainable option for significant housing developments. There would be no impact on the GB and it's not in a rural setting. It's directly located on the M40 with good rail connections and better town centre amenities with local employment opportunities. Development would be an expansion of Bicester opposed to merging towns together and there's good availability of ex-MOD land.  |
| PR-B-0802 | Peter J    | Frampton    | Framptons on behalf of db Symmetry                                      | 9            | C, G                    |  | Areas of Search C and G are the two locations where a regional scale distribution centre would be best located to meet the needs of the manufacturing industry and serve market demand for electronic retailing. The opportunity to locate a regional distribution centre at these locations is illustrated on the accompanying plans. Either location is well located to provide employment opportunities within the logistics sector for economically active residents in Areas of Search A and E  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1342 | Laura      | Precious    | Quod on behalf of Albion Land                                  | 9            | E                       | PR3           | Agree, but considers that Area E should be included in the area of search. Preference towards areas A and B is inappropriate. Have provided a detailed statement and the reasons why the site is suitable, deliverable and available for development in response to this question in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon      | Joyce       | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire                | 9            | E                       |               | Area of Search E is the most suitable location to accommodate Oxford's unmet need. The Council's adopted Local Plan highlights Bicester and the surrounding area as a key growth location. Reference is made to LTP 4, the development of the 'Knowledge Spine' and the East-West rail project. Given the level of national and local investment being made in and around Bicester and its excellent links with Oxford it is logical that further sustainable development in this part of the District would be appropriate to meet Oxford's unmet housing need. However, acknowledge that it is inappropriate for Bicester itself to grow further. It is submitted that our client's land at Launton is well placed to sustainably provide a proportion of the 4,400 homes required. Further details on site characteristics of this site can be found in our response to Q13. |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex       | Wilson      | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd             | 9            | E                       |               | Due to its strong economic and transport connections with Oxford City, consider Bicester would be a logical location in which to bring forward new homes to meet the unmet need of Oxford City. A2D therefore welcomes the identification of Bicester in Areas of Search Option E.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle       | Greenlight Developments  | 9            | E                       |               | This is a lengthy response assessing each of the areas of search. It concludes by stating that Option E is the preferred area of search, and that development options here need to be fully explored and exhausted before development sites in the Oxford GB are even considered.   |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine  | Richenburg  |  | 9            | E, F                    |               | Options E and F as well as rural dispersal are probably the best choices. Bicester has already undergone considerable expansion with new facilities and good transport links.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham    |  | 9            | F                       |               | Provision of good public transport access to Oxford from Heyford Park is problematic and so should be excluded.   |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley       | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                      | 9            | F                       |               | The Areas of Search identify options to meet the needs of both Cherwell and Oxford City. Area of Search F provides a sustainable option to meet the unmet needs of Oxford City as it is well-related to Oxford by way of a rail connection. Area of Search F also provides the most sustainable, deliverable option to meet the needs of Cherwell in the longer-term. Have provided a detailed comment in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1347 | Zahra      | Alrashed    | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of Kenley Holdings | 9            | F                       |               | Support the inclusion of the Former RAF Upper Heyford and surrounding area (search option F). The SA and ITA findings for Letchmere Farm in Area F are recorded as having significant positive effects; therefore it should be considered within site assessments.  |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                                    | 9            | F                       |               | Further development at Upper Heyford and in the adjacent villages must be resisted.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham    |  | 9            | G                       |               | M40 J10 has no large settlement nearby so should be excluded.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam       | Ryder       | Gladman Developments Ltd                                       | 9            | H                       |               | Area of Search H seems too tightly drawn and should be expanded to include settlements such as Bloxham which are located in close proximity and with good transport links to Banbury  |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia     | Banbury Town Council   | 9            | H                       |               | The map of these areas (pg.45) demonstrates why 'Option H', is unsuitable for Oxford's unmet need.  |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom        | Hockaday    |  | 9            | H                       |               | Area H is the furthest from Oxford and transport is the least favourable of all the areas. It is already absorbing huge numbers of new houses under the Cherwell plan and does not address Oxford's opportunities for economic growth.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham    |  | 9            | H                       |               | Banbury has its own travel to work area and should therefore be excluded.   |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul       | Goulding QC |  | 9            | I                       |               | Area I (Remainder of District/Rural Dispersal) is particularly notable for its rural beauty and views, distinctive and unique village life, and limited infrastructure and public transport links. These factors should weigh heavily in future development of the Plan.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1027 | Jonathan   | Porter      | Archstone Projects Ltd                                | 9            | I                       |               | Combining all the sites within the rest of the district and rural areas in to one area of search (Option I) does not make sense for assessment. They vary hugely geographically and relate to different centres and transport links within the District. Option I should therefore be broken down so that the sub areas are assessed accordingly and more fairly.  |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie      | Lewis       | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate | 9            | I                       |               | For reasons set out elsewhere M and G Real Estate believes that Option I will be a necessary element of meeting the housing requirement in a sustainable manner.   |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother     | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies | 9            | I                       |               | Agrees that it is appropriate to identify areas of search across the whole District. However, question Area of Search I and whether it would make it easier to refine the proposals if this was split in to geographically more appropriate areas.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                           | 9            | I                       |               | Should be dismissed as it will simply add more and more expensive homes in the countryside without addressing the real needs of people seeking a home in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ         | French      | Deddington Development Watch                          | 9            | I                       |               | See the logic of defining Areas of Search around urban areas or other 'focal points', but do not understand the logic of Option I (Remainder of District/Rural Dispersal), which represents a 'scatter gun' approach for the sake of appearing to be inclusive. Self-evidently, development on the scale contemplated to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs in the rural areas would not be sustainable for a variety of reasons. This is confirmed by the Interim Transport Assessment and the Initial Sustainability Appraisal.   |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson     | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                     | 9            | I, A-G                  |               | Area I is unhelpful as it is too general to be useful and the Banbury area is too remote from Oxford to be relevant. The Areas of Search should be restricted to areas A-G. New Alchester is within Area C together with proposals at Weston on the Green. New Alchester is close to the built up area of Bicester and falls within the Garden Town Masterplan area. It does not relate well to Weston on the Green. It should therefore be considered as part of the area around Bicester. (Area E).  |
| PR-B-1033 | Matthew    | Symons      | Hollins Strategic Land                                | 9            | I, E                    |               | It is demonstrated that Ambrosden should be removed from Option I and included within Option E. Have provided more detailed information in their submitted representation  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds        | Fringford Parish Council                              | 9            |                         | A, B, C, E, I | Preference is Option A and B, avoid Option C, Option E needs careful consideration, and Option I consider maintaining rural character and sustainability in terms of available services and travel in villages.  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage      | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt  | 9            |                         | H             | Welcomes the approach to the identification of the potential areas of search and the inclusion of Area H 'Banbury and Surrounding Area'. Questions whether Area I is well connected, or spatially close to Oxford. Noted that Area H includes land to the south of Bodicote. This is welcomed and in RPS view confirms that the land south of Bodicote represents a sustainable location for further development.  |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole     | Pack        |   | 9            |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 behind The Moors is one of our most beautiful stretches of meadowland and important area of biodiversity. It needs to be preserved.  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison     | Forfar      |   | 9            |                         | PR157         | Why has site PR157 been included if this site has been categorised as unsustainable in two previous local plans. Nothing has changed to the village. Development would constitute village extension which has been previously refused. Your proposal would suggest that 200 homes could be added to a village that currently has 55 homes with no local infrastructure or transport links would be in any way sustainable. It would not.   |
| PR-B-0848 | Rob        | McLennan    | Rob McLennan Planning on behalf of Mr RF Kendall      | 9            |                         | PR161         | The additional allocation of housing should be provided in accordance with and in compliance with the sound planning principles set out in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. Quotes the vision and states that the spatial strategy of the plan. Considers that growth should be directed towards the larger and more sustainable towns and villages rather than this site. Has provided a very detailed statement setting out the reasons why this site is not suitable for development and development should be carried out in accordance with the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and the NPPF. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation                                     | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| PR-B-0848 | Rob        | McLennan | Rob McLennan Planning on behalf of Mr RF Kendall | 9            |                         | PR192  | The additional allocation of housing should be provided in accordance with and in compliance with the sound planning principles set out in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. Quotes the vision and states that the spatial strategy of the plan. Considers that growth should be directed towards the larger and more sustainable towns and villages rather than this site. Has provided a very detailed statement setting out the reasons why this site is not suitable for development and development should be carried out in accordance with the adopted Cherwell Local Plan and the NPPF.   |
| PR-B-0904 | Jill       | Grain    |  | 9            |                         | PR20   | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, to build here would destroy the villages identity along with Yarnton and Begbroke if site PR20 were developed. Footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Building on GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. CDC adopted the Local Plan to protect GB.   |
| PR-B-1076 | Jana       | Gnappova |  | 9            |                         | PR20, PR24   | Yes, especially PR20 and PR24, see general comments  |
| PR-B-1221 | Martin     | Perisi   |  | 9            |                         | PR20, PR24   | Yes, especially PR20 and PR24, see general comments  |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter      | Webber   |  | 9            |                         | PR20, PR24, PR126  | The areas near to Oxford Parkway will be attractive to London commuters and therefore won't be affordable houses. If Oxford airport was relocated to another local airfield in conjunction with developing sites PR20, PR24, and PR126 it would support sustainable transport and a significant new railway station within site 20.  |
| PR-B-1254 | Philip     | Redpath  |  | 9            |                         | PR22, PR25   | Land North West of Oxford Airport is located in the parish of Shipton-on-Cherwell and is therefore in Cherwell's district. The effect though is on Woodstock, which is already being targeted in the revised West Oxfordshire Local Plan. This site in 2014 was rejected by CDC for good reasons and there have been no changes to the situation. Apart from the infrastructure and environmental issues relating to the site it will have an adverse impact on the Blenheim World Heritage Site and has been opposed by ICOMIS which advises Unesco accordingly. The land is adjacent to GB land and has a claim to be made GB so that it can protect historic Woodstock. The farmland is very production and tenants have already objected to its loss. Land East of Marlborough School, Woodstock. This site is isolated from the town of Woodstock and cannot be easily integrated. It also ignores the fact that there are other proposals for Woodstock causing overload to the local infrastructure. It breaks the Cherwell policies of development in villages and should not be considered. |
| PR-B-1081 | Lynn       | Pilgrim  |  | 9            |                         | PR32, PR14, PR27   | Building on GB meadows adjacent to Kidlington conservation area, sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 GB would completely disregard the NPPF. It would destroy ancient ridge and furrow, wildlife, and flora. It would increase flood risk and impact on the setting of listed buildings.   |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole     | Pack     |  | 9            |                         | PR37   | Site PR37 lies within the conservation area and was described by the inspector as an "area of high landscape value", it should be preserved.   |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain       | Johnson  |  | 9            |                         | PR38   | The development between Oxford and Kidlington will fill the green space between the two and double the size of the suburb of Cutteslowe. This important space with views of the countryside will be lost. GB is there to protect against such urban sprawl. There is no provision to deal with the road congestion and no consideration of the additional cars, sources of particulate pollution degrading the air quality and health.   |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone    |  | 9            |                         | PR38, PR39, PR41, PR123, PR124, PR125, PR125(sic) PR167, PR168, PR177, PR178 | Yes, strongly object to building on the GB between Kidlington and Oxford which is essential to preserving the openness and setting of Kidlington and North Oxford. These plans are unsound and unsustainable. Particularly object to building next to Cutteslowe Park and the destruction of North Oxford Golf Course for misleading assertions of economic gain. I object to development on the sites listed. Have slight sympathy for smaller commercial development such as Oxford United Stadium/ sports complex to replace the Gosford facilities with better solutions to facilitate community needs, this as far as erosion of the Green Belt is any way acceptable.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0742 | Keith and Hilary | Prince    |              | 9            |                         | PR38, PR50    | No. GB should not be developed, as it's a vital green space between Kidlington and Oxford for wildlife and recreational use. Business sites in Oxford need to be utilised as this is the better solution to traffic congestion. Absolutely do not want to come under jurisdiction of Oxford City. Development of Sites PR38 and PR50 will encourage to try and increase their area, if development is allowed the other side of the A34 too, Kidlington will eventually become part of Oxford City itself.   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard  |              | 9            |                         | PR38, PR50    | Sites PR38 and PR50 have no consideration for the destruction of the GB and the impact on the local surrounding areas. Do not agree with the excepted circumstances stated. Used as a commuter belt for London etc. No consideration into the CPRE survey which 76% surveyed in Oxford want GB protected. Oxford City has enough brownfield sites to develop.  |
| PR-B-0801 | Janet            | Stott     |              | 9            |                         | PR38, PR50    | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB. GB policy to prevent urban sprawl, keeping land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford is unspoilt, we walk in the fields of sites PR38 and PR50, value its biodiversity, views and its role as a green lung for the area. GB protects historic Oxford, do not accept that the exceptional circumstances exist to justify housing on GB close to Oxford, once this land is lost, there will be a continuous sprawl of housing from Oxford city centre to the far end of Kidlington, and a loss of open space. In a public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. |
| PR-B-0812 | Tim              | Stott     |              | 9            |                         | PR38, PR50    | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB. GB policy to prevent urban sprawl, keeping land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford is unspoilt, we walk in the fields of sites PR38 and PR50, value its biodiversity, views and its role as a green lung for the area. GB protects historic Oxford, do not accept that the exceptional circumstances exist to justify housing on GB close to Oxford, once this land is lost, there will be a continuous sprawl of housing from Oxford city centre to the far end of Kidlington, and a loss of open space. In a public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard          | Silvester |              | 9            |                         | PR38, PR50    | Agree with CDC's adopted Local Plan Part 1 which states that Oxford GB was "designated to restrain development pressures which could damage the character of Oxford City and its heritage through increased activity, traffic and the outwards sprawl of the urban area". If sites PR38 and/or PR50 are developed traffic would inevitably increase between North Oxford and Kidlington along with noise and pollution. Open spaces, used by many for recreation would be lost. This would compound the problems already arising due to large scale development happening nearby, the West Barton development and the proposed Northern Gateway. In a public survey commissioned by CPRE 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB.   |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan            | Silvester |              | 9            |                         | PR38, PR50    | Agree with CDC's adopted Local Plan Part 1 which states that Oxford GB was "designated to restrain development pressures which could damage the character of Oxford City and its heritage through increased activity, traffic and the outwards sprawl of the urban area". If sites PR38 and/or PR50 are developed traffic would inevitably increase between North Oxford and Kidlington along with noise and pollution. Open spaces, used by many for recreation would be lost. This would compound the problems already arising due to large scale development happening nearby, the West Barton development and the proposed Northern Gateway. In a public survey commissioned by CPRE 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1263 | Katie      | Silvester |   | 9            |                         | PR38, PR50    | Agree with Cherwell's adopted Local Plan part 1 which states that Oxford GB was "designated to restrain development pressures which could damage the character of Oxford City and its heritage through increased activity, traffic and the outwards sprawl of the urban area". If sites PR38 and RR50 were developed, then traffic would increase on the Banbury Road between North Oxford and Kidlington. Noise and other pollution would increase and green spaces for recreational activities would be lost. This would add to the large scale developments like West Barton and the Northern Gateway. A public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm | 9            |                         | PR39          | The historic development patterns of Kidlington have preserved the setting of the historic core of the village, whilst resulting in a more urban form that is car-orientated and lacking in services. The historic development of Oxford has resulted in a north-south urban area consisting of a number of distinct yet linked settlements. Site PR39 will compliment this historic development of Oxford and will provide for a more sustainable and higher quality development with easy access to key transport links than would be achievable at a 'South of Kidlington' location.  |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler    | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                         | 9            |                         |               | No, do not support Option I as a sustainable location for Oxford's unmet need. Dispersing Oxford's unmet need across district's rural communities would be an approach that is incompatible with Council's draft vision. It would not deliver the good connectivity and convenient, sustainable and affordable travel opportunities to Oxford City that such a growth would require.   |
| PR-B-0029 | Sonia      | Morgan    |   | 9            |                         |               | The government's promise in its last manifesto to protect GB must be upheld. I strongly object to development in the GB around Kidlington, where it is a pleasant, well used space which protects the historic city of Oxford from over development.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday    |   | 9            |                         |               | Think the areas of search are extensive, frightening and disruptive, and people may move away.   |
| PR-B-0036 | David      | Blowers   |   | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford   | Jones     |   | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0046 | Caroline   | Thompson  |   | 9            |                         |               | I object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall      |   | 9            |                         |               | The GB is a beautiful and vital part of the environment and should be maintained with vigour. Only brownfield sites should be considered.  |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor    | Aitchison Rafferty                                  | 9            |                         |               | 7.7has remains of SHLAA ref WG019. The remaining land falls within areas of search C, E and I.   |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony    | Hall      |   | 9            |                         |               | No except, that you have obviously decided that the choice of A and B is a foregone conclusion   |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue        | Mackrell  | Bicester Town Council                               | 9            |                         |               | Agree that the only sensible areas for housing working in Oxford are Options A and B.  |
| PR-B-0078 | Anthony    | Churchill |   | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0081 | Linda      | Beattie   |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0082 | Felicity   | Emptage   |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname          | Organisation                           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0119 | C A               | McCall           |  | 9            |                         |               | Option A Flood plains and overcrowding.  |
| PR-B-0119 | C A               | McCall           |  | 9            |                         |               | Option B Loss of GB and potential merging of Kidlington to Oxford City.  |
| PR-B-0120 | E                 | Tonkin           |  | 9            |                         |               | No, CDC needs to develop less economically successful locations. Congestion would increase in Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-0150 | Patrick and Julia | Marcks           |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0151 | Prof John         | Batchelor        |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0152 | Henrietta         | Batchelor        |  | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0154 | Hannah            | Hale             |  | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val               | Colby            | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK | 9            |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter             | Worth            |  | 9            |                         |               | Mostly agreeable however there are other land opportunities that could be considered which provide less than 100 houses. If other pieces of land were said to be suitable, some would become available due to the increase in land value.  |
| PR-B-0175 | Mr D and Mrs S    | Rudd             |  | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0181 | Diane and Darryl  | Bates-Brownsword |  | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0184 | Roger             | Prince           |  | 9            |                         |               | Yes, the GB is a permanent designation and government guidance states, unmet housing needs are not a reason for building there. CDC policy is also to protect GB, which provides footpaths used and enjoyed by many, and prevents urban sprawl.  |
| PR-B-0185 | Terrence          | Yeatman          |  | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul              | Walker           | Oxford Bus Company                     | 9            |                         |               | Agree with the identified areas of search, in particular concentrating the areas of search adjacent to existing settlements, most noticeably are Kidlington and Bicester. Support the approach to develop sites over 100 houses as well as the need to develop sites that can enable infrastructure, including ability to support viable public transport provision. |
| PR-B-0201 | Dr Catherine      | Grebenik         |  | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It is a haven for wildlife with large populations of badgers, foxes and roe deer. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and Cherwell's policy to protect it should be upheld.                                 |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings   |              | 9            |                         |               | Area A and B are in Oxford's GB which prevents irreversible urban sprawl and ensure access to the countryside and nature for existing Oxford residents. It's there for a reason and should be respected. Article 7.30 outlining results from the Interim Transport Assessment states that 'exceptional circumstances need to be demonstrated to release of any land from the Green Belt.' However this is in direct contradiction to your statement that Areas A and B are the most sustainable broad locations for identifying sites and have therefore undertaken an early assessment of the 38 sites in A and B. To actually respect and not breach 'National Policy' areas C should be prioritised over GB. The fact that you have undertaken an early assessment and appear to already have formulated a conclusion before the consultation process is over actually suggests you do not plan to seriously assess other areas or respect the National GB Policy. |
| PR-B-0213 | Linda               | Browning   |              | 9            |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is pleasant, unspoilt, well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0222 | Malcolm             | Axtell     |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0234 | Prof Roger          | Davies     |              | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the GB, it's a permanent designation and unmet housing needs do not justify building on it. Some of the areas to the north and east of Kidlington contain precious natural habitats and well used footpaths. GB's purpose is to prevent urban sprawl and the present governments manifesto promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0238 | D A                 | Burt       |              | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to the loss of GB it is a permanent feature and unmet housing needs do not justify building on it. It allows people to enjoy the countryside with its walks and prevents urban sprawl.  |
| PR-B-0240 | Mrs Carole          | Walton     |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is mainly unspoilt countryside, well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0241 | Richard             | Walton     |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is mainly unspoilt countryside, well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0260 | Chris               | Pack       |              | 9            |                         |               | It is clear that Kidlington and the surrounding area in the GB are the principle target and it would have a devastating impact upon Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0262 | Peter and Christine | Stevenson  |              | 9            |                         |               | The area of search is an important part of the GB and too valuable as such to build upon. There are no exceptional circumstances to justify building on GB.   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | 9            |                         |               | Brownfield sites, previously developed land and areas next to busy roads and junctions should always be considered before GB; therefore Options A and B are not appropriate sites. The numbers suggested would destroy Kidlington as a village and put stress on infrastructure and traffic. It is unreasonable that Banbury based CDC should nominate it as its preferred area of search.  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield   |              | 9            |                         |               | Option A and B are in the GB and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building in the GB. Oxford's overcrowding problems should be solved by dispersed new villages and industrial centres rather than new houses in the periphery impacting on the transport crisis.  |
| PR-B-0641 | J                   | Willoughby |              | 9            |                         |               | It would destroy a large proportion of quiet, unspoilt land of great benefit to residents. We use it daily.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen      |              | 9            |                         |               | The GB and open spaces must be preserved, to prevent loss of identity between existing communities and maintain wildlife corridors for the survival of species. In the partial review document, the value of the open countryside is grossly underestimated in providing free amenity for everyone, and supporting wildlife.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0648 | Patricia       | Perisi     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to the proposed development of 4,400 houses on GB, which should be protected. Have lived in Kidlington 80 years and do not want to see my village joined to Oxford and lose its character. The development will destroy the countryside and wildlife and bring chaos to the area. Traffic is already heavy and the doctors surgery at capacity  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary | Shirley    |  | 9            |                         |               | Purchased our property on the understanding we were in GB, this should not be changed without consultation.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G         | Shirley    |  | 9            |                         |               | It is far too large.  |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan          | Oldfield   |  | 9            |                         |               | They represent a wholly unacceptable destruction of GB, which is your responsibility to protect.  |
| PR-B-0670 | Mary           | Phipps     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic city of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0671 | David          | Phipps     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic city of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0673 | Joyce M        | Morris     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB which will result in north Oxford becoming one large urban sprawl. The historic nature of Oxford as a city will be destroyed. The government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0676 | John F         | Morris     |  | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development on GB with its well used public footpaths. Government guidance states that unmet housing needs are not a reason to use GB, and so their manifesto promise and CDC's policy to protect it must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0682 | Felicity       | Peacock    |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0695 | Mark           | Bale       |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. The destruction on GB is irreversible, please consider such developments as the Westgate in the 1960's which involved the demolition of St Ebbe's, which is still lamented.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J              | Kershaw    | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 9            |                         |               | Object to any areas of search in the green belt as they would contravene the five purposes of the Green Belt which must be protected and enhanced.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick           | Small      | Stagecoach   | 9            |                         |               | Strongly agrees that a 'Policy off' approach should be taken to identifying and defining areas of search. The Green Belt should not be considered sacrosanct as exceptional circumstances exist.  |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn         | Phillips   |  | 9            |                         |               | Yes. There are other choices, such as new garden villages, the area around Bunkers Hill and a major expansion of Upper Heyford.   |
| PR-B-0712 | Sonya          | Willoughby |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. |
| PR-B-0723 | RA             | Humphreys  | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 9            |                         |               | Questions the suitability of Yarnton for significant additional development.  |
| PR-B-0728 | Verity         | Westgate   |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. |



| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname             | Organisation                 | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0729 | Tamara            | Lucas               |                              | 9            |                         |               | Strongest objection to erosion of unspoilt green belt around Kidlington. The old part of the town is a heritage site. Unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the green belt. The Government's manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0736 | Kieran            | Ward                |                              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0739 | G                 | Gelder              |                              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0740 | Richard and Linda | Jurd                |                              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Yarnton. Already lost old footpaths due to intolerant landowners over the past 25 years, the plan will take many more away. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB, this should be supported by our local Member of Parliament. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John              | Tremlett            |                              | 9            |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian            | Scargill            | Oxford Green Belt Network    | 9            |                         |               | Note that Areas A and B are favoured for further investigation and that most of the sites in these areas are in the Oxford Green Belt. Furthermore the initial three sites identified in the Growth Board Spatial Options report and on which the figure of 4,400 homes was based were all in the Green Belt. Strongly object to development in the GB which was designated to restrain development pressures which could damage the character of Oxford City and its heritage..." as stated in Policy ESD14 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. Support the five purposes of the GB, and in particular protect the setting band character of the historic city of Oxford. The reference to the character of the City, as referred to in Cherwell's local plan is often overlooked but it is a crucial arm of the GB policy. The City is already under substantial pressure and this is likely to become intolerable if expansion on the edge of the city is not restricted. The City's never-ending traffic problems are testimony to this, and there have been calls for even the number of buses in the centre to be limited. Do not consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify development in the GB and suggest adhering to Policy ESD14 and maintain the existing GB boundaries. |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian            | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories | 9            |                         |               | Steeple Aston is too distant from Oxford to warrant serious consideration as an area of search.  |
| PR-B-0749 | Dr and Mrs M      | Wallace             |                              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname      | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0750 | Niels         | van Kuijk    |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0752 | Keeley        | Middleditch  |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0754 | Philippa Jane | Nelson       |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB for reasons outlined to question 1. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin        | Palmer       |   | 9            |                         |               | All areas would mean that Kidlington becoming part of Oxford, with the loss of GB that needs to be avoided at all costs.  |
| PR-B-0757 | Martin        | Palmer       |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0759 | R L           | Davies       |   | 9            |                         |               | Areas are in the GB, present government promised to protect in its 2015 manifesto along with Cherwell's existing policy. Strongly object to building on GB as the purpose of GB is to prevent urban sprawl. Areas north and east of Kidlington contain precious natural habitats, enjoyed by all, why build here.   |
| PR-B-0764 | Steven        | Daggitt      |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington it has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld. How can GB stop urban sprawl if boundaries can be moved when they are considered inconvenient? |
| PR-B-0765 | Layla         | Vidal-Martin | NLP Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Taylor Wimpey | 9            |                         |               | Do not consider it is appropriate to identify 'Areas of Search'. Further concerns about the application of the site search methodology within these Areas of Search.  |
| PR-B-0776 | Anthony       | East         |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0779 | David C       | Hinde        | Hinde Law Ltd   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Yarnton has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation                               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0782 | Andrew and Emma  | Mundy     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0796 | David            | Tighe     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development of the GB. GB policy to prevent urban sprawl. GB between Oxford and Kidlington is an unspoilt green lung, appreciated by many local residents. GB helps protect historic Oxford. This is not exceptional circumstances. A public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat.  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive            | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group        | 9            |                         |               | Disagree. The areas of search more remote from Oxford lie beyond its economic or principal travel-to-work area, so are less relevant in the context of specifically meeting Oxford's unmet housing need.   |
| PR-B-0805 | Tamara           | Frishberg |  | 9            |                         |               | Too much concentration in the Kidlington and Oxford area. Development to be sited in smaller villages, increasing the population to keep schools, shops and bus services running. Strongly feel that the bulk of GB between Oxford and Kidlington needs to be reserved.  |
| PR-B-0807 | Justin           | Scroggie  |  | 9            |                         |               | Yes. Cherwell have committed to protecting and upholding the GB in the district. This is a direct contradiction and the areas identified most lie within the GB. Health and well-being of Kidlington residents are under threat by Cherwell plans. The more that this is damaged the greater burden on the NHS. Local services already under strain or being closed, these would be overwhelmed by the almost doubling of the homes in Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0809 | Karen            | Selway    |  | 9            |                         |               | Yes. All GB areas should be removed from the consultation. GB created to check unrestricted urban sprawl, preventing merging into towns. The GB should only be built on in exceptional circumstances - and these are not. Consider other areas like Peartree Park and Ride.  |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim              | Green     | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association | 9            |                         |               | Object to the areas of search included in the GB land. Public opinion surveys by CPRE show that the majority of people think that GB land should not be developed. GB designation is intended to be permanent, only to be amended in exceptional circumstances which have not been demonstrated. GB around Oxford prevents urban sprawl and protects Oxford's setting. GB around Oxford is accessible open space and it is well used but many local communities for exercise and recreation.   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor    |  | 9            |                         |               | Told by CDC Planning that areas A and B are "preferred". Most of the sites are in the GB. Concerned this view has been formulated, before consultation has been completed. CDC should revisit and avoid building on GB. Object strongly to the development of GB. GB is permanent only to be changed in exceptional circumstances, which this is not. GB around Oxford fulfils preventing urban sprawl, protecting the character and heritage. Provides open space used by local communities. Pubic opinion surveys show that the majority of people think the GB should be protected. |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson    |  | 9            |                         |               | Thought key principles of having a GB included preventing urban sprawl and providing a green buffer between conurbations. Cannot see how the proposals square with the 'Five GB Purposes' on p.5 of the summary booklet. Footpaths in this area are an amenity enjoyed by residents of Oxford, Cherwell and other areas, they should be protected. The presence of the golf course provides a green lung to help reduce pollution in the area. The green lung argument, of course, applies to both sides of Banbury Road.  |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus           | Campbell  | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group   | 9            |                         |               | Note that the more remote or rural areas pose additional challenges due to distance from existing surgeries, and lack of sustainable options for new local surgeries. Have provided a detailed response in a separate statement as part of the representation.   |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel            | Buttler   |  | 9            |                         |               | The Areas of Search should be limited to those areas much closer to the City of Oxford boundary  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha    | Eliot         | Oxford Preservation Trust                                     | 9            |                         |               | The importance of the key criteria of the Green Belt should be paramount in protecting the green setting of Oxford. OPT is strongly opposed to any development which will act to coalesce Oxford and Kidlington and therefore cannot support the sites within the Kidlington Gap (sites 38, 39, 41, 50, 122, 123, 124, 167, 168, 177 and 178). All sites must be assessed against the criteria set in Questions 3 and 4 on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues.   |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard    | Hills         |   | 9            |                         |               | It is a good start. More areas must be identified. Planning applications for development from outside these areas should be welcomed too.   |
| PR-B-0833 | Cas        | Lester        |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The GB around Kidlington has many well-used footpaths and 'green spaces' is much appreciated and enjoyed by large numbers of local residents. It also helps to protect the historic city of Oxford from the effects of over-development. Government guidance states that unmet housing need is NOT a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0834 | Eleanor    | Williamson    |   | 9            |                         |               | Concentrated heavily on Kidlington and not equally dispersed around the district. The village would become engulfed and disfigured beyond recognition. Concerns regarding the population growth. Concerns about the impact to the loss of rural landscape, amenity and the effect on the quality of life. Residents chose to live in Kidlington to avoid the urban -suburban sprawl of Oxford so they can enjoy the surrounding countryside. GB is sacrosanct and strongly oppose building upon it. Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's promise must be upheld. Cherwell's policy is also to protect the GB which needs to be upheld. |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike       | Gilbert       | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd                                     | 9            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren     | Bell          | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd | 9            |                         |               | Serious concerns expressed about the Areas of Search. It has, in effect, predetermined the assessments by ruling out deliverable sites in other sustainable locations. Option I is far too broad. There are strong opportunities to deliver additional housing in Cat A villages. It is not appropriate that these opportunities are sifted out at the high level. This is of fundamental importance so that CDC has properly and fully assessed all alternatives. It is suggested that a further Area of Search is included which draws on updated evidence on Cat A villages and assesses 'Category A villages with public transport connectivity to Oxford'  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP   | 9            |                         |               | Area A is the key area of search. Area B is already separated from Oxford by the River Cherwell. Suggestions for a revised GB boundary to the north of Kidlington are put forward. Banbury, Bicester and U Heyford have already received substantial amounts of housing and the other Areas of Search are too remote from Oxford and will not deliver the pressing need for housing within the time required.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David      | Smith         |   | 9            |                         |               | Only that areas And B need to be looked at in conjunction with the adjoining local authority and that these extended areas are the logical ones to look at if the objective is solely to provide overflow for Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0857 | Mark       | Christodoulou |   | 9            |                         |               | Major objection is to the development on GB should Kidlington be chosen for 4,400 homes. CDC previously adopted their local plan to pledged to protect the GB. it's their policy to do so. No exceptional circumstance have been presented to revise this position. The original policy of CDC to protect GB must be preserved.   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim        | Perkins       | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC      | 9            |                         |               | No comment at this stage.   |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter      | Nicholson     |   | 9            |                         |               | CDC should not accept the undemocratically-allocated housing quota; therefore strongly objects to the Ares of search A and B on that basis. Objects to development in the Green Belt. Has provided a very detailed statement in response to this question in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt       | Todd          |   | 9            |                         |               | Favourable inclination to areas A and B which are in the GB. Imperative that GB is preserved. These are not exceptional circumstance when many options available.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer   | McFadden   |                            | 9            |                         |               | Totally opposed to the decimation of the Oxford GB. Encroachment of this area already with the Northern Gateway development. GB's aim is to protect undeveloped areas from becoming urban sprawl. GB provides open spaces and footpaths that many residents use and it's important for mental well-being. Sites PR38 and PR50 would join Kidlington to Oxford becoming one large urban area. Circumstance do not justify the use of GB. Health concerns linked with busy roads and dementia. A public survey by CPRE Oxfordshire finds 76% of Oxfordshire residents want GB to be protected. Site PR50 has a footpath and bridleway that would disappear. Views at Cutteslowe Park would be affected and air quality decreased due to more cars in the area. |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter      | Hainsworth |                            | 9            |                         |               | Strongly in favour of maintaining the GB, unless there are greater benefits to be gained from development for the inhabitants of Oxford and Kidlington. GB is a valued and well used amenity for all. Development will have a negative impact on the day to day lives of many, these new homes will likely serve London commuters via Oxford Parkway.  |
| PR-B-0871 | Patricia   | Redpath    |                            | 9            |                         |               | Reference to land North West of Oxford Airport. Suggestions that submitted for employment, retail and residential use which is unacceptable. Debate regarding the appropriateness use of GB, overriding factors that are important to keeping the GB undeveloped. Site borders GB so its an impact on its "openness" contrary to para 79 of NPPF. GB protects historic towns like Woodstock. Cherwell and Oxford should not seek to undermine this. In 2014 a previous application was rejected. Rather than destroying the site it needs to be protected and made GB. There's no change to the circumstances to fulfil another authority's needs. There are other proposals for Woodstock and surrounding areas that are in debate put upon West ODC.       |
| PR-B-0871 | Patricia   | Redpath    |                            | 9            |                         |               | Reference to land East of Marlborough School Woodstock. No acknowledgement of the impact on Woodstock. The site is poorly related to Woodstock both in terms of access to the town and from a landscape perspective. Due to the site's isolated nature, it is difficult to see how the site could be successfully integrated into the town. It is not taking into consideration the other proposals for Woodstock in the West Oxfordshire Local Plan and is against the Cherwell plan of development of the rural areas - being actually situated in Shipton-on-Cherwell but at a distance.  |
| PR-B-0873 | Jenyth     | Worsley    |                            | 9            |                         |               | Object very strongly to the development in the Oxford GB. GB was set up to prevent urban sprawl, which is now threatened. The green lung between Oxford and Kidlington has been there since after the war. Oxford is a historic city and should not be allowed to sprawl towards the north. Do not accept that exceptional circumstances exist to justify housing on GB close to Oxford. Over 76% of Oxfordshire residents want to protect the GB from housing.  |
| PR-B-0877 | David      | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council | 9            |                         |               | Provides detailed comments for all the options on Transport Strategy and Health and Education in its representation.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 9            |                         |               | Questions the status of the Growth Board and whether the or not the publication of these sites is in direct contravention of the principles of LPP1. Why has the Authority done a 'U' turn by encouraging landowners and speculative developers to put forward schemes by drawing a red line on a map? This action has placed stress and concern on this community and the others affected by this process.  |
| PR-B-0880 | Rhiannon   | Davies     |                            | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation                         | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0882 | Julia                  | Trowles  |                                      | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Do not agree that search areas A and B are reasonable options.  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter                  | Trowles  |                                      | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Do not agree that search areas A and B are reasonable options.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley  |                                      | 9            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun                | Breith   | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust | 9            |                         |               | Agree with the areas of search in broad terms although some areas are a long distance from Oxford and not well connected by sustainable modes of transport. They suggest that some areas should be combined as they affect the same communities. This could also assist in assessing impacts comprehensively and cumulatively as well as providing appropriate infrastructure (including green infrastructure).<br>* Areas A and B: Area A and B both affect Kidlington and are located in the Oxford Green Belt. Development in area A (and B) also raises concerns with regard to potential impacts on the SAC as well as potentially resulting in Kidlington and Oxford growing together.<br>* Areas C and E: Areas around J9 (M40) and Bicester;<br>* Areas F and G: Upper Heyford, (Lower Heyford) and Ardley. |
| PR-B-0891 | Katherine              | Simpson  |                                      | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development.   |
| PR-B-0892 | Richard                | Simpson  |                                      | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development.   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |                                      | 9            |                         |               | Consider section A around Kidlington to be too large with the present infrastructure and integrity of the village. Kidlington could support some further development to the north, emphasising the amenities provided by the canal. Development to the west of the canal should not be supported exclusively by Yarnton Road hump backed bridge. Do not support development on the GB between Kidlington and Oxford. Also do not support any development on section B.  |
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard       | Miles    |                                      | 9            |                         |               | Regarding option A due to the proximity of this area to West Oxfordshire borders and the proposals for development there, what considerations are being made to ensure that there is not an over development of the areas surrounding the A44? This area has beautiful countryside with protected species such as bats, rural pathways and habitats that need to be preserved rather than becoming part of the Oxford sprawl.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |                                      | 9            |                         |               | Many of the areas of search are too far from Oxford for reasonable commuting especially given the poor road infrastructure and lack of suitable public transport.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname    | Organisation                             | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0902 | Vanessa        | Pinder     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa        | Goss       | Bloxham Parish Council                   | 9            |                         |               | Agree with the assessment criteria and area of search   |
| PR-B-0906 | Steve and Anne | Handsley   |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Kidlington has grown from a small village to one of the largest in the county. It has contributed significantly to the housing growth in the CDC area. Further growth will allow it to lose its character. The green corridor between Kidlington and Oxford needs to be maintained. |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken            | Pelton     |  | 9            |                         |               | Again the question presumes areas of search are needed. The areas of search should be well away from Oxford and not in the Oxford GB. Would like to see a safe and dedicated cycle route from Noke to Islip and Noke to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew         | Smith      | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting     | 9            |                         |               | Concerned about the impact on Kidlington if areas A and B were developed. It will sacrifice the 'Green Belts' of Kidlington area and risk it becoming an Oxford suburb; destroying key recreational and nature conservation area of the River Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-0912 | David          | Mason      |  | 9            |                         |               | Option A covers a far too wide area, which leave it open for unviable sites to be dismissed, leaving the remaining one or two as the only serious options. Disregarding GB and that CDC existing policy prohibits the merging of villages and should be sufficient to discount all but one or two small developments. Each of the villages in this location have a distinct character which would be lost.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen          | Marshall   | CPRE Oxfordshire                         | 9            |                         |               | Strongly objects to development in the GB, which exists to protect the historic city and equally acts as a 'green lung' providing opportunities for recreation for the local communities. Set out the purpose of the GB around Oxford and that any development in the GB would need exceptional circumstances to justify development. Consider it to be a telling and serious omission that you have not asked a question about the acceptability of development in the Green Belt.   |
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric        | Sidebottom |  | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to building in the GB. Do not accept that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the need. GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford is an unspoilt green lung with footpaths that is appreciated by local residents. It's there to protect historic Oxford. Public survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, 76% of Oxfordshire residents are in favour to protect GB.  |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie          | Lodwick    |  | 9            |                         |               | Agrees to the areas of search and considers that if Cherwell does not have to take Oxford's unmet need, Arncott and Upper Heyford would be preferred areas of search. A new town/settlement approach outside the Green Belt is suggested rather than building on the Green Belt. The areas of search should not be just Cherwell but cover the entire County area. The process has not been coordinated with other districts, and so inherently flawed.   |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter          | Bateman    | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family | 9            |                         |               | Area I is a very broad area covering the majority of the District. This causes the conclusions of the SA to be unduly broad and strategic. Should more focused areas be assessed it is considered that a more robust conclusion and scoring system would result.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0935 | David      | Lock      | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates            | 9            |                         |               | The approach to the Areas of Search has predetermined the assessments by ruling out deliverable sites in appropriate locations beyond Kidlington. An approach that excludes sites that have a real opportunity to deliver new housing to meet Oxford's needs in a sustainable location with good links to Oxford. It does not adequately consider potential from Cat A villages. The approach of assessing all villages through a single category is flawed. The potential of Cat A villages should be considered taking in to account their suitability as service villages and their connectivity relative to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0939 | Lynne      | Tighe     |   | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to building in the GB. Do not accept that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the need. GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford is an unspoilt green lung with footpaths that is appreciated by local residents. It's there to protect historic Oxford. Public survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, 76% of Oxfordshire residents are in favour to protect GB.  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk      | Banbury Civic Society   | 9            |                         |               | The need to examine all sites put forward in order to meet the 'comprehensive analysis' test is understood but, following the logic of the criteria regarding proximity to employment, community education etc. facilities (see Q 8) only the sites in areas A to E can possibly meet the sustainability test, given the constraints on Oxford City's investment budget. Suggestions of 'mass transit solutions must be far in the future for cost reasons and the County Council will have its budget stretched to improve routes such as Banbury Road, Oxford if provision of facilities for limited stop bus services on tracks that have a good running surface are to materialise - these being essential if users are to be attracted to use such services into the city centre. Present users of this route will attest to the 'shake, rattle and roll' journey currently offered. |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 9            |                         |               | Notes that the SA concludes that all areas of search would have significant negative effects in relation to SA Objective 9: "To protect, enhance and make accessible for enjoyment, the historic environment." This is most unfortunate and must beg the question whether further development in any of the Areas would be truly sustainable. Whilst they understand the consideration of the spatial options of the Growth Board, and the need for strategic sites, etc. which are discussed in detail in their representation. In terms of effects on the historic environment this demonstrates that these are generally clearer assessed on a site by site basis, as we have done in response to Question 11, rather than broad Spatial Options or even broader Areas of Search.  |
| PR-B-0960 | M          | O'Mahoney |   | 9            |                         |               | Strongly objects to development in the GB. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant and unspoilt countryside with many well-used footpaths and 'green spaces'. It is much appreciated and enjoyed by large numbers of local residents. It also helps protect the historic City of Oxford from the effects of overdevelopment. Also makes reference to the importance of the GB as set out in the NPPF.   |
| PR-B-0963 | Mr and Mrs | Shepherd  |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington. Has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0967 | Eileen     | Bloomer   |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld  |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin    | Noke Parish Meeting   | 9            |                         |               | The preferred Areas A and B are in the Green Belt. As Green Belt is essential to preserve the special character of Oxford, it is highly questionable that the criteria for 'exceptional circumstances' has been met'.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation          | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|-----------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd | 9            |                         |               | The Areas of Search may be appropriate for larger strategic development areas. However, the identified housing requirement should not be confined to these areas. Deddington is outside the Areas of Search but offers a sustainable location for development within the Oxfordshire HMA. It would benefit significantly from housing growth which would also deliver much needed sports facilities.  |
| PR-B-0983 | Suzanne    | Morris    |                       | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to building in the GB. GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford is an unspoilt green lung with footpaths that are appreciated by local residents. It's there to protect historic Oxford. Do not accept that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the need. Public survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, 76% of Oxfordshire residents are in favour to protect GB and housing is seen as its greatest threat.  |
| PR-B-0996 | Lucy       | Smith     |                       | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0997 | George     | Thomas    |                       | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0998 | Lisa       | Coulling  |                       | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. GB is there to protect against unrestricted urban sprawl of large built up areas. If built upon between Kidlington and Oxford we become consumed and lose our village identity. Building between Kidlington, Yarnton, Thrupp and Begbroke four villages become one town.  |
| PR-B-1005 | SP and SA  | McQuillan |                       | 9            |                         |               | CDC acknowledge the GB is essential to preserve the special character of Oxford City. Questionable therefore that the criteria for exceptional circumstances has been met for any of the proposed GB areas. Brownfield sites within GB are a much stronger case for development and should be considered first.   |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher   | Rosconn Group         | 9            |                         |               | On the basis of seeking to direct housing to meet Oxford's unmet needs to locations well-connected by public transport, would have expected the Council to have considered an option assessing sites within an appropriate distance from existing train stations. Suggest reviewing the adopted Greater Birmingham and Solihull LEP Strategic Housing Needs Study (Stage 3 August 2015) undertaken by PBA. This study considered sites within 1.2km and 3.75km of train stations on the basis these reflected reasonable walking and cycling distances respectively. This would be a simple further option to consider on the basis that some of the search areas already include such locations at Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington. The additional option would therefore only need to consider the potential of areas within Cherwell close to the stations at Kings Sutton, Lower Heyford and Tackley. Such locations are clearly more sustainable than other areas within the rest of the Rural Area under Option I, providing realistic and commutable train journeys into Oxford City of no more than 23 minutes (Kings Sutton). |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver       | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 9            |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew       | Hornsby-Smith |   | 9            |                         |               | Area I is too broad an area of search to be meaningful. Areas such as Bletchingdon and Kirtlington are more sustainable than Cropredy or Hook Norton, and it seems incongruous that they are not incorporated within Area B or as a separate area.   |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan     | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 9            |                         |               | The Areas of Search may be appropriate for larger strategic development areas. However, the identified housing requirement should not be confined to these areas. Sibford Ferris is outside the areas of search but offers a sustainable location for development within the OHMA. It would benefit significantly from housing growth which would support existing services and facilities.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David        | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 9            |                         |               | A more refined approach would be beneficial. As noted in para 3.38 the Partial Review is specifically to address the unmet need arising from Oxford City, therefore those areas remote from the City can be reasonably discounted. Development remote from the City would necessitate long distance commuting and increase car focussed travel.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 9            |                         |               | In identifying areas of search, clear reference must be made back to the overarching spatial strategy of the adopted LPP1. Whilst the principle of the approach set out in para 6.6 is supported, the strategy must be clear in that the bulk of the proposed growth must continue to be focused in and around Bicester and Banbury. This will ensure that growth can be delivered in a sustainable manner, supported by strong transport connections to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret | Sidebottom    |   | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB., this is not accepted as exceptional circumstances. Aim of GB is to prevent urban sprawl with land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. A public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson         |   | 9            |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land such as at the former air base at RAF Upper Heyford, be affordable and house the current population first.  |
| PR-B-1040 | Robert       | Dyson         |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1046 | William      | Hodgson       |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB policy is to specifically prevent urban sprawl, land kept open and not covered with concrete and tarmac which kills the soil. GB between Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt farmed countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Do not accept the justification to build on the GB close to Oxford. A public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1049 | Maria             | Page      |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1052 | Andrew            | Mundy     |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Rural setting is loved and village identity would be lost forever.  |
| PR-B-1053 | David             | Hemingway |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1054 | Bharat and Jankee | Badiani   |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1055 | Philippa          | Mullineux |              | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to any development on any of the Oxford Green Belt. The Green Belt around Kidlington is mainly pleasant and unspoilt countryside with many well-used footpaths and 'green spaces'. It is much appreciated and enjoyed by large numbers of local residents. It also helps to protect the historic city of Oxford from the effects of over-development. The phrase 'Green Belt' is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the Green Belt. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld. |
| PR-B-1056 | Simon             | Parker    |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of overdevelopment. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1057 | Julie             | Walters   |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname   | Organisation                    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1058 | Kim             | Bennell   |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of overdevelopment. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. |
| PR-B-1065 | J               | Bevis     |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1068 | Louise          | Crone     |                                 | 9            |                         |               | GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is NOT a reason for building in the GB. The Government's promise and CDC's existing policy to protect the GB should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1069 | JP              | Lyes      |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Are there no possibilities for garden villages? Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1073 | Susan           | Simms     |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1079 | JW              | Fresen    |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1080 | Mr and Mrs      | Horne     |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1081 | Lynn            | Pilgrim   |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The rep provides a list of the NPPF stated purposes of GB and the benefits it provides. The wellbeing of Oxfordshire residents needs to be considered along with the history, beauty and scientific interest of the area. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1082 | Nicholas Edward | Mullineux |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M         | Rugg      |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1088 | Bryan           | Rugg      |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1089 | Dave            | Bevis     |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F        | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council | 9            |                         |               | The areas of search are clearly defined.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val             | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council         | 9            |                         |               | Only the areas close to Oxford should be considered, as Oxford is where the unmet need for housing has been identified.  |
| PR-B-1097 | Caroline        | Hayes     |                                 | 9            |                         |               | Do not think it is appropriate to develop in the Oxford GB which provides a green lung to the city and helps protect our historical city from excessive development.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1098 | Michael          | Bott       |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1100 | Katherine        | Andrews    |   | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to any development on GB which is an area enjoyed by local residents and important to wildlife. It protects Oxford from over-development and serves as a flood plain which must be taken into account. The GB is a permanent designation and the government's manifesto promise and CDC's policy to protect it must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1101 | Catherine        | Dobson     |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB which is there to limit urban development and keep open spaces. GB is well used and a vital breathing space, in a survey commissioned by CPRE 76% of Oxfordshire residents wish to keep the GB. It should only be encroached upon in exceptional circumstance which don't exist at present.  |
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate   | Hamilton   |   | 9            |                         |               | The areas of search chosen are reasonable, but believe there is more potential in Bicester which is not constrained by a GB. Bicester is 15 minutes from the centre of Oxford by train, which compares with 30 or more minutes by bus from Kidlington High Street.  |
| PR-B-1105 | Norman and Janet | Bates      |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat              | Clissold   |   | 9            |                         |               | Seem OK   |
| PR-B-1117 | Georgina         | Tibbs      | Barton Willmore on behalf of Bellway Homes Ltd and Archstone Projects Ltd | 9            |                         |               | Support the identification of rural dispersal as one of the spatial options for accommodating new housing. Consider rural dispersal to be a sustainable option which is appropriate to the context of the District, much of which is characterised by dispersed rural settlements. The Ambrosden site presents an opportunity to provide new housing at a scale which is appropriate to the local context, in a location which relates to the existing settlement and with strong connections to Bicester beyond.   |
| PR-B-1119 | Bob              | Hessian    | Weston on the Green Parish Council  | 9            |                         |               | Options Area A and B, close to Oxford, would seem the ideal location for development sites but not where the Oxford Green Belt is degraded. Options Areas C (Junction, M40), Banbury and Bicester nor villages where there is no public transport are not suitable.   |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul             | Mayhook    |   | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in GB around Kidlington which is pleasant unspoilt countryside with footpaths used and appreciated by many. The GB helps protect the historic city of Oxford from overdevelopment and should only be used as a last resort.  |
| PR-B-1127 | David            | Betts      |   | 9            |                         |               | Object in principle to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. The coalescence of villages should be avoided but in order to capitalise on potential investment in infrastructure favour housing in a smaller number of sites. Any development within close proximity to Oxford Parkway will attract London commuters and not provide affordable houses. The majority of employment is to the south of the city so building should be to the north. Banbury and Bicester could meet Oxfords unmet needs with strengthened rail links. |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward       | Kidlington Development Watch  | 9            |                         |               | Object to development in the GB (areas A and B), which is mainly pleasant and unspoilt countryside with many well-used footpaths and 'green spaces'. It is much appreciated and enjoyed by large numbers of local residents. Concerned that Kidlington does not have many green spaces and parks within it and the surrounding GB compensates for it. The Masterplan notes that Kidlington's distinctive character is as a 'village set in the landscape' and specifically seeks to enhance that. Have also highlighted the purpose of the Oxfordshire Green Belt.  |
| PR-B-1134 | Neil             | McKendrick |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation             | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1142 | Alan             | Lodwick   |                          | 9            |                         |               | Search Areas A and B are almost entirely within the GB. CDC's Local Plan Part 1 includes Policy ESD 14 to maintain the GB. It was designated to restrain development which could damage the character of Oxford City and its heritage through increased activity, traffic and the outward sprawl of the urban area. GB provides a well used and appreciated space for people from a wide area. The rep refers to Q1 and questions the need for development and its justification.   |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard          | Bennett   |                          | 9            |                         |               | Areas under review are heavily congested already. Compromise and protection to our green belt is essential with this very important factor in mind.   |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |                          | 9            |                         |               | Wherever any development is proposed someone will inevitably complain.  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council  | 9            |                         |               | Objects to development in the green belt. It is a pleasant and unspoilt countryside with many well-used footpaths and 'green spaces', which is much appreciated and enjoyed by residents. It helps protect the historic city of Oxford from effects of overdevelopment.   |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |                          | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to the development on GB which will lead to unrestricted sprawl. Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke will merge together losing their setting and special character as countryside is encroached upon. One of the main features of the NPPF is the permanence of GB and we believe there are alternatives to development on GB. Oxford City's inability to meet its housing needs are not exceptional circumstances for developing on GB.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council   | 9            |                         |               | Yes. Some are more suitable than others. Some are completely unsuitable. Sites E and H (Bicester and Banbury) already have their own road traffic problems at peak times. Rail links from Banbury to Oxford already exceed capacity at certain times, yet the new Chiltern link to Oxford offers additional capacity, except that there is virtually no scope for additional housing close to Bicester station, thereby creating more road travel in and around Bicester. Option F, however (Upper Heyford) could provide a very good development site if new roads were constructed to link in with the M40 and better rail services from the local station It would also require a large investment in effectively creating a new town with. all necessary services and facilities on site. |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands | 9            |                         |               | Agree with these identified areas of search being investigated, but as noted in response to Q2, feel that the additional growth should reflect sustainable patterns of development including a focus on sustainable larger settlements , new settlements and garden towns.  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis            | Davies    |                          | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. Why should Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington be sacrificed for Oxford when they protect their own GB by Horspath. The GB around Begbroke is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1175 | Clare            | Cooper    |                          | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1176 | Laura            | Pritchard |                          | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1177 | Sandra and Richard | Tyrrell   |  | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1180 | RA                 | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd | 9            |                         |               | Do not take issue with the areas of search.   |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi              | Lancaster |  | 9            |                         |               | Some of the sites are on GB which can only be built on in exceptional circumstances and some areas would lose their character if further developed. It is quicker to get into Oxford from the north of the district by train, than from the south of the district by road.  |
| PR-B-1182 | Alison             | Noel      |  | 9            |                         |               | Object to development on the Oxford GB which aims to prevent urban sprawl and keep land permanently open. The GB around Kidlington is well used and enjoyed by many, a survey commissioned by the CPRE showed 76% of Oxfordshire wished to protect it. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment and exceptional circumstances to justify building on it don't exist.  |
| PR-B-1186 | Christina          | Miskin    |  | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1187 | Nigel              | Homent    |  | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol              | Matheson  |  | 9            |                         |               | Too much emphasis has been placed on Kidlington because of its proximity to Oxford and existing infrastructure. However the infrastructure cannot accommodate another 4,400 houses. New facilities and services will need to be built and a solution to solve the transport problems. Brownfield sites offer a better option than carving up the GB. Having a good public transport link from the site into Oxford would help the traffic problems at Kidlington and Gosford. |
| PR-B-1192 | Robert             | Selway    |  | 9            |                         |               | Yes. All GB areas should be removed from the consultation, it was created to check unrestricted sprawl and prevent towns merging together. The GB should only be built on in exceptional circumstances, and these are not, especially when other areas such as Pear Tree Park and Ride have not been considered.  |
| PR-B-1207 | Douglas and Louise | Lloyd     |  | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1213 | Fleur              | Hodgson   |  | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1216 | Christine          | Lodge     |  | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa         | Goss     | Adderbury Parish Council                                | 9            |                         |               | The Parish Council supports the identification of Areas of Search being close to existing larger settlements, including those spatially close to Oxford and others with good transport links to Oxford. It does not think that area I will provide the same benefit.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul            | Butt     | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd   | 9            |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M           | Green    |   | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development of the GB and the areas of search should be revisited avoiding it. These areas of GB are largely pleasant and unspoilt countryside used and enjoyed by many people for recreation. It prevents urban sprawl and protects the character, setting and heritage of the historic City of Oxford. Do not believe that exceptional circumstances exist to justify building on the GB. A public survey has shown that the majority of people think that the GB should be protected and not built on.  |
| PR-B-1231 | Prof J M        | Baker    |   | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to the proposed development in the Oxford GB which exists to prevent urban sprawl and discourage development pressure around the city. Building such a large development would have the opposite effect and encourage erosion of the GB elsewhere. The land east of Banbury Road has high landscape value which is an amenity for local residents. The semi-rural quality of Cutteslowe Park would be impaired.   |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed              | Barrett  | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd | 9            |                         |               | No comments at this stage. It is noted that the Area of Search covers the whole of CDC.   |
| PR-B-1241 | Beverley        | Kwan     |   | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera       | Kantor   |   | 9            |                         |               | The proposed destruction of the GB to build 4,400 homes based on speculation is unacceptable. The Government guidelines require an exceptional reason to build on GB and no such justification has been put forward. Instead the proposal will provide urban sprawl which will damage the City of Oxford, remove the GB and destroy ancient villages. The Government and our MP must fulfil their promise to protect the GB.  |
| PR-B-1245 | Jason and Petra | Tyrell   |   | 9            |                         |               | Yes strongly object to extensive development within the GB, which was designed to prevent urban sprawl and villages like Kidlington being merged with Oxford. Need to maximise use of brownfield sites already within Oxford city. There are no extenuating circumstances to justify extending development into the GB.   |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia           | Sheppard |   | 9            |                         |               | Isn't the point of GB policy to protect open areas to prevent the spread of Urban areas ? This proposal is totally contrary to this principle. The area between Oxford and Kidlington is beautiful countryside which is good for our health. There aren't enough areas like this, so to develop on this area will impact on many people's lives. Can't think of any exceptional circumstances to build on the GB. What would the impact be on this historic area, GB helps to protect against development pressure and needs to be maintained. A public survey shows that 76% of the public are in favour of protecting GB, public views need to be considered.   |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola          | Mallows  | Gresswell Environmental Trust                           | 9            |                         |               | LP Policy ESD14 is to maintain the Green Belt. Cherwell has a duty to all of us to keep Oxford within its boundaries, to keep the Green Belt open, to keep GB development small scale within the surrounding villages – with gaps in between, and to stop villages becoming merged or being swamped by ill conceived blanket developments. Oxford's unmet housing need is not only exaggerated, but is NOT 'an exceptional circumstance', so should NOT be adopted by Cherwell. There are no exceptional circumstances that mean the Cherwell should relax its commitment to the GB. It is also inappropriate to ask a question that is deliberately designed to consider any development whatsoever in the GB. |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname             | Organisation                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1257 | Charles    | Fletcher            |                                   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The fundamental aim of GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Do not accept that this is exceptional circumstance to justify building on GB close to Oxford. A survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, shows 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat.   |
| PR-B-1258 | Hilary     | Fletcher            |                                   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The fundamental aim of GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Do not accept that this is exceptional circumstance to justify building on GB close to Oxford. A survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, shows 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat.   |
| PR-B-1259 | Mircea     | Popa                |                                   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The fundamental aim of GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Do not accept that this is exceptional circumstance to justify building on GB close to Oxford. A survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, shows 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat.   |
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard            |                                   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB which is contrary to the fundamental aim of GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. Oxford is an area of great historic interest and has a wealth of extraordinary buildings. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Do not accept that this is exceptional circumstance to justify building on GB close to Oxford. The CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat.                            |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew     | Gant                | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group | 9            |                         |               | The principles of the GB must be respected and maintained. This does not mean that GB land cannot ever be assessed for building, but it does mean that housing need in itself does not constitute "exceptional need". The function and benefit of GB land should be properly and scientifically assessed through a complete review and not in a piecemeal fashion, as has already happened at Northern Gateway. The principles of Green Belt are permanent and must be maintained, including preventing urban sprawl and not allowing coalescence of settlements. The new idea of "swaps" is fundamentally flawed: the whole point of Green Belt is where it is, so it is not possible simply to move it somewhere else. |
| PR-B-1264 | Drs        | Slater and Harrison |                                   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Green spaces are essential to people's wellbeing.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1266 | Linda      | Ward    |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. GB can only be developed if it has been demonstrated that a valid exceptional need exist. , Oxford's unmet target is not a real, immediate or proven need. GB should be excluded from the search area.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells   | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 9            |                         |               | Agree with the areas of search, however are concerned about the scale of the development 'allocated' to Cherwell by Oxford Growth Board. Do not accept that Areas A and B would be unable in principle to deliver a useful contribution to meeting Oxford's needs.  |
| PR-B-1271 | Rebecca    | Hodgson |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The aim of GB is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, acts as a green lung, with footpaths and green spaces enjoyed by many. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over-development. Do not accept exceptional circumstances exist to justify this. A public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. Cutteslowe Park will be effected with housing right at the edges of the park, changing its character for residents and visitors. |
| PR-B-1275 | Dagmar     | Carr    |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld  |
| PR-B-1276 | John       | Carr    |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld  |
| PR-B-1278 | Helena     | Boyce   |   | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1280 | Peter      | Offord  | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers   | 9            |                         |               | The majority of these sites are in the GB, which should remain a permanent feature as it shelters wildlife, stores carbon, removes pollutants and has a role in absorbing rainwater. It also provides quiet lanes and footpaths for walking which benefits both mental and physical health. It should remain protected by CDC's policy ESD14 Oxford Green Belt.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation                                     | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1281 | G M J      | Taylor  |  | 9            |                         |               | The whole area between The Moors and the River Cherwell must be protected. This area is greatly valued by all the residents of Kidlington. One of the few beauties of Kidlington is once you walk down to St Mary's Church into the conversation area, you are out into the open Oxfordshire countryside; where deer roam and in the summer the water meadows are full of swallows. The area is not overlooked by houses and the peace and quiet of the area needs protecting. Areas that should be considered which will not disastrously ruin GB is the land between Sainsbury's and the A34, along with further down beyond Stratfield Brake. These areas are big enough to justify the infrastructure needed, like another primary school. Kidlington needs more affordable housing, any development must be at least 35% affordable. |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry   | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes          | 9            |                         |               | In identifying areas of search, clear reference must therefore be made to the overarching spatial strategy and the area of search should accord with the approved strategy in the adopted Local Plan and must be clear in that the bulk of the proposed growth must continue to be focused in and around the main towns of Bicester and Banbury, and at sites such as Banbury 3. Furthermore, consideration needs to be given to opportunities to increase the amount of dwellings, where appropriate, on these existing Strategic Sites.   |
| PR-B-1286 | Gary       | Crone   |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. Kidlington's GB is enjoyed by local residents. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes  | West Oxfordshire District Council                | 9            |                         |               | This as a Cherwell matter   |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn |  | 9            |                         |               | Cherwell's Options paper, Interim Transport Assessment and Initial Sustainability Appraisal all explicitly state that Areas A and B have already been deemed most suitable and therefore it has been directed that these sites proceed to detailed site assessment.<br>This pre-empts the consultation process and undermines the NPPF's aim to include, rather than exclude, people and communities in the planning process.   |
| PR-B-1300 | Julia      | Hammett |  | 9            |                         |               | Why has GB been chosen for development. It is unacceptable and the unmet housing need for Oxford has not been proven. GB is there to protect Oxford from over development. The Government and Cherwell are breaking their commitment to protect the GB and will be held accountable for this.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk  | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust | 9            |                         |               | The areas of search should be focussed on the A44 corridor, such that it appears within the Kidlington and North and East Kidlington area.  |
| PR-B-1303 | Steve      | Gerrish |  | 9            |                         |               | The prospects for Kidlington are grim, because the character of the place will be transformed from small town to small city, with an increase in number of households of about two thirds its current size. However, if it has to happen, let it happen well:<br>Public transport - This must be a priority and be convenient and frequent. Sites that cannot be served well by public transport should be eliminated. Consideration needs to be given to preventing new houses being taken by London commuters.<br>Environment - There will be sites which have biodiversity value or are adjacent to such sites and some that are used as open space which is important for people's wellbeing. SSSI's and wildlife corridors also need to be maintained.   |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster  | Fritwell Parish Council                          | 9            |                         |               | Options G, F and I will result in increased traffic through rural areas and villages in Cherwell. Open space between villages is at risk, together with the character and appearance of historic Oxfordshire, its villages, countryside and landscape.  |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede  |  | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the GB anywhere, but particularly around Kidlington where the GB is fairly narrow and there are few open spaces for residents. The GB is a permanent designation and do not believe that an unmet housing need is a reason to desecrate this, especially to meet a speculative estimated need of Oxford. The majority of the areas of search are too far from Oxford but 4,400 homes is overwhelming if narrowed down to one or two areas for their proximity to Oxford.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname               | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria   | Campbell              |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric     | Rose                  |              | 9            |                         |               | In the future there will be some development in the GB around Kidlington. Object to the over development in the Oxford GB, the narrowing and removal of gaps between settlements, is not the GB there to protect and prevent this. Visitors appreciate the footpaths and green spaces that the countryside provides. Sites in Oxford such as Southfield Golf Course should be further investigated before asking other authorities to co-operate.  |
| PR-B-1309 | Kate       | Miklaszewska-Gorczyca |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1310 | Tara       | Prayag                |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington and Gosford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces which is equivalent to Oxford City's many parks. which are enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Extra housing isn't a good reason to build on GB. If Kidlington and Gosford GB and park area is classed as exceptional why has this not been applied to Oxford City's parks. |
| PR-B-1311 | Keith E    | Stratford             |              | 9            |                         |               | Yes. Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1312 | Carl       | Parker                |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. Cherwell have already identified there's no requirement to remove land from the Oxford GB for Cherwell's own needs, it is therefore its a contradiction to the original plans for Kidlington and its improvements. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.                                 |
| PR-B-1313 | Helen      | Broxap                |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname            | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1314 | Nicole and Eugene | Brooks and Griffin |              | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB. Chose to move to the village of Yarnton to raise our children in a village environment, not to become part of an urban sprawl. It is totally unacceptable to build in Kidlington, Yarnton or the other nearby villages. They would lose their village identities and character. The available outdoor spaces enjoyed by many for walking and the loss of habitats for local wildlife would be impacted. The residents quality of life would be significantly reduced. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.                    |
| PR-B-1315 | Joel              | Phipps             |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1316 | Christian         | Gilliam            |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1318 | Laura             | Walton             |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to the developments in the Oxford GB. GB should not be built upon, it should be protected and not lost for ever. Wildlife habitats will be destroyed. Some of the areas are prone to flooding, development will make it worse and move it into other areas if there are no green run off areas. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1319 | Mr and Mrs        | Unwin              |              | 9            |                         |               | Principle objection is to the proposal to develop in the Oxford GB. This rep states the five main purposes of GB. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. This development proposal would be totally contrary to the 'raison detre' of the GB and if permitted would not only destroy all the benefits of the GB but also provide a Green light for yet further development in the remains of the GB.   |
| PR-B-1320 | Vassilis          | Athanassoglou      |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1321 | Catherine R       | Mundell            |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Why has no consideration been given to the unused brownfield site of the former fuel depot in Islip, it has good access to the A34 and trains to Oxford and Marylebone. This is far more sensible than the areas suggested. The emphasis in the plan is on greenfield development rather than brownfield sites. |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname         | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1322 | Judy          | East            |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington should be sacrosanct it is enjoyed by a large number of local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Oxford City needs to be held accountable and manage their own housing needs and not expect the surrounding villages to take their over spill resulting in the destruction of the countryside which would result in a vast amount of wildlife lost. |
| PR-B-1323 | Karen         | Suter           |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1324 | Katie L       | Stratford       |              | 9            |                         |               | Yes. Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1325 | Richard       | Lodge           |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents and visiting friends as a great fitness resource. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1326 | Jan and Chris | Lacey and Plant |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents and ramblers from near and far. Local walks feature in major publications recognising their access to the open countryside. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1327 | John          | Pilgrim         |              | 9            |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB and attention is drawn to the NPPF's five stated purposes of including land within the GB. The GB around Kidlington is mainly attractive, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1330 | N M           | O'Mahoney       |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1333 | Zoe           | Christodoulou   |              | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation                                   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1334 | Jenny          | Betts     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1335 | Natalie        | Usher     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object to development in the Oxford GB. GB serves to protect quality of life in the city and surrounding village, the countryside is used by many local residents. The documentation does not provide a compelling argument to build on GB. Understand that central government considers that unmet housing need is not a sufficient reason. The government should uphold its manifesto and the District Council should continue with its existing policy to protect the GB.  |
| PR-B-1337 | Marcus         | Lloyd     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1338 | Philip         | Camp      |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Begbroke and between Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld, infilling between villages is not acceptable.   |
| PR-B-1339 | Dr Christopher | Wedge     |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents and myself for running and walking. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1340 | Sophia         | Argyris   |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Building in the area would make Oxford another over built up city like areas similar in London, losing its unique character and ruins it for many residents in the area. |
| PR-B-1341 | Olga Lascano   | Choperena |  | 9            |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld.  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun          | Richards  | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd | 9            |                         |               | The Areas of Search are well defined and are logical to make best use of infrastructure and services with existing urban areas and/or existing allocations within the adopted Part 1.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd                                   | 9            |                         |               | The areas of search identified are appropriate for larger strategic sites. However, the identified housing requirement should not be confined to these areas. Deddington is outside the Areas of Search but offers a sustainable location for development within the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area. It would benefit significantly from housing growth which would also deliver much-needed sports facilities.   |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick       | Alston    | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd | 9            |                         |               | Support the areas of search, in particular the extent of Area of Search A which includes the London Oxford Airport.  |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden     | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                | 9            |                         |               | 9 areas of search encompassing have been identified with regard to the location of the urban areas; their potential opportunities for delivering housing on previously developed land, site submissions received and focal points/nodes which may be developable.<br>14% of CDC lies within the Oxford GB, with areas A and B encompassing much of this GB land. It is therefore important that areas beyond the GB have been included as alternative options, to serve Oxford's unmet need.<br>Whilst the GB should be taken into account it is also considered that the 'area of search' should not exclusively focus on the GB as by definition these GB areas will be subject to constraint and therefore less suitable for development. Consider that the southern area of the District may be appropriate for a defined area of search, including Option E (Bicester and surroundings), which is better related to Oxford. |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council                                | 10           |                         |               | Agrees with this site size threshold for allocating sites for most of the search areas outlined with the exception of Area I.  |
| PR-B-0002 | Kerry      | Wilce     |   | 10           |                         | PR10, PR97    | It seem sensible to have a size threshold and grow communities to ensure their continual regeneration. However it has to be in context to the size of an existing community or it can be detrimental, particularly with regards to infrastructure. Development should be phased, no more than 10% per year. At sites near Wendlebury which has 167 houses this should be no more than 17 houses so the development can be assimilated into the existing community.   |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter      | Collins   | Islip Parish Council                                    | 10           |                         | PR30          | Supports and considers that the site size threshold should apply to sites less than 100 dwellings, e.g. PR30, which can provide a sustainable housing on a brownfield site. Detailed statement in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert     | Davies    | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford      | 10           |                         | PR51          | Have provided a table within the representation illustrating SA RAG and Proposed RAG for site PR51. The assessment of site PR51 has been affected by a misunderstanding of the proposed development area for housing which would be concentrated on the eastern portion of the site, rather than the entire area.  |
| PR-B-1143 | Dr Pamela  | Roberts   |   | 10           |                         | PR52          | No do not agree with the minimum size threshold. Sizes should be as proposed in Local Plan Part 2. Large sites are out of scale with existing developments as would be at site PR52 and the probability of causing coalescence is much higher.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler    | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                             | 10           |                         |               | Yes, agree with the site size threshold for Partial Review purposes. MAPM feels that a gross density of 50 dwellings per hectare is inappropriate for suburban and rural areas.  |
| PR-B-0021 | Kenneth    | Porter    | Cropredy Parish Council                                 | 10           |                         |               | Yes.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday    |   | 10           |                         |               | Agree if the infrastructure and services are in place.   |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford   | Jones     |   | 10           |                         |               | No, do not agree, thinks that allowing for smaller sites would increase the amount of brownfield or redevelopment sites available rather than the forced identification of larger areas of green belt or countryside.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall      |   | 10           |                         |               | NO, the site is too large, including flats in developments should be considered.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor    | Aitchison Rafferty                                      | 10           |                         |               | The risk with allocating sites of at least 2ha is that they are more suited to volume builders who may wish to land bank. Smaller sites of 50 units upwards should be included. They are normally built by smaller builders who deliver them in a shorter time frame.  |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue        | Mackrell  | Bicester Town Council                                   | 10           |                         |               | Agrees with the site size threshold  |
| PR-B-0119 | C A        | McCall    |   | 10           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0120 | E          | Tonkin    |   | 10           |                         |               | No, should be allocating fewer than 100 homes, to spread areas of expansion.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname             | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0153 | Paul                | Goulding QC         |  | 10           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val                 | Colby               | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                               | 10           |                         |               | Agree with site threshold of 2ha but do not consider this should be aligned with site capacity. In some instances a 2ha site would not yield 100 dwellings and for some areas a lower density is appropriate. Most suburban settings are between 25 and 30 dwellings per ha and in rural villages less than 25dph may be appropriate. By excluding sites below 50dph their contribution to achieving the overall housing target is therefore unassessed. The site threshold of 2ha should be retained but no reference should be made to the number of dwellings as a limiting threshold. |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth               |  | 10           |                         |               | No, smaller sites can help new people integrate into the community and prevent a 'them and us' attitude.  |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                | Walker              | Oxford Bus Company   | 10           |                         |               | Agrees to the site size threshold. Whilst allocations on a village basis may be suitable to meet local housing need consider that any developments less than 10 hectares should more ideally be used to enable a faster paced deliver of the housing sites to meet the unmet housing needs of Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings            |  | 10           |                         |               | No, smaller sites would not have such an environmental impact, would fit into existing urban areas with transport and facilities, despite being less attractive to developers.  |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright          |  | 10           |                         |               | This is unnecessarily restrictive and that sites accommodating fewer than 100 homes should be considered.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield            |  | 10           |                         |               | No. Small infill sites should be considered. For example, sites which already have planning permission but which the developers are hoarding, rather than building on them.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen               |  | 10           |                         |               | No, much smaller sites should be considered which would be in keeping with the local style of existing communities. They should include affordable houses for the younger generation and support self build groups. Ignoring smaller sites results in missed opportunities, including them would probably yield up suitable brownfield sites. Additional headcount in an area would underpin public transport services. The deadline of July 2017 is too tight for such an important issue.   |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber              |  | 10           |                         |               | In order to provide affordable and key worker housing with all the necessary infrastructure sites need to be large.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley             |  | 10           |                         |               | The site is far too large.  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley             |  | 10           |                         |               | It is far too large.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw             | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 10           |                         |               | No do not agree with the thresholds. Small sites can often be very important in meeting housing targets. Smaller sites can accommodate a greater number of people by building higher buildings. Housing a greater number of people on smaller sites has to be positive provided that such sites provide sufficient living and amenity space.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick                | Small               | Stagecoach   | 10           |                         |               | Agrees that it is unlikely that allocating sites of less than 2ha or 100 dwellings capacity would be appropriate. A deatle djustification is given.   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn              | Phillips            |  | 10           |                         |               | Yes. Think big. New services, schools, doctors etc. must be included in the plans.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony             | Matthews            | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 10           |                         |               | Agree that the site size is reasonable  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                  | Humphreys           | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 10           |                         |               | Consider that Yarnton is not a suitable location for development sites capable of accommodating 100 homes. There is universal objection to housing in Yarnton.  |
| PR-B-0731 | Ioana               | Davies              |  | 10           |                         |               | No. Size restriction seems aimed at big developers. Have brownfield sites not been considered for smaller numbers?  |
| PR-B-0743 | John                | Tremlett            |  | 10           |                         |               | Yes and Yes   |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian              | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories   | 10           |                         |               | It would be better to have a few large sites close to Oxford but smaller sites near to Oxford should not be ruled out.  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin              | Palmer              |  | 10           |                         |               | Agree 2 hectares / 100 homes, if they are all to be starter homes, is correct. Do not agree that mixed properties work, even if it is not PC to say so.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0770 | Steve            | Pickles  | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                            | 10           |                         |               | This is not supported. It is considered that providing development on a range of sites is the best way of ensuring that environmental impacts are minimised and that the development integrates both with its surroundings and existing communities. The statement in para 6.11 ignores the fact that development on larger sites and associated infrastructure often takes much longer to provide than on smaller sites. This argument in the rep is supported by reference to the Council's Draft Community Infrastructure Charging Schedule. |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane             | Olds     | Caversfield Parish Council   | 10           |                         |               | Yes, however the hectare area should have been bigger   |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip           | Morley   | North Oxford Golf Club   | 10           |                         |               | Note that the CDC working assumption is 50 houses per hectare, so a total of 88 hectares needs to be found for 4400 homes.  |
| PR-B-0796 | David            | Tighe    |  | 10           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive            | Booth    | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group  | 10           |                         |               | Agree to the site size threshold. The level of provision required and the timescale indicated render it infeasible to allocate sufficient sites if a lower threshold were applied. This should not preclude smaller developments in appropriate locations coming forward during the Local Plan period.  |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard |  | 10           |                         |               | No, Consideration should be taken on any site that might be used for housing as this will spread the effect and possibly keep the local people within that area.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris            | Robbins  |  | 10           |                         |               | Whilst smaller sites could make a useful contribution to meeting the overall need, at this stage it probably makes sense to concentrate on larger sites of 100 or more homes  |
| PR-B-0809 | Karen            | Selway   |  | 10           |                         |               | Agree that if small brownfield areas can be found, then these should be the first port of call.   |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim              | Green    | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association                                 | 10           |                         |               | Do not agree, but consider that smaller sites can contribute.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder    | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 10           |                         |               | The suggested size threshold and capacity is too high. Whilst large strategic sites have an important part to play they are often dependent upon major infrastructure investment and consequently may have longer lead in times. A portfolio of larger and smaller immediately available sites will ensure that the housing requirement is capable of being delivered as soon as possible.  |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor   |  | 10           |                         |               | No. Smaller sites can make a valid contribution.  |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce    | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbshire                             | 10           |                         |               | Yes to both questions.  |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson   |  | 10           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel            | Buttler  |  | 10           |                         |               | Agree with sites being provided with allocation of at least 100 homes.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard          | Hills    |  | 10           |                         |               | Disagree on any restrictions that get in the way of housing provision. If a planning application or proposal is made for a site with fewer than 100 homes, this should not be turned down simply because it is small. This will block smaller builders from contributing to construction. But should also allow sites with more than 100 homes.   |
| PR-B-0837 | David            | Jackson  | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 10           |                         |               | As a general principle, there is advantage in locating development in sites that are of sufficient scale to support a range of associated uses and investment in infrastructure. Adopting the principle that sites closest to Oxford represent the most sustainable options, the capacity of the land to the north of Oxford should first be fully realised before determining the level of allocation of sites more remote from Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0839 | Mark             | Rose     | Define on behalf of William Davies Ltd                                     | 10           |                         |               | Agree that the Council should not look to allocate sites of less than 100 dwellings.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike             | Gilbert  | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 10           |                         |               | Yes, although consideration needs to be given to the possibility of combining all or parts of adjoining sites.  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex             | Wilson   | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                         | 10           |                         |               | A2D notes that the Council has applied a notional density of 50 dwellings per hectare in setting the 2 ha threshold. This density should not only apply to strategic sites to meet Oxford's needs but should be applied District wide.  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard          | Cutler   | Bloombridge LLP  | 10           |                         |               | Yes.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0856 | David                  | Smith    |  | 10           |                         |               | No and No. Some smaller sites may not be as popular with developers but be included as a condition of permission for larger sites.   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins  | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | 10           |                         |               | The PC considers that smaller sites of less than 100 homes should be considered. This will spread the burden and impact on surrounding areas and residents. Smaller sites with fewer homes would be more in keeping with preserving the character of the village of Gosford/Kidlington. It would meet the purposes of the GB to 'preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Gosford/Kidlington village has 6000 houses. Adding 4400 more would virtually double the size of the village and destroy its current character and setting.   |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt                   | Todd     |  | 10           |                         |               | No. All options should be investigated, especially brown field sites.  |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin   | Oxfordshire County Council                               | 10           |                         |               | Transport strategy supports the site size threshold. Education requirements will typically be dependent on the permutation of sites that are allocated rather than individual site basis. Detailed comments are in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds     | Wendlebury Parish Council                                | 10           |                         |               | Agree  |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia                  | Trowles  |  | 10           |                         |               | Not if this excludes brownfield sites outside the GB.  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter                  | Trowles  |  | 10           |                         |               | Not if this excludes brownfield sites outside the GB.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley  |  | 10           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun                | Breith   | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                     | 10           |                         |               | Concerned about the proposed minimum size threshold of 2 ha and the allocation of sites for more than 100 units. This takes insufficient regard of the local context. Whilst both size and numbers might be appropriate in some urban locations they are unlikely to be appropriate in more rural locations. These thresholds could result in densities of up to 50 units per hectare, which is a density typically found in inner urban centres with little green space. Concerned about the impact this will have on the environment of this mostly rural district. In addition, it is our view that this will not allow for sufficient green infrastructure (e.g. formal and informal open space, gardens, street trees etc.) and biodiversity to be integrated into developments to create high quality sustainable developments, and to deliver a net gain in biodiversity. |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks    |  | 10           |                         |               | Yes. However, where sites are rejected for 100+ houses for reasons unrelated to the development size i.e. flood risk or GB, this should automatically disqualify any smaller schemes for the same locations.   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |  | 10           |                         |               | Considered priority for a mixture of designs and density with the consideration to open spaces and landscaping. On this basis the housing provision would not have to appear similar across each hectare. Can not comment on the density of 100 homes per hectare, so much depends on the design and whether they are flats.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |  | 10           |                         |               | I agree that you should not be seeking to allocate sites for less than 100 homes.  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council                                   | 10           |                         |               | Agrees with this objective and suggests that this would only be acceptable in locations that have adequate infrastructure nearby.  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar   |  | 10           |                         |               | The size threshold and density might be appropriate for urban locations, where there's already areas similar. Applying this criteria to rural and village locations is inappropriate. Adding 100 homes to any small village is totally unsustainable, needs to be in line with a neighbourhood plan prepared by each village. Needs to be supported with a funded infrastructure that needs to be implemented concurrently with the building of any new homes.   |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark                   | Lowen    |  | 10           |                         |               | Do not agree that only sites of at least 100 homes are suitable. There are countless villages within Cherwell that would not be substantially affected by small developments, so should not be ignored.  |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton   |  | 10           |                         |               | The criteria is just there for an administrative convenience, but changes which are going to affect residents lives perpetuity should not be driven by the capacity to process applications.. 100 houses on a hector is far too high a housing density. Local communities might welcome carefully selected sites of ten houses, but 100 houses can not be built anywhere without fundamentally altering the character of these local communities.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0912 | David      | Mason     |  | 10           |                         |               | Disagree with the policy as it goes against CDC existing policies that set out the appropriate level of development in villages or varying sizes. If there is development to be located adjoining smaller villages the scale of it must be proportionate; therefore a 100 homes minimum limit is wholly inappropriate.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall  | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 10           |                         |               | Higher density housing helps reduce land take and forces developers to build the more affordable housing that is actually needed. We believe the 30 dwellings per hectare standard currently in the Cherwell Local Plan should be raised. It is worthwhile noting that , 'Paris achieves 400 dwellings per hectare' (Driven by necessity, Inside Housing magazine, 23 June 2006)  |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux  | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 10           |                         |               | A smaller site size would be likely to only meet local need and not contribute to Oxford's unmet need. Smaller sites would not enable provision of additional services to provide mixed and balanced communities. Larger sites are more capable of providing additional investment into local infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds      | Fringford Parish Council   | 10           |                         |               | Agrees with the site size threshold and 30 dph (min), which would provide sufficient funding for infrastructure needs.  |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter      | Bateman   | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                             | 10           |                         |               | The figures appear arbitrary. Sustainable and deliverable sites may exist below the threshold. The priority should be sourcing the best sites to meet what is an urgent housing need rather than limiting consideration to arbitrary thresholds. No thresholds are proposed by the Framework therefore each site should be considered on its particular planning merits.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle     | Greenlight Developments  | 10           |                         |               | No. The Council must provide for a range of sites including not only strategic sites but also smaller sites which are unencumbered by infrastructure and other considerations and so can be brought forward early in the Plan period to help ensure a 5 year housing supply is achieved.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone     |  | 10           |                         |               | No, all sites need to make a greater contribution, not just because they are near to Oxford. This is a misleading premise and contributory to extra unnecessary pollution and environmental damage. A balance needs to be realised relative to sites, rather than a particular prescriptive solution. Local circumstances need to have greater prominence. Location proximity does not necessarily concur to provide affordable housing.  |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo  |  | 10           |                         |               | Disagree. Surely, to do so may ignore some smaller sites that could be used as infill within existing residential areas ? Look at all brown field sites regardless of size.   |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk      | Banbury Civic Society  | 10           |                         |               | Agree to the site size threshold on the basis of 30 dwelling per hectare, the minimum site size should not be less than 100 dwellings (say 3 hectares).   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia   | Banbury Town Council   | 10           |                         |               | For those sites with the most immediate relationship with Oxford the proposed site size ration would be appropriate, particularly in light if a green belt areas where larger sites are likely to be greeted with greater hostility.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 10           |                         |               | The potential contribution of sites below the 2 ha/100 houses thresholds should not be ignored, and it may not be appropriate to develop all of some of the identified sites (e.g. where it is necessary to protect the setting of a heritage asset), so the thresholds should not be seen as minimal that must be achieved. However, in the interests of a manageable exercise (this is already a consultation on some 140 possible sites), accept that these are sensible thresholds as a starting point. |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin    | Noke Parish Meeting  | 10           |                         |               | Concerned that the density of 30dph is that of a City Centre, it would ruin the essential characteristics of many small villages in Oxfordshire and would be totally unsuitable for small villages.   |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd  | 10           |                         |               | There is inadequate justification for the minimum site size threshold. Smaller sites can be large enough to justify a strategic allocation.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett       |                                   | 10           |                         |               | Do not agree with either of these questions. There is a paradox in the phrasing of these questions: If you propose a minimum site size of two hectares does this mean you are planning to have a density of 50 houses per hectare? Or are these two questions a way of expecting consultees to agree with a proposal for much larger sites in which the density would be less than 50 houses or of variable density?   |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner        | Launton Parish Council            | 10           |                         |               | Yes to both questions  |
| PR-B-1005 | SP and SA  | McQuillan     |                                   | 10           |                         |               | The proposed density is better suited to a city centre and urban areas, gardens are small and anything above three storey's is in keeping with the surroundings. This density is totally inappropriate to rural areas and would destroy the nature of village life. There needs to be a consistent and agreed rationale whereby any new development must not be more than x% increase on the existing community. The value of x can be debated but for small communities in particular this must be less than 25% to allow the existing community to continue and develop from its existing identity   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council        | 10           |                         |               | Agrees to the site size threshold so long as they are in areas adjacent to Oxford and do not increase traffic from further out.  |
| PR-B-1012 | Calum      | Miller        |                                   | 10           |                         |               | Rather than select a number of large sites, its more appropriate to consider smaller sites like PR30, as they would serve to support the local communities. Islip have benefited from GB policy but are at considerable risk if not able to undertake limited development. Residents are the elderly and retired, despite the flourishing primary school families are finding it difficult to move to the village. The village amenities are under threat and so a modest development would support these. If the choice was no development and a site for 100 houses, then I would support a larger development up to 100 homes. However I would not support a large development and have concern that any granting of permission for this site should limit the scope of development to that which a village of Islip's size (approx. 260 houses) could support without being overwhelmed.   |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher       | Rosconn Group                     | 10           |                         |               | Agree with the site size threshold, but do not agree with the site capacity of 100 dwellings. This would remove many potentially suitable sites from consideration which whilst not suitable to accommodate a density of 50 dph, may in all other respects be suitable and sustainable.  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd | 10           |                         |               | This approach does not discriminate between the larger site opportunities such as New Alchester that can make very significant contributions towards infrastructure, facilities and amenities and other smaller sites that can only really contribute a small number of homes but no tangible contribution to wider needs. At this strategic level of plan-making the minimum site size should be much higher - a minimum of 500 homes in order to facilitate comprehensive planning and delivery of development.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd          | 10           |                         |               | Yes although it could be argued that a threshold of 100 homes is too low for strategic issues such as this.  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |                                   | 10           |                         |               | The rationale for excluding small sites is justified. However, it is not reasonable to argue that because a site is small it cannot make a contribution to meeting Oxford's needs, and would purely be making a contribution to local needs. This is especially the case given that local needs have already (allegedly) been addressed in the Local Plan Part 1, so that new sites would contribute to meeting Oxford's needs, particularly in the Kidlington area, where the two economies of Oxford and Kidlington are closely interlinked, and where sites within or close to the existing curtilage and the village's defensible natural boundaries could also become well integrated within the village, assist in contributing to local infrastructure needs and aspirations, and therefore not be isolated un serviced developments. Many of the likely sites that meet these criteria are relatively small, but should be considered on their individual merits in terms of how well they could be integrated within the existing built areas. Site densities should be site specific to allow flexibility in design and appropriate housing mix. |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1027 | Jonathan       | Porter    | Archstone Projects Ltd  | 10           |                         |               | A threshold of 100 homes would be consistent with the Local Plan Part 1. However there should be provision in the Local Plan so that suitable smaller sites can also come forward. Such sites can make an important contribution, so should not be overlooked.   |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan       | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd   | 10           |                         |               | There is inadequate justification for the minimum site size threshold. Sites smaller than 2 hectares and those accommodating less than 100 homes can be large enough to justify a strategic allocation. Policy should be accommodating of all sustainable development to meet identified needs. Development in smaller settlements to meet local requirements can free up existing housing stock. Sites of less than 2ha may be able to accommodate over 100 dwellings where higher densities are appropriate. |
| PR-B-1032 | David          | Burson    | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford           | 10           |                         |               | This is supported and could have been set higher. A proliferation of smaller developments are unlikely to provide suitable access to the City and will give rise to car-based travel. They are also less likely to foster a sense of identity with clear links to Oxford. Larger strategic developments can provide the necessary critical mass to deliver high quality connections to the City, including strategic transport upgrades such as rail, cycle and road enhancements.                             |
| PR-B-1033 | Matthew        | Symons    | Hollins Strategic Land  | 10           |                         |               | It has demonstrated that the site size threshold should be reduced to plan for the most sustainable further growth. Have provided more detailed information in the submitted representation  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice          | Suttie    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments         | 10           |                         |               | No comment at this stage. Do however, reserve the right to comment on this topic in future rounds of consultation.   |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri   | Dyson     |   | 10           |                         |               | No. If the new homes are affordable and have been built on previously developed land, then there should be no need for a minimum threshold, any available land should be considered, but not GB land.  |
| PR-B-1040 | Robert         | Dyson     |   | 10           |                         |               | Emphasizes that development is about profit and not sustainability. Look to build in smaller spaces, which fit in with existing developments. Instead of accommodating for a bigger Westgate Shopping Centre which will impact the local retailers and cause traffic issues. To suggest there is a housing shortage and that the Kidlington area has to solve this is hypocritical.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP             | Lyes      |   | 10           |                         |               | Agree with sites of 2 hectares and above   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F       | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 10           |                         |               | This seems a reasonable stance   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val            | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council   | 10           |                         |               | This will depend on the individual sites. If, say, 50 houses could be accommodated without impact on local services, why not go for it?  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg           | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 10           |                         |               | As a strategic matter this threshold is supported and will assist delivery of the associated infrastructure required for growth.   |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan           | Storah    | Oxford City Council   | 10           |                         |               | Agrees with the site size threshold  |
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate | Hamilton  |   | 10           |                         |               | Infill sites in Kidlington should be counted against the overall figures demanded, including those currently under construction.   |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith          | Johnston  |   | 10           |                         |               | Yes. But disagree with developments of such scale in the environs of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington as it represents developments contra to CDC policies and erosion of important GB.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain           | Johnson   |   | 10           |                         |               | No, smaller developments would be more appropriate.  |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat            | Clissold  |   | 10           |                         |               | 250 houses/hectare is high density. Could have a few larger homes built on smaller sites by local builders. Would bring more prosperity to Cherwell and houses for executives  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1117 | Georgina         | Tibbs      | Barton Willmore on behalf of Bellway Homes Ltd and Archstone Projects Ltd | 10           |                         |               | Do not agree with the approach not to allocate sites of less than 100 homes, and consider it unnecessarily restrictive. Cherwell is characterised by small settlements and smaller sites should be a key contributor. Also, smaller sites tend to be less complex to deliver, and therefore have the potential to make a contribution to housing needs in the shorter term. Rep continues by setting out why the Church Leys Farm site is a sustainable location for housing development. |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie            | Lewis      | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                     | 10           |                         |               | CDC has previously not followed the approach of identifying settlement boundaries for settlements, beyond which development would not normally be permitted. Consequently the expansion of settlements is reliant on windfall development particularly within the 'built-up limits' of a settlement. This approach does not recognise that there may be suitable sites in close proximity to settlements and the key role that smaller sites may have in delivering housing.              |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip           | Towler     |   | 10           |                         |               | No large developments have a massive impact on the local community and are not always appropriate.  |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine        | Richenburg |   | 10           |                         |               | No, smaller sites would blend in better and have less impact on existing communities.   |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard          | Bennett    |   | 10           |                         |               | Don't know, the question is not clear to us.  |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French     | Deddington Development Watch  | 10           |                         |               | Agree with the site size threshold. A minimum site size threshold of 5 acres or at least 100 homes makes sense in the context of meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs.  |
| PR-B-1152 | Helen            | Pattison   |   | 10           |                         |               | If you are going to supply 4,400 homes it would be best to have larger sites, with 100 as the minimum.  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer    |   | 10           |                         |               | Yes, with regards to this consultation there has to be an arbitrary start point, smaller sites could be revisited in the future.  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright     | Begbroke Parish Council   | 10           |                         |               | Disagrees with the site size threshold and considers that smaller sites should be investigated. E.g. bungalows in Kidlington demolished to provide 4 flats. Building on existing land footprint is considered as a good policy.   |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis      |   | 10           |                         |               | No do not agree with the Council's thresholds. Small sites can be just as important in meeting housing targets, and more desirable for people to live in. Smaller sites of less than two hectares can accommodate a greater number of people by building slightly higher town houses. Small sites are less likely to make an impact on the scenery and can be used as possible infill within villages.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy    | Hornton Parish Council  | 10           |                         |               | No. Depending on the site concerned, ruling out small developments of less than 100 homes means losing the ability to 'tuck in' small developments close to existing facilities. This may be one of the problems behind Oxfords 'inability' to meet it allotted housing figure. Larger developments may be more profitable for the larger develop but they do not necessarily meet current or future housing needs  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian  |   | 10           |                         |               | There is not one hectare I would give up for premium price housing in the Green Belt.   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson    |   | 10           |                         |               | No. If small sites are available they should be pursued. These are more likely to be in sustainable locations and will be proportionate to local services. They would be more adaptable to changes in employment and if as anticipated the projected employment increases do not materialise they would not be a white elephant.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes     | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 10           |                         |               | Agree that the site threshold of 100 homes in line with Cherwell's existing Part 1 Local Plan. This is conditional on sites of 100 homes or less being allocated within the Part 2 Local Plan.  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis            | Davies     |   | 10           |                         |               | No. All sites should be considered and should look at ways to increase the densities per hectare by having more stories. There is no need for more executive housing to satisfy the developers.   |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi            | Lancaster  |   | 10           |                         |               | No, do not agree with the threshold. Smaller developments could be more acceptable to the local community and fit in with the existing character and infrastructure.  |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol            | Matheson   |   | 10           |                         |               | Smaller sites should be considered that have less of a devastating impact on villages, their amenities and services. It also means the character of the existing village is not destroyed. Larger developments should be on brownfield sites where services can be built.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1192 | Robert          | Selway          |   | 10           |                         |               | Agree that if small brownfield areas can be found, then these should be the first port of call.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul            | Butt            | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 10           |                         |               | Yes to both.   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew          | Garraway        | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 10           |                         |               | Yes. Sites smaller than 2ha and/or 100 homes are incapable of providing sustainable new settlements which would not accord with the Council's draft vision.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry           | Brougham        |   | 10           |                         |               | Agree on both counts, particularly as sites of this size will enable requirements for affordable housing to be enforced.   |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M           | Green           |   | 10           |                         |               | No do not. Smaller sites can make a valid contribution and many such sites can make a huge difference.   |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark            | Schmull         | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 10           |                         |               | Do not agree that a minimum site size threshold of 2ha or 100 homes should be applied. Cumulatively, sites below 2ha or 100 homes can make a significant contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet need and therefore the threshold should be reduced to 0.5ha or 10 dwellings.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon           | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 10           |                         |               | Agrees generally with the application of a minimum site threshold for this exercise, and 2ha seems a reasonable minimum to apply. Note, however, in some locations it may not be appropriate to apply a blanket density of 50 dwellings per hectare, without compromising design and leading to conflict with the spatial arrangement and context of surrounding areas.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed              | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 10           |                         |               | The minimum site area threshold of 2ha is agreed. At this stage, it is not considered that a number of homes threshold is required. It may be that the strategy for meeting Oxford's needs could be addressed by allocating sites in Cat 1 settlements i.e. some rural dispersal in accordance with the Part 1 Plan strategy. This may lead to some sites being allocated which accommodate less than 100 homes.   |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard         | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 10           |                         |               | Yes in both cases. Larger sites are a more sustainable way of meeting Oxford's unmet housing need.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne         | Willson-Higgins |   | 10           |                         |               | Smaller sites of less than 100 homes should be considered. This will spread the burden and impact on surrounding areas and residents. Smaller sites with fewer homes would be more in keeping with preserving the character of the village of Gosford/Kidlington. It would meet the purposes of the Green Belt to 'preserve the setting and special character of historic towns'. Gosford/Kidlington village has 6000 houses. Adding 4400 more would virtually double the size of the village and destroy its current character and setting. |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera       | Kantor          |   | 10           |                         |               | Am unable to answer this question as it would require more time than has been given.   |
| PR-B-1245 | Jason and Petra | Tyrell          |   | 10           |                         |               | No reason why sites below 100 homes can not be identified, especially as a lot of the housing need can be met on smaller sites.  |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip          | Boxall          |   | 10           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia           | Sheppard        |   | 10           |                         |               | Do not support either.   |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew          | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 10           |                         |               | Smaller sites such as brownfield land and windfalls will be considered in the normal way as and when they become available, whether for CDC's own housing target or as part of this exercise, so this not really relevant.   |
| PR-B-1268 | Garry           | Lancaster       |   | 10           |                         |               | No to both. Whilst appreciating the increased workload associated with identification of many smaller sites, this may yield more acceptable locations for the kind of affordable, small scale development that residents would actually welcome.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre         | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 10           |                         |               | Agrees on the minimum, in order to ensure substantial integrated infrastructure delivery. Smaller sites could be assessed against the existing adopted Policies of the Local Plan.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling  |  | 10           |                         |               | No. The minimum site size is irrelevant. What is far more important is that there should be a maximum number of dwellings per hectare. A rule saying that there is a minimum of private land, space and green areas attached to each house (.e. private garden) - per bedroom is far wiser as this makes living conditions more healthy and sane.   |
| PR-B-1274 | Andrea     | Duffy     |  | 10           |                         |               | Should seek to re-use brownfield sites, some of which may be small, rather than concrete over green fields, therefore smaller sites should be considered.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes              | 10           |                         |               | Have no comments at this stage, but do however reserve the right to comment on this topic in the future.  |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley     | Soanes    |  | 10           |                         |               | No, small sites would not destroy the local area as much, less impact and pressure on schools, doctors etc. and be less divisive. Larger sites are seen more profitable than small well designed ones.  |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes    | West Oxfordshire District Council                    | 10           |                         |               | This is a Cherwell matter. Local planning authorities in Oxfordshire can adopt different approaches in planning for their apportionment of Oxford City's unmet housing need. In West Oxfordshire the chosen sites are well above the Cherwell threshold for sites.  |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha    | Blackmore | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family | 10           |                         |               | Supports the proposed site size threshold to deliver housing in the numbers set by Oxfordshire Growth Board and will ensure that necessary infrastructure is integrated within larger scale major developments. It also allows the granting of planning consent on sites which are sustainable by virtue of their location adjoining or within categorised settlements, but would not otherwise be acceptable under adopted planning policy. The adopted Local Plan sets out policies for housing delivery within established settlement boundaries. This, combined with PD rights for Change of Use will deliver small scale housing development schemes on sites which are not allocated. |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy     | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd    | 10           |                         |               | Support the site size threshold   |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn   |  | 10           |                         |               | No comment.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk    | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust     | 10           |                         |               | Aagree with the site size threshold   |
| PR-B-1303 | Steve      | Gerrish   |  | 10           |                         |               | The threshold should be ten houses. Large developers have to minimise cost and maximise profits and this conflicts with the interests of the new home owners, build quality and the environmental impact. Small developers can afford to be ethically motivated.  |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede    |  | 10           |                         |               | Probably, yes. However, additional factors need to be taken into account when considering such large and dense developments e.g. additional runoff from rain. Much of Kidlington for instance is susceptible to flooding and substantial development on currently undeveloped land would significantly increase the risks.  |
| PR-B-1308 | Alaric     | Rose      |  | 10           |                         |               | In the future there will be some development in the GB around Kidlington. Object to the over development in the Oxford GB, the narrowing and removal of gaps between settlements, is not the GB there to protect and prevent this. Visitors appreciate the footpaths and green spaces that the countryside provides. Sites in Oxford such as Southfield Golf Course should be further investigated before asking other authorities to co-operate. Do believe that smaller sites should be considered in keeping with the current Local Plan.  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards  | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd       | 10           |                         |               | No. Sites capable of providing less than 100 homes have an important role to play if they are located in sustainable locations. Question whether the reliance on Part 2 of the Local Plan would be successful. To avoid the reliance on the Part 2 Plan, sites with a 1 hectare threshold for villages should be set unless there is no lengthy gap between the two plans being adopted.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation                                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                                      | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle   | Land and Partners Ltd                             | 10           |                         |  | There is inadequate justification for the minimum site size threshold. Sites smaller than two hectares and those accommodating less than 100 homes can be large enough to justify a strategic allocation. It would be inappropriate to specify that meeting unmet need in Oxford city should be dealt with in the same way as meeting local need in the adopted Local Plan Part 1. Sites of less than two hectares may be able to accommodate over 100 dwellings where higher densities are appropriate.   |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden       | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates          | 10           |                         |  | The proposed minimum site size threshold of 2 hectares is a better way to define strategic sites than 100 dwellings. For example Grange Farm, which is 5.92 Ha can deliver 60-70 homes whilst retaining a business use. Thus, by adopting a 100 homes threshold for strategic sites CDC would rule out suitable and sustainable sites such as at Grange Farm, Launton.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                       | 10           |                         |  | CDC has the onerous task of protecting a very rural region which sadly is being overrun by urban sprawl. It is not appropriate to build mini housing estates in small rural villages. House building should be restricted to infill and for a known local need e.g. rural exception sites.   |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson   |   | 11           | A                       | PR20, PR23, PR24, PR48, PR51, PR74                 | Should proposals to develop land be approved for sites PR20, PR23, PR24, PR48, PR51 and PR74 the settlements of Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington would merge breaching the primary condition of GB.  |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline   | Johnson     |   | 11           | A                       | PR20, PR38, PR39, PR50, PR122, PR125, PR167, PR178 | Object to the use of GB. Proposals in Area A remove land from the GB and result in coalescence of communities leading to them losing their identities. In particular object to PR20, PR38, PR39, PR50, PR122, PR125, PR167, and PR178.   |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine  | Richenburg  |   | 11           | A                       | PR38, PR50   | Option A is especially inappropriate as development will damage Kidlington as a distinct and separate community, affect the GB and compound traffic problems on the A4165. At sites PR38 and PR50 the proximity to Oxford Parkway may solve London's housing needs rather than Oxford's. There will be damage to the Park, loss of sport and leisure facilities and difficulties on the A4165 due to emerging traffic.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small       | Stagecoach  | 11           | A                       |  | This is a detailed and lengthy response. This area of search is closest to where the need arises. Appropriate candidate sites are most likely to be identified here. Position accords entirely with the conclusions of the ITA. The opportunities for sustainable transport stand out as being higher here, by far, than any other area of search. A detailed site by site assessment relating to public transport opportunities follows.  |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley     | Soanes      |   | 11           | A                       |  | Area A is deemed to be too much in the GB , do not destroy this. There is a flood risk to this area. The burial ground has often been flooded. The pollution from the A34 and A4260 is not good for our health. Oxford City are not happy until the rest of the county is covered in concrete.   |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy       | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd | 11           | A                       |  | Area of Search A is the most suitable location to accommodate Oxford's unmet need, excluding the land immediately to the north of Oxford which is likely to result in coalescence between Kidlington and the city. Any housing growth not met just to the north of Oxford could be met through a combination of sites PR14 and PR27.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris      | Dicks       |   | 11           | A, B                    | PR20, PR34, PR91, PR92, PR126                      | Search areas A and B are not appropriate for development as they will have a significant and unjustified impact on the GB and rural setting. The Oxford-Banbury canal zone was designated by CDC as a conservation area in 2012 important for tourism. The surrounding habitat is also part of the Oxfordshire Biodiversity Action Plan. The area between the canal and railway is a designated flood zone. Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke will lose their identities and all suffer from insufficient amenities at present. Local roads are limited and trunk roads are at capacity with Oxford Parkway contributing to this. Development near the railway would be limited by the noise. As acknowledged in the SA report section 3.39 the area has a good dark sky at night and any development would impact on this. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|---|
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony    | Matthews  | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                           | 11           | A, B                    |                | Given that the 4,400 homes is to fulfil the City's needs. They should be provided close to the City so that the effects of the infrastructure are not extended northwards and thus adversely affect the already overloaded conditions now being experienced. Therefore, sites within Areas A and B south of Kidlington should be considered.<br>Since a distinction has been made between the type and design of housing needed for the City and that required by Cherwell generally the site(s) would clearly need to be designed and developed in the appropriate way to satisfy these City requirements (thus, not being appropriate to satisfy the specific housing needs of Cherwell)  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine  | Arakelian |   | 11           | A, B                    |                | Support the objections to sites in Areas A and B submitted by the parish councils of Begbroke, Gosford and Water Eaton (PR A 012)., Yarnton and Kidlington (PR A 085) and the objections raised by Kidlington Development Watch (PR – A – 056).   |
| PR-B-1056 | Simon      | Parker    |   | 11           | A,B                     |                | Objections to options A and B development will result in the loss of GB, countryside, view walks and natural habitats. GB was brought into protect us from urban sprawl. Have we not learnt that unchecked expansion destroys areas and the quality of life. Kidlington will double in size, increased traffic in and around the local area adding to air pollution. The character of the historic villages will be damaged or lost. Added strain to schools, doctors and essential services. Yarnton and Begbroke will become part of the Kidlington Oxford sprawl and become new P and R's.   |
| PR-B-1056 | Simon      | Parker    |   | 11           | A,B                     |                | Objections to options A and B development. Current development near Barton and Bicester and with the new Garden City at Eynsham on the congested A40, the roads will not be able to cope, there is gridlock at rush hour and the A34 is at standstill on Friday afternoons towards J9. Cycling needs to be better promoted and funded to have segregated cycle lanes and junctions. Oxford City haven't investigated to develop within the city ring road before they want other areas to accommodate their housing needs. Areas such as Southfield Golf Club, South Park, land near the Ice Rink or University land would result in less traffic and pollution, if there were good cycle routes. The numbers are now out of date and it's unlikely the number allocated as affordable housing will have any impact to Oxford's need, it will bring people from outside the area. |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling  |   | 11           | A,B                     |                | Any areas near railway stations on lines connected to Oxford are feasible, otherwise only A and B are likely to allow workers to get work, but arguments listed in responses to questions 1 to 5 and question 7 above, are still applicable.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small     | Stagecoach  | 11           | B                       |                | While the ITA and SA ranks this area of search quite well, the added distance from existing and potential high quality sustainable transport options makes most of them (except PR22) considerably less sustainable than Area A. A detailed site by site assessment relating to public transport opportunities follows.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells     | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           | B                       |                | Concerned about development in search areas B, north of Kidlington as this would give rise to increased traffic through the village with recreation and leisure corridors of significant importance to local character and the local economy. These are sensitive landscapes which should be protected from major new development.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small     | Stagecoach  | 11           | C                       |                | This Area of Search will have significant adverse impacts on the A34 and the wider strategic road network, and is further from Oxford City.   |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett   |   | 11           | C, I                    | PR-A-083, PR10 | PR-A-083 East Wendlebury put forward by Bonnar Allan Ltd is shown as Area C. The rep. has provided detailed comments to this area. Which concern flooding and overflow from the Bicester sewage works. Concerns with executive commuter homes and not being affordable homes. The impacts to rural Wendlebury village and traffic movements. Concerns with local jobs for the residents. CDC has a policy of protecting rural villages, this is reaffirmed with search area shown as I.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small     | Stagecoach  | 11           | D                       |                | Arncott is relatively distant from the City. Some modest small-scale development may be appropriate to meet local need.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1111 | Pat        | Clissold |  | 11           | E                       | PR141, PR142  | Site PR141 is part of the Local Wildlife Gavray Meadow (520W1) so should not be built on, it constitutes the only Green link to other LWS like Blackthorn. A wildlife corridor is required to maintain free movement for animals living in Gavray Meadows.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small    | Stagecoach   | 11           | E                       |               | Strongly disagrees that Bicester is either an appropriate location nor that it would be feasible to accelerate and augment what is one of the most ambitious expansion programmes within the UK.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small    | Stagecoach   | 11           | F                       |               | Agree with the SA and ITA that this does not perform well as an option to meet the City's needs.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small    | Stagecoach   | 11           | G                       |               | The sites being promoted at Ardley will not sustain a commercial public transport service to Oxford, on any reasonably regular frequency.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small    | Stagecoach   | 11           | H                       |               | Detailed response on relationship of Banbury with Oxford. Argues that Banbury cannot credibly be expected to plan to accommodate Oxford's unmet needs in a sustainable or practical manner.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small    | Stagecoach   | 11           | I                       |               | Such a strategy runs entirely counter to all the principles of sustainable development, being inherently car-dependent.  |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie      | Lewis    | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                  | 11           | I                       |               | Locations within Area I should be recognised for their valuable contribution to housing growth. It is important that the contribution that smaller sites can make to the early delivery of homes which addresses short-term housing need in combination with larger strategic/mixed use sites, receives full and proper consideration within any emerging strategy.  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds     | Fringford Parish Council   | 11           |                         | 31            | This proposal would have adverse impact on the traffic flow.   |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert     | Davies   | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace | 11           |                         | 41            | Would welcome the identification of this site as an option for growth. It is located close to existing sustainable transport links. The link between the A44 and A40 in the Oxford Transport Strategy passes through this site. Exceptional circumstances exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries in Cherwell that Oxford City Council cannot meet its need within its own administrative boundaries. This site contributes little to the function of the GB and development would be naturally contained by the existing road and canal network that surrounds the site.   |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert     | Davies   | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace | 11           |                         | 124           | Would welcome the identification of this site as an option for growth. It is located close to existing sustainable transport links. The link between the A44 and A40 in the Oxford Transport Strategy passes through this site. Exceptional circumstances exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries in Cherwell that Oxford City Council cannot meet its need within its own administrative boundaries. This site contributes little to the function of the GB and development would be naturally contained by the existing road and canal network that surrounds the site.   |
| PR-B-0789 | Lynne      | Whitley  | Yarnton Parish Council   | 11           |                         | 126           | Object to development so this site on policy grounds. Site is wholly in the Green Belt, Policy ESD14 seeks to safeguard the countryside from development and prevent urban sprawl. Policy Villages 1 identifies Yarnton as a Category A Village, where only minor development, infilling and conversions are permitted. In addition, access to and from the dual carriageway A44 is restrictive and near impossible at this location. The site includes an important water course that flows into Yarnton village, and over paving natural soak-away will exacerbate flooding already occurring in southern sections of the village. |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds     | Fringford Parish Council   | 11           |                         | 136           | This proposal would have adverse impact on the traffic flow.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-1035 | Robert       | Davies        | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace | 11           |                         | 177   | Would welcome the identification of this site as an option for growth. It is located close to existing sustainable transport links. The link between the A44 and A40 in the Oxford Transport Strategy passes through this site. Exceptional circumstances exist to justify a review of Green Belt boundaries in Cherwell that Oxford City Council cannot meet its need within its own administrative boundaries. This site contributes little to the function of the GB and development would be naturally contained by the existing road and canal network that surrounds the site.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver       | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   | 11           |                         | 178   | Object as erodes an important piece of the Oxford GB which effectively would lead to the merging of Oxford and Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-0749 | Dr and Mrs M | Wallace       |  | 11           |                         | PR-A-019<br>PR 14   | Yes regarding previous site PR-A-019 (site ref 14) loss of completely open unsullied countryside much used by walkers for informal recreation, part of the setting of the Cherwell valley; loss of habitats; effect on already congested local roads; groundwater flooding at the eastern end (impossible to mitigate?); possibility of exacerbating flooding by runoff.  |
| PR-B-1334 | Jenny        | Betts         |  | 11           |                         | PR14, PR20, PR27,PR32, PR29,PR34, PR49, PR118, PR125, PR178, PR194. | I specifically object to any development on sites PR14, PR20, PR27,PR32, PR29,PR34, PR49, PR118, PR125, PR178 and PR194.  |
| PR-B-1335 | Natalie      | Usher         |  | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR07, PR34, PR126, PR91                                 | Objection to the development on GB, particular concerned with developments that would merge the boundaries between Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke identified as sites PR20, PR24, PR07, PR34, PR126 and PR91.   |
| PR-B-0747 | George A     | Doucas        |  | 11           |                         | (Previous PR-A-061)   | Reference to the developers previous PRA-061 number. "It is considered to be highly accessible with the A44 to the East and Cassington Road to the South". If you have seen the traffic on Cassington Road during the rush hours you would be bemused by the word "highly". Cassington Road is already an established rat-run between the A40 and A44 it does not need more cars adding to this.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver       | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   | 11           |                         | 38, 50, 122   | Object as erodes an important piece of the Oxford GB which effectively would lead to the merging of Oxford and Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun      | Breith        | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                                   | 11           |                         | Area E  | Are concerned about the additional quantum of development proposed near Bicester, which is already subject to a very extensive extension. Particularly concerned about the piecemeal approach to this, which is likely to result in developments being unrelated and which will not deliver the essential infrastructure such as sufficient recreational open space and green infrastructure. Consider it important that a comprehensive Green Infrastructure strategy is developed for the town and the surrounding areas, which does address the needs of all developments comprehensively (already proposed extensions and additional sites to meet Oxford's housing needs).   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun      | Breith        | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                                   | 11           |                         | Area F  | Concerned about potential cumulative effects of developments in this area and Area G (Ardley). Are especially concerned with regard to sites PR52 and PR47, which comprise a very large extension of Lower Heyford, the scale of which is completely out of context with the surrounding area and which might result in Upper Heyford and Lower Heyford merging into one settlement. Consider the proposed allocation too large for this area and are concerned about the direct and indirect effects (including hydrological changes, recreation, increased traffic) this might have on the natural resources in general and on designated sites such existing adjacent woodland blocks, the River Cherwell and Rousham Gardens. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun    | Breith        | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                                       | 11           |                         | Area H  | This proposed allocation together with the already existing allocation results in a considerable amount of development in the area. Again are concerned about cumulative effects of development on the natural environment and consider it important that development is comprehensively assessed and planned. This includes comprehensive masterplanning and infrastructure planning, including Green Infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul       | Walker        | Oxford Bus Company   | 11           |                         | General   | Would welcome the opportunity to discuss on the type of infrastructure that would be needed to facilitate developments in particular areas. Are keen to focus quantum of development along transport corridors where possible or where they are concentrated where volumes can justify the provision of a bus service. Having higher concentrations in a place that already has an established public transport links will allow this 'network' to grow for the benefit of all residents.<br>More supportive of Areas A, B, E and H. |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson     |  | 11           |                         | General   | Concerns about health services and how they can cope with a large increase in the population when they are already delivering an unsatisfactory standard of care. Another concern around development anywhere in the Oxford area is flood risk and the drainage capacity of the existing infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | 11           |                         | General   | The SA allocates theoretical capacities that far exceed the number of houses required, which is unhelpful. A detailed assessment of what the developer's intentions are within the site would need to be undertaken. In addition, if the principle for development were agreed for a larger than needed parcel, then at some later stage the developer could argue that the principle of development had been agreed, which is considered undesirable. Has provided an assessment and scoring for each site.                         |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson       | Environment Agency   | 11           |                         | General   | The Environment Agency notes CDC's preference to areas A and B. Therefore they have commented on the 38 sites within these areas on flood zones, watercourses, and SSSI's.   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR 064  | Concerned about the impact on the A361   |
| PR-B-0837 | David      | Jackson       | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 11           |                         | PR 38, PR 50  | As a general point, the identification of sites 38/50 as options for growth is welcomed. A number of detailed points are made in the rep in support of this allocation. Concludes by stating that North Oxford Triangle is a logical and highly sustainable location to create a new community on the northern edge of Oxford that would contribute towards meeting the City's unmet housing and other needs.  |
| PR-B-1266 | Linda      | Ward          |  | 11           |                         | PR027, PR14, PR49, PR125, PR16, PR50, PR38, PR12, PR123. PR39 | Specifically object to consideration of the following sites for development. PR027, PR14, PR49, PR125, PR16, PR50, PR38, PR122. PR123 and PR39. Also object to all of the parcels put forward around Begbroke and Yarnton that maintain the separation of these villages. So, yes this is the Oxford GB doing its job of preventing urban sprawl. The GB review showed all parcels remain Fit For Purpose. None should be sacrificed.  |
| PR-B-0021 | Kenneth    | Porter        | Cropredy Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR1   | This site has been subject of an application which was refused by CDC as it was considered to harm the character of the rural setting , rural setting and setting of the listed buildings. It would result in the additional vehicle movements on the existing road infrastructure that is under strain. Cropredy is not supported by public transport.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group            | 11           |                         | PR1   | This site is within the setting of the Cropredy Conservation Area. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger      | Bellamy       | Hornton Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR1   | Cropredy - unsustainable due to flooding and next to main Railway Line   |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific          | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------|---|
| PR-B-1235 | Ed          | Barrett   | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd         | 11           |                         | PR1                    | Rep refers to detailed planning history of this site, particularly an outline planning application 16/01468/OUT. There were no 'technical' issues included in the reasons for refusal. It is expected that outline planning permission for residential development is capable of being secured. On the balance of planning considerations, it is considered that allocating the land for residential development will enable the delivery of an appropriate and comprehensive development. The allocation will assist the District's housing need, assist in the vitality and viability of small businesses and services within Cropredy, deliver public open space, enhance biodiversity, enhance existing vegetation, and improve accessibility and linkages to local services, in particular pedestrian links.                                   |
| PR-B-0777 | Mark        | Longworth | Ambrosden Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR10                   | Significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there has been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains.<br>- The site also has significant visual impact, and hydrological issues, as it is on the River Ray basin, which is subject to flooding.<br>- There are significant issues related to elevated rail line.<br>- The site may be suitable for leisure or sporting use.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane        | Olds      | Wendlebury Parish Council                                       | 11           |                         | PR10                   | The site proposal is inappropriate development, due to flooding, BAP habitat, Green Boundary zone, unsustainable location, viability and conflict with Local Plan Strategic Objectives SO6, SO11, SO12 and SO15. It is also contrary to Policies BSC 11, ESD 1, ESD 6, ESD 10, ESD 13, ESD 15, ESD 18 of the local plan.  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun     | Breith    | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR10                   | This large site allocation is located in close proximity of the Wendlebury Meads and Mansmoor Closes SSSI. It is separated from the site by the M40 but connectivity underneath the motorway might exist resulting in increased recreational pressures on the site. Indirect impacts caused by accessing the site might also exist and will need to be fully assessed.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR10                   | This site abuts the Alcester Roman site scheduled monument to the north. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the monument.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb      |   | 11           |                         | PR10                   | Development at site PR10 would destroy the setting and character of little Wendlebury village. Consideration also need to be given to the stream.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F    | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR10                   | Objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb      |   | 11           |                         | PR10, PR11, PR12, PR97 | Development on these sites would be like a piecemeal way of getting the previously rejected 'Weston Otmoor Eco town' but without any of the 'Eco' credentials and thus benefits of this previous proposal. My main concern is for those sites that are near sensitive wildlife sites.   |
| PR-B-0002 | Kerry       | Wilce     |   | 11           |                         | PR10, PR97, PR12, PR11 | Further consideration needs to be given to using brownfield sites. For example the old RAF station, north of Bicester that would accommodate the majority of housing needs, even if the existing heritage value hangers were retained. Any section 106 agreement with developers could be used to create a living museum, beneficial to Bicester. PR10, PR97, PR12 and PR11 sites are located next to small existing rural communities with little or no infrastructure or public transport links. The bus service through Wendlebury and Weston on the Green to Oxford was closed this year and the service between Oxford and Bicester requires crossing a 70mph dual carriageway. Noise and air pollution would be excessive for the sites close to the M40, A34 and A41. Building on PR10 and PR97 would exacerbate existing flooding problems. |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane        | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council                                      | 11           |                         | PR105                  | Is one of the only available green spaces in the village. Limited vehicular access and the local roads unable to support additional volume of traffic. The existing infrastructure and services cannot sustain additional pressure from new housing. The Parish Council believes that this site in particular should be retained in perpetuity as recreational land and given to the community for such use.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small           | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR105         | The RAF Bicester Conservation Area lies just to the north of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small           | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR109         | The southern end of this site is within the setting of the Hook Norton Conservation Area. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0777 | Mark        | Longworth       | Ambrosden Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR11          | Significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there has been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane        | Olds            | Wendlebury Parish Council                                       | 11           |                         | PR11          | Objects - the site is located in the Green Belt, which prevents inappropriate development and stops urban sprawl. The site is not sustainable due to lack of infrastructure or connections to urban or developed areas, which would increase dependence on car; therefore contrary to objectives SO6, SO10, SO11, SO12, SO13 and SO15. Contrary to Policies ESD1, 6, 10, 13, and 14.   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun     | Breith          | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR11          | This site large site allocation includes or comes close to woodland blocks that are designated as Ancient Woodlands. In addition, there is a SSSI nearby that might come under pressure from development, e.g. recreational pressure.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small           | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR11          | The Weston-on-the-Green Conservation Area lies to the west of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb            |   | 11           |                         | PR11          | The west side of site PR11 may be within the rainwater catchment of Weston Fen SSSI springs. Rainwater catchment zone of the fen is not known and this needs to be calculated. This rep provides specific details to fens and flowery hay meadows.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F    | Hickman         | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR11          | Objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements   |
| PR-B-1119 | Bob         | Hessian         | Weston on the Green Parish Council                              | 11           |                         | PR11          | PR11 site is unacceptable due to inadequate traffic infrastructure, and the impossible (and impassable) burden it would put on the A34. A major transport route would need to be put in place to accommodate more major development in the Cherwell corridor - even making the A34 into a motorway is not the solution (re the Botley bottleneck). Detailed comments on the importance of the landscape setting of Weston on the Green, its housing need and the Draft Neighbourhood Plans are included in the Representation. |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne     | Willson-Higgins |   | 11           |                         | PR11          | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. Has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small           | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR111         | This site is within the setting of the Deddington Conservation Area to the south-west and may be within the setting of the Deddington Castle Scheduled Monument to the south. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal, and the setting of the scheduled monument.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small           | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR112         | This site is within the setting of the Deddington Conservation Area to the south and may be within the setting of the Deddington Castle Scheduled Monument to the south. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal, and the setting of the scheduled monument.  |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ          | French          | Deddington Development Watch                                    | 11           |                         | PR112         | This site is a greenfield site, which is located at the 'gateways' to the Conservation Area. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1162 | Roger         | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR112         | Milcombe - Remote, no facilities  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin        | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR113         | This site is within the setting of the Deddington Conservation Area to the south and may be within the setting of the Deddington Castle Scheduled Monument to the south. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal, and the setting of the scheduled monument.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ            | French    | Deddington Development Watch                                    | 11           |                         | PR113         | This site is a greenfield site, which is located at the 'gateways' to the Conservation Area. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa       | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR114         | This site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proved housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up settlement and landscape.   |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha       | Blackmore | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family            | 11           |                         | PR114         | Promoters this site known as 'The Paddock', Berry Hill Road, Adderbury. It has already been submitted by Strutt and Parker on behalf of the owners and is being considered within the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 Partial Review Options Paper and a duplicated representation for Part 2 of the Local Plan. Site PR114 is the main focus of this representation. Have provided a very detailed analysis of the suitability of this site for development in Adderbury. |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa       | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR116         | This site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proved housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up settlement and landscape.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa       | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR117         | This site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proved housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up settlement and landscape.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry         | Munday    |   | 11           |                         | PR118         | Employment. Widen Langford Lane, Upper Campsfield Road and Woodstock Road.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L             | Allen     |   | 11           |                         | PR118         | Site PR118 appears to be in GB and should not be developed, as the area will be full of wildlife. Noise pollution will be a problem to those living in the vicinity of the airport leading to higher specification of sound insulation and therefore higher building costs. It will add to the unsafe conditions at Begbroke. Here residents have to cross the A44 dual carriageway without a pedestrian crossing to access village amenities and the bus stop.       |
| PR-B-0856 | David         | Smith     |   | 11           |                         | PR118         | Site PR118 - better to allow runway extension across the Straight Mile than close and redevelop the airport site.   |
| PR-B-0881 | James Kenneth | Jutton    |   | 11           |                         | PR118         | Site PR118 its use as an airfield is inappropriate, this area would be better used as industrial and science parks. Also an good location for a Park and Ride so that traffic is eased towards Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris         | Dicks     |   | 11           |                         | PR118         | Site PR118 is the current site for the airport, a vital strategic asset for the region. The airport should be promoted for growth and expansion and not lost to development.  |
| PR-B-0960 | M             | O'Mahoney |   | 11           |                         | PR118         | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A   | Webb      |   | 11           |                         | PR118         | Development on site PR118 would cut off the wildlife corridor which connects the wet rush/sedge meadow LWS good for wetland birds and rare plants that abuts Langford Lane.   |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M       | Rugg      |   | 11           |                         | PR118         | Site PR118 is at Oxford Airport, a site of major employment.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                                    | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| PR-B-1123 | Paul        | Mayhook   |   | 11           |                         | PR118  | Are there plans to close Oxford Airport?  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson   | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR118  | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4708515607  |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles       | Hughes    | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 11           |                         | PR118  | This site adjoins its boundary. It would appear to compromise London Oxford Airport. This is an important piece of strategic transport and economic development infrastructure for Oxfordshire.   |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick        | Alston    | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd                 | 11           |                         | PR118  | Have provided a statement that sets out the planning proposition for the London Oxford Airport site and the economic case for the proposal. This is submitted with their representation. This should be read in conjunction with their earlier representation dated 11th March 2016 and 6th July 2016, in particular the 'London Oxford Airport Sustainable Development Opportunity, Position Paper' (dated March 2016).  |
| PR-B-1079 | JW          | Fresen    |   | 11           |                         | PR118, PR195, PR194, PR27, PR14, PR24, PR07(sic) | Object to areas PR118, PR195, PR194, PR27, PR14, PR24, and PR07. Reasons include loss of Green Belt, open countryside, views and walks, impact on nature, implications for flooding and drainage, and the impact on local road traffic.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane        | Olds      | Wendlebury Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR12   | Objects - unsustainable development for a small village . It would lead to merging Little Chesterton with Chesterton and to the urban sprawl of Bicester out towards the M40 and the eventual growth of the town over all the rural areas between it and the M40. Contrary to objectives SO6, SO10, SO11 and SO12. Contrary to Policies ESD10 and 13.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger       | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR12   | Chesterton - unsustainable due to its remote location, no facilities and car access only  |
| PR-B-0777 | Mark        | Longworth | Ambrosden Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR12   | Significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there has been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F    | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR12   | Objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday    |   | 11           |                         | PR122  | Part of PR38, widen A34 and fence rail line.  |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha     | Eliot     | Oxford Preservation Trust   | 11           |                         | PR122  | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues  |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney |   | 11           |                         | PR122  | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman   | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum  | 11           |                         | PR122  | This site, considered separately and as part of site PR38, is unsuitable for housing. It is badly located bounded by the railway and the A34. Noise and air quality would be seriously damaging for residents. The problems of isolation and access are similar to those of PR123.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson   | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR122  | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4968811242; Watercourses - Small w/c at south of site  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew      | Gant      | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 11           |                         | PR122  | Oxford and Kidlington must maintain a substantial green barrier between the two settlements, and must now allow housing adjacent to bust roads, for reasons of noise, air pollution etc. The plans showing Northern Gateway as undeveloped is misleading.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre     | Wells     | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR122  | This area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD) |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1123 | Paul        | Mayhook         |   | 11           |                         | PR122, PR123  | Sites PR122 and PR123 are either side of the Oxford-Bicester railway line which would present noise issues for residents.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday          |   | 11           |                         | PR123         | Part of PR38, widen A34 and fence rail line.   |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha     | Eliot           | Oxford Preservation Trust                                       | 11           |                         | PR123         | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues   |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul        | Buckley         |   | 11           |                         | PR123         | Site PR123 it is unsuitable due to the remote roads. Residents would always have to use cars as a means of transport. It is unsuitable for employment as the access is through narrow residential streets. The golf course would be reduced making it unsustainable and remove a much valid local amenity.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney       |   | 11           |                         | PR123         | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman         | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum                                  | 11           |                         | PR123         | Disagree with the ++rating for SA6 and SA16. Consider that the site is not suitable opportunities for employment because access is only possible through narrow residential streets. Also disagree with the rating under SA10 because there is no easy access except by car. The golf course is already small and developing this site would reduce it and make it unviable. It would also remove a valuable recreational facility and, just as important, an area that makes a contribution to biodiversity and provides a wild life corridor.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson         | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR123         | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4984111084   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne     | Willson-Higgins |   | 11           |                         | PR123         | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. She has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday          |   | 11           |                         | PR124         | Part of PR41, roads need widening.   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth   | Moore           |   | 11           |                         | PR124         | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha     | Eliot           | Oxford Preservation Trust                                       | 11           |                         | PR124         | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small           | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR124         | This site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the west. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney       |   | 11           |                         | PR124         | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb            |   | 11           |                         | PR124         | There are constraints to development at site PR124 as included in PR41   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew      | Hornsby-Smith   |   | 11           |                         | PR124         | Supports the development of this site in conjunction with Site PR41. Has provided a criteria based assessment.   |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman         | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum                                  | 11           |                         | PR124         | This site is surrounded by major roads to the south and west and the planned link road will cross it. There are limited public transport possibilities for access to Oxford so it favours car use and pedestrians and cyclists would have to cross major roads.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger       | Bellamy         | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR124         | Kidlington - Flood Risk, close to A40/A34 (noise and pollution)  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname                  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                   | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| PR-B-1223 | Judith                 | Johnson                  | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR124                           | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4904810708; Watercourses - watercourse on southern and western (canal) boundaries   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre                | Wells                    | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR124                           | This area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler                   | Bloombridge LLP   | 11           |                         | PR124, PR41, PR39, PR177, PR168 | The proposed sites north of Peartree roundabout are separated from any existing community and services, they are constrained by highways, and have been historically considered by the City Council to offer a poor environment for residential development owing to the unsatisfactory noise and air pollution generated by the A34 and A44.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry                  | Munday                   |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Gosford has flooded.   |
| PR-B-0036 | David                  | Blowers                  |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Property will be devalued, wildlife habitats and views lost and Water Eaton Lane and Gosford's character will be destroyed. Noise and light pollution will increase and flooding a consideration. Residents will be looking for compensation.  |
| PR-B-0712 | Sonya                  | Willoughby               |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Site PR125 Concerns regarding flooding and the impact that more houses would have on this area with the inadequate drainage. The new cemetery is based here to.  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth              | Moore                    |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins                  | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC                | 11           |                         | PR125                           | As well as being in the GB, most of this site is shown as being in Flood Zone 3 and should not be considered further on this basis. Development within this and surrounding areas has the potential to increase flooding risks for existing properties in Cherwell and downstream in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0959 | Cllrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Objects to development on this site and considers that this site should be removed from the consultation process entirely because this site is in the Green Belt with no development on it at all. It offers a natural gap between Oxford and Gosford and Water Eaton, this is vital so that the village does not get swallowed up by Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0960 | M                      | O'Mahoney                |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A            | Webb                     |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Site PR125 will have air pollution and traffic noise at the section close to the A34   |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A            | Webb                     |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Site PR125 has an ancient hedgerow that needs protection and preservation and the southern section of the site is unsuitable due to the noise and pollution from the A34.  |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M                | Rugg                     |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Site PR125 is farmland adjoining Water Eaton Lane which is marshy.   |
| PR-B-1158 | Elizabeth              | Leckie                   |   | 11           |                         | PR125                           | Site PR125 is extremely unsuitable for development as it is waterlogged and has experienced flooding. It is designated a Flood Zone 3 by the Environment Agency and this rep has provided specific details with map references of flooding in 2007. The fields at this site are next to the A34 and crucial in absorbing harmful air pollution, any new houses on this site would increase health risks to new occupants. The GB is crucial in preventing urban sprawl and maintaining the separate identities of these villages allowing a sense of community and social cohesion. PR125 is valuable resource for the local communities and rich in wildlife.                 |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin      | Leckie          |   | 11           |                         | PR125         | Site PR125 is extremely unsuitable for development as it is waterlogged and has experienced flooding. It is designated a Flood Zone 3 by the Environment Agency and this rep has provided specific details with map references of flooding in 2007. The fields at this site are next to the A34 and crucial in absorbing harmful air pollution, any new houses on this site would increase health risks to new occupants. The GB is crucial in preventing urban sprawl and maintaining the separate identities of these villages allowing a sense of community and social cohesion. PR125 is a valuable resource for the local communities and rich in wildlife.   |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman         | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum  | 11           |                         | PR125         | This site has similar problems to sites PR38 and PR50 in that both are too close to major roads and would suffer from noise and air pollution, especially in spaces necessary for outdoor recreation.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson         | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR125         | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP5053713316; Flood Zone 2 or 3 Most of site is FZ3 (and2)  |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne     | Willson-Higgins |   | 11           |                         | PR125         | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. She has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.   |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew      | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 11           |                         | PR125         | This site would not create coalescence of Oxford and Kidlington  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre     | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR125         | Object to development in this area, due to loss of an part of the setting of the village and erosion of the Green Belt.  |
| PR-B-1312 | Carl        | Parker          |   | 11           |                         | PR125         | Have particular concerns regarding site PR125 in the Gosford and Water Eaton area. The countryside and views would be spoilt. The only access is at Bicester Road and road infrastructure to this area, extensive changes would be required to this road and the relevant junctions, like the entrance to Water Eaton Lane which is a single road. This would have a detrimental impact on traffic causing congestion towards Bicester and Oxford, and further impact on the lives of those residing near and that use this critical junction point daily. Bus services have decreased, at peak times the S5 is busy and will only get worse with Bicester's growth. There needs to be a review for the public transport to cope with the added demands. |
| PR-B-0833 | Cas         | Lester          |   | 11           |                         | PR125, PR178  | Yes. Site PR 125 (between Water Eaton Lane and the A34) and PR178 (between Water Eaton Lane and the Kidlington Sainsbury's Roundabout) are NOT suitable sites for development. Much of area PR125 is clearly designated as Flood Zone 3. The land in this area floods badly every winter, – with at least one field often entirely underwater. Building on this site will not stop the floodwaters rising – it will only divert the floodwater and worsen the problems of flooding that already exist in the residential areas of east Kidlington. It simply isn't suitable land to build on.  |
| PR-B-1053 | David       | Hemingway       |   | 11           |                         | PR125, PR178  | Much of site PR125 is clearly designated as flood zone three by the Environment Agency. Object to any development in this area due to the implications for flooding and drainage. Strongly object to the erosion of designated GB. Concerned with the damage, loss of the views and walks in the local countryside. There would be an impact on the local traffic. Development on both PR125 and PR178 reduces the quality of life for all living in the area.   |
| PR-B-1310 | Tara        | Prayag          |   | 11           |                         | PR125, PR178  | Particularly object to sites PR125 and PR178 being considered as suitable for development. Much of site PR125 has been designated as a Flood Zone 3 by the Environment Agency. Strongly object to development here as there would be implications to flooding and drainage in this area. Strongly object to the erosion of GB. There would be damaged to the countryside, with the loss of views and walks. Traffic would be impacted in the area. Both sites would reduce the quality of life for residents, land here is our park that needs protecting.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname   | Organisation                        | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-1319 | Mr and Mrs  | Unwin     |                                     | 11           |                         | PR125, PR178, PR16, PR50, PR38, PR50, PR122, PR123, PR28, PR41, PR124, PR168, PR177, PR39, PR49, PR27, PR14, PR32 | Object to these sites. Many are located in the 'Kidlington Gap' and/or adjacent to flood plains and all or at least the majority are in the GB. They would also exacerbate road congestion in the area.   |
| PR-B-0029 | Sonia       | Morgan    |                                     | 11           |                         | PR125, PR178, PR39, PR177, PR168, PR41, PR124, PR38, PR50, PR122, PR167, PR92                                     | All sites along the A34 should be rejected on health grounds and loss of GB. Especially sites 125, 178, 39, 177, 168, 41, 124, 38, 50, 122, 38, 167. Sites 32, 27 and 14 are well-walked and close to areas that flood. Similarly the sites adjacent to the Oxford Canal:49,39,20,91 are valuable open spaces and wildlife corridors. Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington should not be merged as green space and amenities will be lost. The A44 is already busy and as such don't want to see further development on sites 92 and 126 on health grounds.   |
| PR-B-1080 | Mr and Mrs  | Horne     |                                     | 11           |                         | PR125, PR178, PR49  | Object strongly to sites PR125, PR178 and PR49 because of loss of GB, and the impact on nature, walks and views. Also the impact on local roads as traffic increases along with noise and light pollution.  |
| PR-B-0260 | Chris       | Pack      |                                     | 11           |                         | PR125, PR178, PR50, PR122, PR38, PR167, PR123   | This large site would effectively remove the GB between Oxford and Kidlington, creating an urban extension of Oxford and threaten the identity of them both. It is a crucial part of the "Green Lung" that provides recreational facilities including North Oxford Golf Course for a wide catchment area. Natural habitats for farmland species would be destroyed and I'm totally opposed to the development.  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth   | Moore     |                                     | 11           |                         | PR126   | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.  |
| PR-B-0777 | Mark        | Longworth | Ambrosden Parish Council            | 11           |                         | PR126   | The development of this site is considered to have least impact on the settlement of Ambrosden as it is on the edge of the settlement and in the neighbouring Parish of Arccott. Note that Ambrosden has seen a large number of houses built in the last few years.   |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive       | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR126   | This site appears next most appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction on Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line; this would be well placed to improve the transport services of Oxford, whilst being less attractive to London commuters (since the route would be slower than from Oxford Parkway), hence housing at this location would be more likely to serve Oxford's need (rather than London's) than if placed elsewhere. OCS believes there is great potential for a development -related Swift Rail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. In addition to this they suggest making an initial release of parts of the site which are accessible to existing bus services on the A44. |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb      |                                     | 11           |                         | PR126   | Site PR126 will be noisy due to the railway line and close to the sewage works where there may be pest fly problems.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                                    | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| PR-B-1123 | Paul        | Mayhook  |   | 11           |                         | PR126  | At site PR126 there are issues with the Oxford-Birmingham railway and it is an isolated site so would need development on the adjacent site PR20.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson  | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR126  | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4904810708; Watercourses - watercourse on southern and western (canal) boundaries   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre     | Wells    | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR126  | Object to development in this area, due to loss of an part of the setting of the village and erosion of the Green Belt.  |
| PR-B-1065 | J           | Bevis    |   | 11           |                         | PR126, PR34, PR49, PR127, PR51, PR20, PR9Z (sic) | Building on GB in and around Kidlington will make the village too big. It is already difficult to get a doctors appointment, the schools are full and traffic is awful. Crime is another issue that would concern me. Am yet to be convinced this amount of houses is needed.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb     |   | 11           |                         | PR128  | Site PR128 is too close to Arncott Bridge Meadows SSSI and Upper Ray living landscape area of BBOWT. The green corridor between Otmoor and the Upper Ray meadows west of Aylesbury needs to be strictly protected and preserved from development to allow wildlife to travel freely between the two  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun       | Richards | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                          | 11           |                         | PR129  | Client has an interest in site PR129, land at Ell's Lane, Bloxham. The site area is 2.61 hectares and could qualify as a strategic site but due to the proposed yield of around 30 dwellings it may be more appropriate to promote this site through Part 2 of the Local Plan. But would prefer if the Partial Review deals with this issue at this stage and allocates sites of 1 hectare and above for sustainable settlements. Reference is made to the Bloxham Neighbourhood Plan.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark        | Recchia  | Banbury Town Council  | 11           |                         | PR130  | This site does not provide strong road connections with Oxford both road and rail. It would increase road traffic within Banbury and further decreasing connectivity between the town and Banbury.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa     | Goss     | Adderbury Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR134  | This site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proved housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up settlement and landscape.  |
| PR-B-0870 | Stewart     | Patience | Anglian Water Services Ltd  | 11           |                         | PR136  | The available capacity at Water Recycling Centres (formerly known as sewage treatment works) for each site is within Anglian Water's area of responsibility, and is considered to have an impact on its infrastructure. Have not considered the cumulative impact of these developments on their existing infrastructure; therefore ask CDC that further consideration is given to the cumulative impact on existing water recycling centres as part of the preparation of the current review and that this is reflected in the expected timing of development sites. Sewerage network - foul (or used water) flows from growth will have an impact on its existing network. This will depend on the location, size and phasing. Initial assessment is undertaken when approached by developers on a site by site basis. |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR137  | This site is adjacent to the Wroxton Conservation Area to the south. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR138  | The southern half of this site is within the Wroxton Conservation Area. In fact, note that the Council is currently consulting on an updated Character Appraisal that recommends the extension of the conservation area to include the whole of this site. It is not clear from the updated Appraisal why this extension is proposed or, indeed, what contribution this area of land makes to the special interest, character or appearance of the Conservation Area, but it would seem likely that the loss of its openness would be detrimental to that interest, character and appearance, and therefore consider that this site should not be taken forward.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name            | Surname                  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0777 | Mark                  | Longworth                | Ambrosden Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR139         | Significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there has been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                | Small                    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR139         | This site includes the grade II listed assets of Oxford Lodge and bridge c. 200m north-east of Lodge Farmhouse and abuts the Chesterton Conservation Area. A site visit is needed to fully understand the context and setting of the building but we consider that an isolated rural location would be an important aspect of the significance of this building given that lodges are meant to signal the entrance to the estate of a country house, which essentially requires a countryside location. Development of this site would be likely to result in a high level of harm to the significance of this building and that the site should therefore not be taken forward. |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                | Small                    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR139         | This site includes the grade II listed assets of Oxford Lodge and bridge c. 200m north-east of Lodge Farmhouse and abuts the Chesterton Conservation Area. Any development of this site should retain the listed structures and have regard to their setting and that of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A           | Webb                     |   | 11           |                         | PR139         | Site PR139 has ridge and furrow pasture land and a brook. This brook would need its green wetland corridor protected by a wide buffer zone and no development run-off should be directed into it to reduce erosion and downstream flooding risk.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F              | Hickman                  | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR139         | Objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry                 | Munday                   |   | 11           |                         | PR14          | Houses should be for Kidlington residents only not Oxford  |
| PR-B-0757 | Martin                | Palmer                   |   | 11           |                         | PR14          | Site PR14 land behind Webbs Way. As a resident of 25 years this cul-de-sac location would become a through road for a larger estate. Open fields, walks, wildlife like newts would be lost and a great tragedy if lost for ever. Concerns regarding flooding as the fields are a natural flood plan. GB needs to be protected for our future generations.  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth             | Moore                    |   | 11           |                         | PR14          | Opposes the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.      |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard               | Cutler                   | Bloombridge LLP   | 11           |                         | PR14          | Grateful that this site is included in Table 6. Note that some of the site areas given for other sites are exceptionally ambitious given the constraints in this area.   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun               | Breith                   | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR14          | This site is located close to the Lower Cherwell CTA and Langford Meadows LWS (Local Wildlife Site). Concerned about direct and indirect impacts on the LWS (including recreational impacts). Expect the LWS to be protected by an appropriate buffer and any development to provide enhancements in line with CTA aims and objectives.  |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie                 | Lodwick                  |   | 11           |                         | PR14          | Strongly objects to the development of this site on the grounds that it is in the Green Belt, it would affect the setting of the Church, listed buildings and the Conservation area. Has listed in detail the importance of this site green space, the vital role it plays in the life of the communities, the footpaths, wildlife, habitat, etc. in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                | Small                    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR14          | This site abuts the Church Street Conservation Area to the east. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0959 | Clrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |   | 11           |                         | PR14          | Object to any development on this site and consider that this site is inappropriate for development; therefore should be removed from the consultation process. This site to the north of Kidlington with no development on it. It is also an area that is hugely important to local wildlife and residents. The loss of this area would be detrimental to the area.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                        | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| PR-B-0960 | M                 | O'Mahoney       |   | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | Objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew            | Hornsby-Smith   |   | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | Supports the development of this site.  |
| PR-B-1054 | Bharat and Jankee | Badiani         |   | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | Yes. The rep is referring to PR-A-019 (site PR14). Loss of open unsullied countryside, used by many walkers for informal recreation. It is part of the Cherwell valley. The loss of habitats. The effect to the already congested local roads. Groundwater flooding at the eastern end which is impossible to mitigate and possibility of exacerbating flooding by runoff.  |
| PR-B-1055 | Philippa          | Mullineux       |   | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | Object to the development around St Mary's Church and associated conservation area. The development of this site would fundamentally affect the setting of the listed building including the historic views across the fields to St Mary's. There is a huge array of flora and fauna including blackbirds, robins, wrens, owls, jays, woodpeckers, flocks of finches, blue, black and long tailed tits, gold crests, Mistle and Song thrushes, Red kites (nesting) and kestrels, cuckoo, kingfishers along the Cherwell, larks, swifts, starlings and over the winter very occasional waxwings. There are bats (pipistrelle and Leisler's), weasels, adders, toads, and frogs not to speak of the roe and Muntjak deer as well as badgers and rabbits. This list is far from comprehensive or scientific, but provides an indication of the loss of natural habitat that would result from development. |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan              | Lodwick         |   | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | Site PR14 has well used footpaths, enjoyed by many in the absence of a public park. It provides fine views of the historic church and there is a considerable wildlife presence. Access to the site would be from The Moors which already has traffic problems, and the eastern field is subject to flooding.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith            | Johnson         | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4917015035; Flood Zone 2 or 3 - 2 and 3 at or close to NE corner of site.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry             | Brougham        |   | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | Site PR14 should be rejected as its development would affect the setting of St Mary's Church and the accompanying conservation area.  |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne           | Willson-Higgins |   | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. She has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew            | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | This site has good potential for making better use of the historic setting of the Parish Church, which is currently detached from the rest of the village.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre           | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | North of the Village: Land north of the village forms a continuous open farmed landscape between the village and the River Cherwell. It preserves part of the visible rural setting of Kidlington, a green approach to the City and a substantial recreation asset for Kidlington and the local area. Any new development on this site would channel additional traffic through the village centre. Development should not extend into this very important open land, which is of exceptional beauty and frequently used as recreation land by local residents.   |
| PR-B-0676 | John F            | Morris          |   | 11           |                         | PR14                                 | The southward spur on site 14 encompasses not only a public right of way but a spring-fed pond which would cause construction problems and is said to contain an endangered species.  |
| PR-B-0998 | Lisa              | Coulling        |   | 11           |                         | PR14, PR127                          | Sites PR14 and PR27 these to are lovely areas for walking with my dog. Often see deer and unusual birds, this is GB, building here would join Kidlington to Thrupp.   |
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate    | Hamilton        |   | 11           |                         | PR14, PR16, PR27, PR32, PR125, PR178 | Sites PR14, PR16, PR27, PR32, PR125 and PR178 are all adjacent to areas that flood and at high water levels will themselves flood.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| PR-B-1315 | Joel              | Phipps    |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR20, PR24, PR27, PR32, PR34, PR50, PR51, PR74, PR75, PR91, PR124, PR125, PR168, PR177 | These are open spaces with particularly beautiful outlooks used by many local families, children and older people from many communities including Kidlington, Begbroke, Yarnton and North Oxford for recreational purposes, exercise and mental refreshment. There is also a variety of wildlife in these areas. This is precisely the reasons why GB protection exists and should not be broken.  |
| PR-B-1316 | Christian         | Gilliam   |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR20, PR24, PR27, PR32, PR34, PR50, PR51, PR74, PR75, PR91, PR124, PR125, PR168, PR177 | These are open spaces with particularly beautiful outlooks used by many local families, children and older people from many communities including Kidlington, Begbroke, Yarnton and North Oxford for recreational purposes, exercise and mental refreshment. There is also a variety of wildlife in these areas. This is precisely the reasons why GB protection exists and should not be broken.  |
| PR-B-1317 | Rachel            | Walton    |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR20, PR27   | Object to any plans to build on site PR20 which is full of wildlife, floods regularly and is used for recreation. It would affect the quality of life and health of residents and mean the coalescence of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. Sites PR14 and PR27 are a haven for wildlife and need to be preserved.   |
| PR-B-1127 | David             | Betts     |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR20, PR27, PR32, PR29, PR34, PR49, PR118, PR125, PR178, PR194                         | Specifically object to any development on these sites and in particular allowing employment at sites. Strongly object to sites PR14 and PR27 where access is limited through a conservation area and provides a valuable amenity used by many.   |
| PR-B-1213 | Fleur             | Hodgson   |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR22, PR37   | Strongly object to new housing being built at sites PR14, PR22 and PR37 due to loss of GB and open countryside. There would be an impact on local traffic and the risk of flooding if houses are built on the flood plain.   |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford          | Jones     |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27   | Loss of GB, with well used footpaths and home to flora and fauna. Land floods.   |
| PR-B-0150 | Patrick and Julia | Marcks    |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27   | Object to loss of views, and open countryside. Concerned for the impact on wildlife, drainage and local roads.   |
| PR-B-0152 | Henrietta         | Batchelor |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27   | Sites PR14 and PR27 are wholly unsuitable, they are on GB land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, enjoyed by locals and visitors from a 25 mile radius. There has been serious flooding at Kidlington and these sites would increase the existing risk .The fields adjacent to the church support a rich diversity of wild life, and are in constant recreational use. The spire of St Mary's is a landmark and uninterrupted views of the spire rising above the surrounding fields have been part of the community for hundreds of years. Building here would be an act of vandalism. Oxford's problem should not be addressed by Kidlington becoming an annexe, the village is a thriving community with its own identity. |
| PR-B-0184 | Roger             | Prince    |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27   | Sites 14 and 27 are similar to the substantial site K1081 identified under the 2013 SHLAA. Under the 2014 SHLAA most of the land was discounted. Reason being, too large and development would adversely affect the open space that protects the important relationship with the historic environment and countryside to the north. This reason still exists along with the risk of flooding. Any development on sites 14 and 27 would take away views and walks around Kidlington and impact on the wildlife. The Moors is unsuitable for large volumes of traffic and any addition to this would also increase noise and air pollution.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0260 | Chris               | Pack       |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | It is a priority to retain these sites as undeveloped land and it's appalling and possibly immoral that farmland be used for housing. It is agricultural, provides attractive views and walks and important in terms of biodiversity. Declining bird species including the rare short-eared owl use the meadows along with large numbers of Roe Deer. These sites occupy a river terrace only just above flood plain. There is a history of flooding problems in The Moors after prolonged rainfall and parts of site PR14 are waterlogged. Traffic pressure would increase on The Moors.                               |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 north of The Moors are GB, much used by walkers and a valuable lung for Kidlington. These attractive meadows and woodland have been declared a national priority habitat for nature conservation and in the 1991 Inspectors report declared an area of "High Landscape Value". Many species including the protected Great Crested Newt and Badger setts can be found here along with some of our declining birds and wildflowers. This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to building on GB outlined by the Kidlington Framework Master plan.  |
| PR-B-0673 | Joyce M             | Morris     |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Particularly object to the proposed development sites PR14 and PR27 at The Moors, which is crossed by footpaths and used by many. There are wonderful views and an abundance of wildlife. The pond alongside the footpath behind Homewell House would cause considerable foundation problems for any building. The traffic on the Moors is heavy and the road difficult to negotiate, any increase in traffic would add to this hazard.   |
| PR-B-0680 | Dr John             | Maddicott  |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Object strongly to development on sites PR14 and PR27 it is in GB where there are restraints that CDC has undertaken to protect. They are widely used for recreational purposes by a great number from a wide area and have great aesthetic value. The fields constitute one of Kidlington's great 'lungs' that must be preserved for the whole community. The fields are medium grade agricultural land and a haven for wildlife. Many species of birds can be found there using the trees and hedges as nesting sites. Development would create an intolerable volume of extra traffic in pleasant residential roads. |
| PR-B-0681 | Dr Hilary           | Maddicott  |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Strongly object to building on sites PR14 and PR27 which are on protected GB. The fields with their paths and rights of way are used by many from as far away as Oxford. They provide a safe and quiet place to enjoy the views at no cost and with great benefit to health. The fields north of The Moors are a haven for wildlife and good quality agricultural land vital to securing food supplies for the future. Any increase in traffic would result in continual congestion, pollution and an increased risk of accidents. The Moors is limited to single traffic due to parked cars.                           |
| PR-B-0682 | Felicity            | Peacock    |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Particularly object to the development in sites PR14 and PR27 as the traffic generated on the quiet road would be intolerable. GB would be lost with its views and walks and have an impact on nature.  |
| PR-B-0695 | Mark                | Bale       |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Particularly object to sites PR14 and PR27, the open space is a huge amenity close to large number of residents.  |
| PR-B-0712 | Sonya               | Willoughby |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Site PR14 and PR27 this is GB land. Concerns regarding flooding especially the effect this would have on residents of the Moors if this site was developed. Land is used for walking and is abundant with wildlife, the loss of this would effect the residents quality of life. Open countryside with a view of Old Kidlington's Church tower.   |
| PR-B-0729 | Tamara              | Lucas      |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | These areas form exceptionally popular walks between Old Kidlington and Hampton Poyle, and comprise well known countryside views of St Mary's Church and fields that would be ruined by development. The wildlife is unique to Oxfordshire and should be preserved. The roads are historic and not designed to support heavy traffic.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname               | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0764 | Steven     | Daggitt               |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 unsuitable as they are part of GB and abut the Kidlington Church Street Conservation Area. Popular walking areas used by many. Such is the attraction of these fields that many people who do not live close to these areas travel to them on foot or by car to use them. They afford really attractive countryside for Kidlington, and provide irreplaceable views of Kidlington's historic, Grade 1 listed, parish church. The land is low-lying and concerns to increasing the flood risk for the surrounding community. The local roads have only a small capacity and increase to traffic is a serious road safety risk.                  |
| PR-B-0834 | Eleanor    | Williamson            |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 are both situated in the GB. Concerns regarding the flood plain and the effects of the River Cherwell on St Mary's Church and fields behind. Excellent country walks as featured in Oxfordshire County Council's 'Oxfordshire Circular Walks' pass around these sites, these need preserving. Need to maintain character and integrity of the historic conservation area around St Mary's Church. Important areas for wildlife and the ecosystem. Development on these sites would impact the traffic flow of Kidlington. These sites make no sense.   |
| PR-B-0891 | Katherine  | Simpson               |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 are homes to many birds, deer and other wildlife building here would have an impact on their habitats. There would be loss to views, open spaces and walks. Additional traffic would be added to the already over congested area. No scope for extra schools and health services which are already stretched. Sites frequently flood and building would reduce drainage and increase flooding.   |
| PR-B-0892 | Richard    | Simpson               |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 are homes to many birds, deer and other wildlife building here would have an impact on their habitats. There would be loss to views, open spaces and walks. Additional traffic would be added to the already over congested area. No scope for extra schools and health services which are already stretched. Sites frequently flood and building would reduce drainage and increase flooding.   |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip     | Towler                |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | It is difficult to locate the individual sites on your web site, links should have been provided. Object to sites PR14 and PR27 which would ruin a beautiful and tranquil area valued by many for recreation. Proximity to the river Cherwell could increase the flood risk. The land is in the GB and local infrastructure could not support the development.   |
| PR-B-1264 | Drs        | Slater and Harrison   |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Site PR14 and PR27 -object totally for any development on these sites. Due to the damage to GB, residents would be deprived of views and walking in the countryside. Would also be deprived of the green open spaces to exercise and maintain a healthy lifestyle. Important habitats for wildlife would be destroyed. There would be an increase to the traffic in the area which would destroy the tranquillity and identity of the area. This is reflected in objectives 7,8,9 and 13 of the Sustainability Appraisal. All of these objectives relating to the environment and land use show that development in these will have a significant negative impact. |
| PR-B-1286 | Gary       | Crone                 |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | GB behind The Moors concerns me. Many villagers use the beautiful fields everyday for dog walks. Wildlife will lose their natural habitat for ever. Migrating birds will lose a vital food source. Additional cars in the area will cause issue, the speed bumps have been put in place to prevent this from being used as a rat run. The Peartree Park and Ride should be used for housing over employment as the latter would not be aimed at local people and it is not protected by GB status!   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede                |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 are fields used and enjoyed by many and visited by deer. The Moors is a small residential road and it is frightening to consider the impact of it becoming an access road for PR14. North Kidlington primary school is already oversubscribed with no possibility for expansion. There are no bus lanes through Kidlington and roads are congested.  |
| PR-B-1309 | Kate       | Miklaszewska-Gorczyca |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Sites PR14 and PR27 are of particular concern due to the implications of flooding and drainage in these areas.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific    | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| PR-B-1311 | Keith E      | Stratford |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27       | Sites PR14 and PR27 are both strongly objected to development due to the loss of GB. Also the countryside has some of the finest views across to St Mary's Church and beyond, it is cited as a major visual asset in the Cherwell Local Plan. There are well used scenic walks, the impact on nature would be disastrous. There would be an impact to local traffic, which could extend the rush hour congestion through Kidlington, which increases pollution and adds to journey times in and out of Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1324 | Katie L      | Stratford |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27       | Sites PR14 and PR27 are both strongly objected to development due to the loss of GB. Also the countryside has some of the finest views across to St Mary's Church and beyond, it is cited as a major visual asset in the Cherwell Local Plan. There are well used scenic walks, the impact on nature would be disastrous. There would be an impact to local traffic, which could extend the rush hour congestion through Kidlington, which increases pollution and adds to journey times in and out of Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0676 | John F       | Morris    |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27       | A number of new developments along The Moors has already created considerable traffic problems so development at site PR14 would inevitably mean more traffic and disruption. Use of site PR27 would either mean more traffic joining the very congested main road or adding to the Moors traffic problems.  |
| PR-B-0151 | Prof John    | Batchelor |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 are wholly unsuitable, they are on GB land in an area of outstanding natural beauty, enjoyed by locals and visitors from a 25 mile radius. There has been serious flooding at Kidlington and these sites would increase the existing risk .The fields adjacent to the church support a rich diversity of wild life, and are in constant recreational use. The spire of St Mary's is a landmark and uninterrupted views of the spire rising above the surrounding fields have been part of the community for hundreds of years. Building here would be an act of vandalism. Oxford's problem should not be addressed by Kidlington becoming an annexe, the village is a thriving community with its own identity. |
| PR-B-0201 | Dr Catherine | Grebenik  |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Particularly object to sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 which are areas used by walkers but also part of Cherwell's flood plain. These meadows absorb thousands of gallons of water and are frequently partially flooded. Drainage of foul water from Church Street is already a problem with drains overflowing.   |
| PR-B-0731 | Ioana        | Davies    |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 have been identified as areas of beautiful open space with far reaching views. Have substantial amounts of wildlife and are used for recreation by many people from within Kidlington and the surrounding area. Site PR14 is subject to flooding. I have seen up to 6 inches of standing water on these fields.  |
| PR-B-0807 | Justin       | Scroggie  |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Particularly object to site PR14, PR27 and PR32 as these are GB and conservation areas. The access to open countryside is critical to health and well-being. If it is acceptable to build on beautiful and historic land than it is acceptable to build in areas within Oxford, such as Port Meadow, the University Parks and other green spaces. The sites around Kidlington are prone to flooding, there are old streams and aquifers beneath this land, adversely affect any new homes built upon them.   |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia        | Trowles   |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 concerns regarding flooding in the River Cherwell floodplain and its effect to the designated Lower Cherwell valley Conservation Target Area. In the Lower Cherwell Valley CTA area and the St Mary's Field Nature Reserve, there is a significant bird population who's habitats would be under threat.   |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter        | Trowles   |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 concerns regarding flooding in the River Cherwell floodplain and its effect to the designated Lower Cherwell valley Conservation Target Area. In the Lower Cherwell Valley CTA area and the St Mary's Field Nature Reserve, there is a significant bird population who's habitats would be under threat.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris        | Dicks     |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 are located in prime GB and largely unspoilt countryside with accessible well used footpaths. Development would affect the rural setting and road access to The Moors is poor.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate | Hamilton  |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32  | Development in sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 would destroy one of the finest historic landscapes in the county, with an ancient network of well used tracks and views of listed buildings.  |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul           | Mayhook   |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32  | Fields at sites PR14, PR27, and PR32 provide a substantial buffer between Kidlington and the river Cherwell required to cope with winter rainfall.  |
| PR-B-1327 | John           | Pilgrim   |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32  | Sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 are particularly unsuitable for development. They are in the GB and include ancient meadow with rich and diverse flora and fauna some of which are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The area has a high water table which is prone to flooding and there is a serious flood risk in the adjacent conservation area if land is developed. There are existing drainage problems due to damaged and inadequate Victorian drains. The fields are an important amenity for residents and visitors providing walks and views. Development of these sites would have a damaging effect on the conservation area and the setting of listed buildings. |
| PR-B-0967 | Eileen         | Bloomer   |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32, PR38, PR39, PR41, PR49, PR50, PR91, PR118, PR122, PR123, PR124, PR125, PR167, PR168, PR177, PR178, PR194 and, P195. | Sites PR14, PR27, PR32, PR38, PR39, PR41, PR49, PR50, PR91, PR118, PR122, PR123, PR124, PR125, PR167, PR168, PR177, PR178, PR194 and, P195 which have been identified around Kidlington. The rep. has provided a lengthy and detailed objection to the use of these sites. Stating the loss of GB, open countryside, views, well utilised walks along with the impact on nature. Flooding, drainage and the pumping station. Increase to traffic, the effect on public transport and air pollution. The impacts to local infrastructure.  |
| PR-B-1330 | N M            | O'Mahoney |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32, PR38, PR39, PR41, PR49, PR50, PR91, PR118, PR122, PR123, PR124, PR125, PR167, PR168, PR177, PR178, PR194, P195.     | The rep. has provided a lengthy and detailed objection to the use of these sites. Stating the loss of GB, open countryside, views, well utilised walks along with the impact on nature. Flooding, drainage and the pumping station. Increase to traffic, the effect on public transport and air pollution. The impacts to local infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-1313 | Helen          | Broxap    |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR34  | Sites PR14, PR27 and PR34 are also of particular concern as have concerns about building on the flood plain. Encroaching on the precious wildlife, and outstanding walks that can be found in the St Mary's fields area leading up to Thrupp.   |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole         | Pack      |              | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR37  | These sites need to preserved as countryside.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname               | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| PR-B-1309 | Kate        | Miklaszewska-Gorczyca |   | 11           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR49, PR34, PR126, PR91, PR24, PR74, PR23, PR194, PR48, PR51 | Sites PR14, PR27, PR49, PR34, PR126, PR91, PR24, PR74, PR23, PR194, PR48 and PR51 are of particular concern due to the loss of GB, open countryside, views, walks and the impact to nature. There will also be an impact on the local traffic.  |
| PR-B-1143 | Dr Pamela   | Roberts               |   | 11           |                         | PR14, PR32   | Object to sites PR14 and PR32 in Kidlington as this area is of great value as an open space of beauty. To build here would destroy the open field system near St Mary's Fields and should not be allowed.   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun     | Breith                | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR140  | This site appears overgrown and is likely to have developed ecological interest over time. Whilst generally support development to be located within the urban area rather than sprawling into the countryside are concerned about the loss of this site for biodiversity and people. Consider that this site could form an important element of a GI network for the town providing a green link between town and countryside.   |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip      | Rawle                 | Greenlight Developments   | 11           |                         | PR140  | Greenlight Developments interests relate to site PR140 at Skimmingdish Lane, Bicester.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small                 | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR140  | The RAF Bicester Conservation Area lies just to the north of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun     | Breith                | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR141  | This site is entirely on the Gavray Drive LWS. Consider this allocation wholly inappropriate not only as it is clearly against policy but also as this site forms part of an important existing and proposed open space connection between the town and the countryside. The site is an important element in the Bicester 12 application (currently under consideration), which proposes to connect this site via a Nature Conservation Area with the LWS to the east ('Meadows NW of Blackthorn Hill'). This green connection is essential to make the development on Bicester 12 acceptable in ecological terms. As such development on this site will not only directly affect the designation and existing wildlife interest but would completely undermine any strategic work that is currently going on. In addition the site is located in the Upper Ray CTA and any development should not compromise the aims and objectives of the CTA. Strongly object to this allocation. |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon       | Turner                | Launton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR141  | Site PR 141 is not sympathetic with the proposed Wrethwick Green development and, by bringing Bicester housing so close to Launton, threatens coalescence.  |
| PR-B-1013 | Dominic     | Woodfield             | Bioscan (UK) Ltd  | 11           |                         | PR141  | Dominic Woodfield on behalf of Bioscan is promoting this site as a strategic site for housing development. The Council should be consider it as an expansion to Bicester 12, not to increase the amount of developable land under this policy but to deliver environmental gains and as an enabling development under this policy.Has provided a detailed explanation.  |
| PR-B-1143 | Dr Pamela   | Roberts               |   | 11           |                         | PR141  | Strongly object to development on site PR141. It is protected under policies ESD10 and ESD11 of CDC's adopted plan 2015 as it is land known to be of high nature conservation importance. PR141 is part of Gavray Meadows Local wildlife Site that provides a wildlife corridor and is part of the Ray Conservation Target Area.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb                  |   | 11           |                         | PR141, PR142   | Nearness to Gavray Drive LWS meadows is a concern and constraint at site PR141 and PR142. These are not shown on the maps. Isolated wildlife sites lose species, there needs to be a wide green wildlife corridor preserved and protected. These fields are a support system for the LWS of Gavray Drive meadows.   |
| PR-B-0204 | Peter       | Beasley               |   | 11           |                         | PR142  | Although site PR142 is referred to as Bicester it is on the Launton side of Charbridge Lane and development would see the green space between Launton and Bicester disappear. It is important to maintain the village identity and keep Launton separate from Bicester.   |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon       | Turner                | Launton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR142  | Site PR142 develops Bicester outside of the ring road and would cause an unacceptable likelihood of coalescence with Launton.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1013 | Dominic    | Woodfield | Bioscan (UK) Ltd  | 11           |                         | PR142         | Promoting this site as a strategic site for housing development in tandem to site PR141 north of the railway. If there is genuinely no prospect of the part of the Local Wildlife Site represented by PR141 being secured by being bound legally (e.g. by means of a S106) to Bicester 12 (i.e. through LP Part 2), then the northern promotion site PR142 provides an alternative and in fact more direct (in ownership terms) means to secure the appropriate protection and future security of PR141 as green space, in accordance with policies ESD10, 11 and 13. Any policy allocating development to PR142, north of the railway, should therefore include delivery of the commitment to securing the future of PR141, south of the railway, as undeveloped land and a secured continuation of the Gavray Meadows LWS. Has provided a more detailed statement in the representation. |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun    | Breith    | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR144         | Generally welcome the use of inner urban sites for development but are concerned about the resulting loss of open space to development. Bicester has little existing publicly available open space and are concerned about the loss of this recreational site. In addition, the site forms part of one of few green links through the town (located along a stream) and should be considered as part of the GI network.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR144         | The RAF Bicester Conservation Area lies just to the north-east of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-1143 | Dr Pamela  | Roberts   |   | 11           |                         | PR144         | Object to site PR144 being developed as it is an important part of Bicester's green infrastructure. It is a valuable asset to the community providing a green lung, sports area and views which should be protected under policy ESD15. Pollution levels on the Oxford Road are currently higher than recommended.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia   | Banbury Town Council  | 11           |                         | PR146         | This site does not provide strong road connections with Oxford both road and rail. It would increase road traffic within Banbury and further decreasing connectivity between the town and Banbury.   |
| PR-B-1280 | Peter      | Offord    | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers                                 | 11           |                         | PR146         | Object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.  |
| PR-B-0204 | Peter      | Beasley   |   | 11           |                         | PR147         | Site PR147 is unsuitable for development as it consists of greenfield land, beyond the built-up limits of Launton and within open countryside. It would deliver a disproportionate level of growth unsupported by local services and facilities contrary to longstanding policy parameters for the threshold for developments in Service Villages. Travel patterns that are reliant on cars would increase.  |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner    | Launton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR147         | Site PR147 is unsuitable because of the transport infrastructure deficiencies in Station Road, and the crossroads with the Bicester Road, Launton.   |
| PR-B-1152 | Helen      | Pattison  |   | 11           |                         | PR147, PR148  | This rep makes reference to C262 in Cherwell Local Plan. Sites PR147 and PR148 are in Launton a small Cat A village and neither of the developments would be minor. Both sites extend the built up limits and are below the target build for strategic developments. PR148 4.75 ha of the site has been rejected by CDC (SHLAA ref 029) as being unsuitable for development. PR147 only 2.12 ha is quoted as developable. At site PR148 a significant proportion of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and the Ray Conservation area. As these new home are intended to alleviate Oxford's shortage they should be sited close to the city to keep in line with the Local Transport Plan to reduce traffic pressure.  |
| PR-B-0042 | Vivien     | Armstrong |   | 11           |                         | PR148         | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development of flood zone 3 and the Ray conservation Target area. Photo provided to illustrate the point. Additional concern with regards to local services, facilities and increased traffic.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname        | Organisation                             | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0045 | Mark       | Ford-Langstaff |  | 11           |                         | PR148         | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development of flood zone 3 and the River ay Conservation Target area. Photo provided to illustrate the point. Additional concern with regards to local services, facilities and increased traffic.   |
| PR-B-0203 | John       | Hayes          |  | 11           |                         | PR148         | Object to the inclusion of PR148 land at Blackthorn Road being included as the majority of this lies in a zone 3 flood area and falls within the Ray Conservation area. The existing building plans for Bicester and surrounding area are likely to put presume on this flood zone. In 2014 CDC rejected an area (ref LA029) which consists of much of the same areas as unsuitable for development under the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment. The size of the area not previously rejected is only just over 0.6 acres, too small to be considered a strategic development. Any development would be out of character with the village and would add traffic to the village roads (which pass a primary school without a crossing) and the dangerous crossroads of Blackthorn, Station Road and West End.                                  |
| PR-B-0204 | Peter      | Beasley        |  | 11           |                         | PR148         | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development of flood zone 3 and the Ray conservation Target area.   |
| PR-B-0859 | Gary       | Page           |  | 11           |                         | PR148         | This rep. has provided a detailed and lengthy objection in the strongest possible terms to the development on site PR148 described as land at Blackthorn Road. Three primary reasons for the objection of the site. Already rejected by CDC. Does not meet the minimum requirements for a Strategic Development site. Majority of the site is in Flood Zone 3 and the Ray Conservation Target Area. The rep. has provided images of SHLAA and Flood Zones 2014, a map of site PR148 and a picture of flooding at site PR148.   |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner         | Launton Parish Council                   | 11           |                         | PR148         | Site PR 148 is mainly a flood plain and, if you remove the areas that are unsuitable for development because of this, the remainder of the site no longer meets the site size threshold.   |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden          | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates | 11           |                         | PR148         | No proper analysis or assessment can be made of which options, or combinations of options, would achievethe 4,400 homes required. Note that land at Grange Farm is listed as a potential strategic site in Option E, and this inclusion is welcomed. The revised area for this site is now 5.92 Ha. Reference is made to Table 15 of the Options Consultation Document showing the relationship of sites to the Oxfordshire Growth Board Spatial Options. These sites are within areas A and B and the majority in the GB and some sites have potential constraints. Although some of these sites were ranked and rejected sites by the OGB, they are included within Options A and B, which gives rise to questions over the suitability and deliverability of these sites, highlighting the need for CDC to consider other sites beyond Options A and B. |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun    | Breith         | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust     | 11           |                         | PR149         | This site adjoins or comes close to the Arcott Wood LWS, part of which is also designated as Ancient Woodland. Are concerned about direct and indirect impacts on this site (e.g. recreational pressure) and consider it important that any potential development retains a minimum distance of 50m to the woodland edge.  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa    | Goss           | Bloxham Parish Council                   | 11           |                         | PR15          | Concerned about the impact on the A361   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane       | Olds           | Caversfield Parish Council               | 11           |                         | PR150         | This site is labelled as Bicester, but is in Caversfield. It was requested as part of the Green Buffer to reduce the coalescence between Bicester/ Eco Town and Caversfield. The Green Buffer was rejected by the Inspector as there were other policies to protect it. Buildings on this land would be highly detrimental to the rural village of Caversfield and would be well outside the built up area of the village.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1146 | DJ         | French      | Deddington Development Watch                                    | 11           |                         | PR153         | This is a greenfield site outside built-up limits comprising very good quality (Grade 2) agricultural land. Hempton is a Category B settlement under Policy Villages 1. Hempton is not served by any form of public transport. Apart from the B4031 the other road links serving Hempton are unclassified roads. There are around 120 houses in Hempton with a current population around 285. A development of 67 houses (at 30 dph.) on site PR153 (5½ acres) would increase the population of this small settlement by over 50%.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger      | Bellamy     | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR153         | Hempton - No facilities (not even a pub)   |
| PR-B-1280 | Peter      | Offord      | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers                                 | 11           |                         | PR153         | Object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected. This site is along nature reserves, local wildlife sites, Conservation Target Areas and general intrusion into the countryside.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul       | Goulding QC |   | 11           |                         | PR157         | Noke is totally unsuitable as it's a small village and any significant number of additional houses would detrimentally alter the nature of this remote and historic village. Its infrastructure, services and amenities could not sustain any growth. It has no public transport.  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison     | Forfar      |   | 11           |                         | PR157         | Why has site PR157 been included if this site has been categorised as unsustainable in two previous local plans. Nothing has changed to the village. Development would constitute village extension which has been previously refused. Your proposal would suggest that 200 homes could be added to a village that currently has 55 homes with no local infrastructure or transport links would be in any way sustainable. It would not.   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton      |   | 11           |                         | PR157         | Site PR157 has been proposed as low density, and is sited so there is no additional traffic through Noke, but contributes to traffic flow in the surrounding area. I believe that there is a strong case for some additional housing in Noke, so that the community remains viable and attracts young families who are the life blood of the community. There are not a lot of services and amenities, an expansion would safeguard these and possibly enhance these for the future residents of Noke.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small       | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR157         | This site is within the setting of the Romano-Celtic temple North of Woodeaton scheduled monument to the south-west. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting.  |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin      | Noke Parish Meeting   | 11           |                         | PR157         | Large development for a small village like Noke would be inappropriate. CDC's vision includes the need "to ensure that people have convenient, affordable and sustainable travel opportunities to the city". This site would be contrary to this vision with increased traffic and congestion, no public transport, lack of infrastructure and services. It is adjacent to an Nationally renowned bird sanctuary. It is the last remaining unspoilt hills in the area with important views and well used by walkers and cyclists. The Parish feels that the exceptional circumstances to release this site from the Green Belt would be difficult for the reasons mentioned above. |
| PR-B-1005 | SP and SA  | McQuillan   |   | 11           |                         | PR157         | Site PR157 - Noke is a small village with only 55 houses that has a vibrant mix of residents. To build 100 houses would drastically impact the existing village. One of the finest hilltop views would be ruined. The site is not linked to the village and stands exposed and elevated on the busy B4027. There is no pub, shop public transport or community village hall. There is no rationale for any development on this site. Port Meadow destroyed many of the finest views in Oxford. Site PR157 falls into the category of environmental destruction.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger      | Bellamy     | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR157         | Noke - Remote, no facilities, car access only  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| PR-B-1203 | Su         | Cheetham      |   | 11           |                         | PR157  | Noke is a small no though village with no facilities and traffic congestion at the top of the hill. There is no public transport and the road infrastructure could not cope with building new houses. To triple the size of Noke would change the nature and character of the village and deprive residents of one of the last remaining unspoilt views, namely Noke Hill. CDC states that land can only be released from the GB if exceptional circumstances are demonstrated, this cannot be demonstrated when brownfield sites nearer the city could be developed. Noke's proximity to a Special Area of Conservation needs to be considered.  |
| PR-B-1302 | Clare      | Creese        |   | 11           |                         | PR157  | Site PR157 is an unsustainable choice for development. Noke is a tiny village of 55 houses with limited amenities. The site is on a very dangerous road with has experienced numerous serious accidents, more cars will only add to this. It is already problematic during the rush hour. The current infrastructure can not cope, there is no public transport from the village. What reassurance is there that these houses will be for the Oxford workers and not London or Birmingham commuters. The site is also close to the Special Area of Conservation, RSPB Otmoor Preserve and there would be a loss of the beautiful views. The Dr South Primary School in Islip is already at full capacity. |
| PR-B-0844 | Peter J    | Frampton      | Framptons on behalf of EP Barrus                                | 11           |                         | PR16   | In order to ensure that the plan-led planning system can genuinely deliver the homes that are needed by Oxford a broader geographical spread of sites should be allocated. Such an approach will create a more robust delivery strategy for new homes. It is therefore submitted that site PR16 within Area of Search F (Former RAF Upper Heyford) should be allocated for housing. The site extends to 17.3 has and has the potential capacity of providing some 510 homes in a sustainable location within the Plan period.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR16   | Abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to the west and north. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F   | Hickman       | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR16   | Objects to the promotion of this site and any extension to RAF Upper Heyford  |
| PR-B-0904 | Jill       | Grain         |   | 11           |                         | PR16, PR38, PR39, PR50, PR125, PR178                                   | Sites PR16, PR38, PR39, PR50, PR125 and PR178 it is not acceptable to remove the natural break between Oxford and Kidlington. Development here would be suited to London commuters via Oxford Parkway rather than local employees.  |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia      | Trowles       |   | 11           |                         | PR16, PR38, PR50   | Sites PR16, PR38 and PR50 there would be a loss of open countryside and habitat, damage to the amenity value of the bridleway. Damage to the historic landscape setting of Water Eaton Manor.   |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter      | Trowles       |   | 11           |                         | PR16, PR38, PR50   | Sites PR16, PR38 and PR50 there would be a loss of open countryside and habitat, damage to the amenity value of the bridleway. Damage to the historic landscape setting of Water Eaton Manor.   |
| PR-B-1333 | Zoe        | Christodoulou |   | 11           |                         | PR16, PR38, PR50, PR49, PR122, PR123, PR178                            | Development of any of the sites between Kidlington and North Oxford particularly PR16, PR38, PR50, PR49, PR122, PR123 and PR178 would be completely inappropriate. Currently the traffic into Oxford or trying to join the ring road is at capacity during the daily rush hour. More people in the area would add to this pressure. There would be an impact on business due to the delays, seeing reduced footfall in the City. It would not reduce Oxford's need, as houses would be purchased by London commuters due to the new station. CDC have committed to keeping the green belt and this policy must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1278 | Helena     | Boyce         |   | 11           |                         | PR16, PR50, PR38, PR123, PR122, PR125, PR178, PR39, PR177, PR41, PR124 | Sites PR16, PR50, PR38, PR123, PR122, PR125, PR178, PR39, PR177, PR4 and PR124. All of these sites would result in virtually no open space between Oxford and Kidlington, it would just be seen as urban sprawl.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0957 | Martin            | Small       | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR160         | The RAF Bicester Conservation Area lies just to the north-east of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward            | Dowler      | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                                     | 11           |                         | PR161         | Strongly object to this site being allocated for residential development in the Local Plan Part 1 PR or Part 2. It is in an inappropriate location for residential development,. It would be contrary to Policy Villages 1, draft objectives and policies of the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan. Middle Aston is a Category B Village with limited services and facilities, with no amenities of its own and lacks public transport services, footways or street lighting. The existing sewerage infrastructure cannot cope with the current level of development in the village. This proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the village, result in backland development, double the size of the village, be prominent in the landscape, harm the setting of the listed buildings and result in an inappropriate form of development that is unsustainable.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa           | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR162         | This site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proved housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up settlement and landscape.   |
| PR-B-0162 | Robert            | Lawrence    | South Newington Parish Council                                  | 11           |                         | PR164         | Land East of Sands Lane - This site does not offer a suitable development in a sustainable location. It does not meet the criteria in Policy Villages 2.<br>The reasons why the site should not be allocated are based on the detailed matters of the planning application (16/00930/F) Refused<br>- Public transport (488 - 2 buses on weekdays) until June 2017<br>- A361 (fast moving) Sands Lane (Single carriageway)<br>- Oxfordshire County Council objection<br>- PROW 355/1<br>- Conflict with adopted Cherwell Local Plan, South Newington Conservation Area (2014)<br>- Loss of amenity, impact on heritage, wildlife and protected species, open space, grade 3 agricultural land.<br>- Increase size of the village by 50%<br>- existing infrastructure (roads, water, drainage, sewerage unable to cope with the proposed development<br>- Factual errors in the submission on bus services, access, constraints, impact on heritage and wildlife assets, impact on conservation area, facilities and services, necessary infrastructure, etc. |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob               | Lawrence    |   | 11           |                         | PR164         | Site PR164 is not a sustainable development location and not contribute to the principles of the Local Plan or meet the criteria for site allocation set out in "Policy Villages 2". Concerns to public transport in South Newington. No direct access to public highway, Sands Lane is a single carriageway road which should not be obstructed. Concerned with safety, access, turning areas, sustainable drainage, NPPF compliance. Conflict with existing plans and guidelines CDC Local Plan and national planning guidelines and the stated aims of the South Newington Conservation Area (2014). Impact to countryside and all wildlife. 50% increase to the houses and adds stress to the already stretched infrastructure. The rep. has stated that there are seven inaccuracies in the submission form which have been listed.  |
| PR-B-1025 | John and Margaret | Braithwaite |   | 11           |                         | PR164         | This rep. provides a very detailed and lengthy objection to the proposed development on site PR164. Incompatible for a category B village. Their concerns are with the compatibility with the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1, sustainability, facilities, public transport, sewage system and the size of the development. The rep. has also commented on factual errors and incorrect assumptions in the agent's submission form. Section 5 - constraints, section 6 - accessibility and section 7 - delivery and availability. The rep. has provided a quote taken from the 2016 winter edition of the South Newington newsletter with reference to this site.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname             | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|---------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian      | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories  | 11           |                         | PR166         | Strongly object to the development of this site and consider them thoroughly unsuitable. Details of the site specific issues are discussed in detail in their representation.  |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha     | Eliot               | Oxford Preservation Trust   | 11           |                         | PR167         | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues   |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney           |   | 11           |                         | PR167         | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb                |   | 11           |                         | PR167         | Site PR167 will not provide affordable housing due to its proximity to Oxford Parkway.   |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M     | Rugg                |   | 11           |                         | PR167         | Site PR167 is GB with no special case for building on it and the roads could not cope with the extra traffic.  |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul        | Mayhook             |   | 11           |                         | PR167         | Site PR167 includes the car park for Oxford Parkway so should not be on the list.  |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman             | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum  | 11           |                         | PR167         | Free-market housing here would very likely be occupied predominantly by London commuters rather than those working in Oxford. Part of the site is close to the railway and the A34. If developed together with site PR50 it would just be part of urban sprawl.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson             | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR167         | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4904810708; Watercourses - Watercourse at southern boundary   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne     | Willson-Higgins     |   | 11           |                         | PR167         | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. She has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre     | Wells               | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR167         | This area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday              |   | 11           |                         | PR168         | Allow A34 widening and a canal bridge.   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth   | Moore               |   | 11           |                         | PR168         | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha     | Eliot               | Oxford Preservation Trust   | 11           |                         | PR168         | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small               | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR168         | This site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the east. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney           |   | 11           |                         | PR168         | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb                |   | 11           |                         | PR168         | Run off or contamination could go into Kingsbridge Brook which runs to Oxford Meadows SAC. The possible hydrological link between site PR168 and the SAC needs to be assessed and valued for potential harm. sites near to housing with ageing sewers always have nitrate contaminated groundwater.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname             | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|---------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman             | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum                                  | 11           |                         | PR168   | This is an isolated site with restricted access from A44 and not good for housing.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger       | Bellamy             | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR168   | Kidlington - Remote, No facilities, Flood Risk   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson             | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR168   | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4886111290; Flood Zone 2 or 3 -FZ3 at north of site (access to road network?); Watercourse - Canal forms eastern boundary; main river forms western boundary  |
| PR-B-1298 | James       | Jocelyn             |   | 11           |                         | PR168, PR177, PR41, PR124   | One wonders what was the purpose of the Green Belt Study in the context of this housing development plan, if 'exceptional circumstances' may override an outstanding GB contribution in any case? For example OX22 has scored low on its potential to protect from urban sprawl due to the A40, A34 and railway line being considered barriers to the spread of Oxford. These contentions have already been disproved by the results of the Call for Sites in the Partial Review. The cited 'significant and durable barrier to the spread of Oxford into the parcel' is apparently no barrier at all, as parcels 168, 177, 41 and 124 all lie north of the A34 and A40. If they were to be approved for development, then this Green Belt area's 'Low' score could be considered a self-fulfilling prophecy.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James       | Jocelyn             |   | 11           |                         | PR168, PR177, PR41, PR124, PR39, PR38, PR50, PR122, PR123, PR38, PR50, PR16, PR178, PR20, PR126, PR34, PR92 | All of these sites are of primary importance to maintaining the separation of settlements.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark        | Recchia             | Banbury Town Council  | 11           |                         | PR17  | Residential use on this site would lead to the isolating communities on this site and would result in increased car journeys and congestion on the roads. Industrial/employment uses should be explored.   |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian      | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories                                    | 11           |                         | PR171   | Strongly object to the development of this site and consider them thoroughly unsuitable. Details of the site specific issues are discussed in detail in their representation.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small               | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR171   | This site may be within the setting of the Steeple Aston Conservation Area to the south-east. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0870 | Stewart     | Patience            | Anglian Water Services Ltd                                      | 11           |                         | PR172   | The available capacity at Water Recycling Centres (formerly known as sewage treatment works) for each site is within Anglian Water's area of responsibility, and is considered to have an impact on its infrastructure. Have not considered the cumulative impact of these developments on their existing infrastructure; therefore ask CDC that further consideration is given to the cumulative impact on existing water recycling centres as part of the preparation of the current review and that this is reflected in the expected timing of development sites. Sewerage network - foul (or used water) flows from growth will have an impact on its existing network. This will depend on the location, size and phasing. Initial assessment is undertaken when approached by developers on a site by site basis. This site is considered as asset encroachment. Have provide detailed explanation in their representation. |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam        | Ryder               | Gladman Developments Ltd  | 11           |                         | PR176   | This site at Sibford Road, Hook Norton has been granted planning permission at appeal. (application ref: 14/00844/OUT).  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday              |   | 11           |                         | PR177   | Allow A34 widening and a canal bridge.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth        | Moore           |   | 11           |                         | PR177         | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha          | Eliot           | Oxford Preservation Trust   | 11           |                         | PR177         | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin           | Small           | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR177         | This site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the west. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0960 | M                | O'Mahoney       |   | 11           |                         | PR177         | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A      | Webb            |   | 11           |                         | PR177         | Site PR177 will damage the wildlife corridor of the canal. The usefulness of canal banks as wildlife corridors is reduced with adjacent housing by disturbance, light and garden rubbish dumping   |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A      | Webb            |   | 11           |                         | PR177         | Housing at site PR177 may damage the adjacent green canal wildlife corridor, rain collects here and there is noise and pollution from major roads. This rep provides lengthy details of the impact development could have on Osney Mead hay meadow (BBOWT) part of the SAC and New Marston Meadows SSSI by changing access.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A      | Webb            |   | 11           |                         | PR177         | Object to site PR177 as residential development here has the potential to increase detrimental public access for recreation and dog walking on Oxford Meadows SAC meadow Osney mead, and Dukes Cut.  |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher      | Hardman         | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum  | 11           |                         | PR177         | A major road (A44) on the east side of the site would cause problems with sound and air pollution.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith           | Johnson         | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR177         | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4900411306; Flood Zone 2 or 3 -?FZ3 at north of site, near where site adjoins A44; Watercourse - Canal forms western boundary   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne          | Willson-Higgins |   | 11           |                         | PR177         | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. She has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre          | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR177         | This area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry            | Munday          |   | 11           |                         | PR178         | This is creep towards Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0742 | Keith and Hilary | Prince          |   | 11           |                         | PR178         | Site PR178 would be sandwiched between two very busy roads, one being the A34. Concerns already over dangers of diesel fumes, increasing pollution. The site is not suitable for housing.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname                  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth              | Moore                    |  | 11           |                         | PR178         | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha                | Eliot                    | Oxford Preservation Trust                                | 11           |                         | PR178         | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins                  | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | 11           |                         | PR178         | Note that this site has been promoted for circa 700 homes. This site is in the GB and forms an important role in preventing the merging of Kidlington/Gosford and Oxford. The site scores 'HIGH' in the GB study. Development in this area would significantly erode the Kidlington/Gosford gap.   |
| PR-B-0959 | Cllrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |  | 11           |                         | PR178         | Object to development on this site and considers that this site should be removed from the consultation process entirely because this site is in the Green Belt with no development on it at all. It offers a natural gap between Oxford and Gosford and Water Eaton, this is vital so that the village does not get swallowed up by Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M                      | O'Mahoney                |  | 11           |                         | PR178         | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A            | Webb                     |  | 11           |                         | PR178         | Site PR178 is not suitable for development due to the pollution and noise to the A34.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A            | Webb                     |  | 11           |                         | PR178         | Noise and air pollution from major roads would be a problem at site PR178.   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew                 | Hornsby-Smith            |  | 11           |                         | PR178         | Supports the development of this site in conjunction with PR49 and considers that this site has a capacity to deliver a primary school.  |
| PR-B-1158 | Elizabeth              | Leckie                   |  | 11           |                         | PR178         | Site PR78 is unsuitable for development. It has drainage problems, is often waterlogged and is next to the cemetery. High density housing would be inappropriate and insensitive near the cemetery which is best located in a quiet area that allows the bereaved space and privacy for contemplation. The GB is important for absorbing harmful air pollution and creating a gap between communities.   |
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin                 | Leckie                   |  | 11           |                         | PR178         | Site PR78 is unsuitable for development. It has drainage problems, is often waterlogged and is next to the cemetery. High density housing would be inappropriate and insensitive near the cemetery which is best located in a quiet area that allows the bereaved space and privacy for contemplation. The GB is important for absorbing harmful air pollution and creating a gap between communities.   |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher            | Hardman                  | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum                           | 11           |                         | PR178         | This site has similar problems to sites PR38 and PR50 in that both are too close to major roads and would suffer from noise and air pollution, especially in spaces necessary for outdoor recreation.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith                 | Johnson                  | Environment Agency                                       | 11           |                         | PR178         | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP5020112601; Flood Zone 2 or 3 -? small area of FZ3 at north of site (unsure of site extent)   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne                | Willson-Higgins          |  | 11           |                         | PR178         | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. She has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.   |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew                 | Gant                     | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                        | 11           |                         | PR178         | This site would not create coalescence of Oxford and Kidlington  |



| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific            | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre        | Wells    | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR178                    | This area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD) |
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria       | Campbell |   | 11           |                         | PR178                    | Site PR178 development would have a significant detrimental effect on local traffic congestion making it impossible to leave Kidlington during rush hour by road. There would be a negative impact on the village character as the Kidlington roundabout is the "gateway" to Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-1339 | Dr Christopher | Wedge    |   | 11           |                         | PR178                    | Concerned as this is adjacent to Sainsbury's roundabout, this already suffers from traffic congestion during the rush hour. The traffic can queue so far back that buses can not reach the bus lane, so public transport becomes disputed. This will only get worse with the extra volume of cars trying to use this junction that come with the additional houses.   |
| PR-B-0998 | Lisa           | Coulling |   | 11           |                         | PR178, PR125             | Sites PR178 and PR125 are walked in everyday where I enjoy the countryside and the variety of wild birds with my dog. The Bicester Road which leads to the area is in a bad state and in need of repair, it would not be able to cope with the extra traffic using it daily.  |
| PR-B-0682 | Felicity       | Peacock  |   | 11           |                         | PR178, PR38, PR50, PR157 | All of these sites will feed into the Oxford Road, south of Sainsbury's roundabout and will exacerbate the current traffic problems. GB would be lost with its views and walks and have an impact on nature.  |
| PR-B-0739 | G              | Gelder   |   | 11           |                         | PR178, PR49, PR16        | Sites PR178, PR49, PR16 would increase the pressure on roads.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa        | Goss     | Adderbury Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR18                     | This site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proved housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up settlement and landscape.   |
| PR-B-0011 | Simon          | Marsh    | The Battlefields Trust  | 11           |                         | PR181                    | This site is likely to lie on the 1645 Islip Bridge battlefield. Site has local and national significance. There is likely to be surviving battlefield archaeology on the site which should be investigated. The LPA needs to establish whether the development of the site outweighs the public benefit of preserving this battlefield heritage.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry          | Munday   |   | 11           |                         | PR181                    | Road and rail improvements needed.  |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken            | Martin   | Noke Parish Meeting   | 11           |                         | PR181                    | This proposal would be inappropriate for a small village like Noke and put unnecessary burden on the infrastructure services and facilities in the village.   |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter          | Collins  | Islip Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR181                    | This site is in the Green Belt and on the edge of the Islip Conservation Area. The access of Mill Lane is narrow and is not suitable for development as it would result in increase in traffic problems in the village and the bridge.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith         | Johnson  | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR181                    | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP5222813877; Flood Zone 2 or 3 Fz3 adjoins SE boundary  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin         | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR181                    | This site contains the Islip Conservation Area abuts this site to the west, east and south. This end of Islip retains its historic settlement pattern as a row of houses which tapers out and ends in a farm. To break this up with a new block of housing would be detrimental to the special interest, character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Therefore consider that this site should not be taken forward.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin         | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR181                    | The Islip Conservation Area abuts this site to the west, east and south. Any development on this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal. More comments in their representation.   |
| PR-B-1012 | Calum          | Miller   |   | 11           |                         | PR181, PR55, PR21        | Am strongly opposed to developments of sites PR181, PR55 and PR21, these are green field sites and with availability of a brownfield site, it would seem perverse to authorise development of these sites.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name                | Surname | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------------|---------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0041 | David                     | Pratt   |   | 11           |                         | PR183         | Site ref 183 is inappropriate as there has been 2 dismissed appeals here  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth                      | Powles  | Kirtlington Parish Council                                      | 11           |                         | PR183         | PR183 is inappropriate for most of the criteria in the consultation document, and because two appeals for housing on this site have been dismissed by two different Planning Inspectors. Arguments against this site raised at the Public Hearing are available in CDC.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val                       | Colby   | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                          | 11           |                         | PR184         | Support the allocation of site PR184. Adderbury is recognised as being a sustainable settlement for new development. This 6.7ha site could deliver up to 50 dwellings within a developable area of 2.3ha together with children's play space and parkland. The site fills a gap between existing development at Adderbury Close and Summers Close/Green Hill  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                    | Small   | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR184         | Site is within the setting of the Adderbury Conservation Area and of the grade I listed Church of St Mary. This site should not be taken forward.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa                   | Goss    | Adderbury Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR184         | This site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proved housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up settlement and landscape.   |
| PR-B-0662 | Stephen John and Jennifer | Bird    |   | 11           |                         | PR186         | Object to the proposed development at PR186 as the parish of Bodicote has already provided a fair share of new housing. Langford Park, and two sites to the south 'blossom fields'. Site 186 has also flooded several times. The proposed access points at Water Lane and Austin Road are only a lane and bridleway. A further 50 households would have a detrimental effect as there are already many challenging areas within Bodicote with regards to traffic.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val                       | Russell | Bodicote Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR186         | Objects to the promotion of this site for housing due to its impact on Bodicote. Have already lost a large portion of the Parish to the Longford Park development and currently there are 2 developments approved on the south part of the Parish at Blossom Fields. There is a risk of flooding with this site and it is not the most accessible. It would increase traffic through the village and Water Lane, which is a bridleway and not a street. It could be a precursor to more development. The Parish is already experiencing major traffic problems. Where will the infrastructure funding come from to deliver LTP4 and Masterplan.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon                     | Gamage  | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt            | 11           |                         | PR186         | No specific comments to make at this time other than in respect of site PR186, which is promoted by RPS on behalf of Mr Bratt, the site owner.  |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel                     | Buttler |   | 11           |                         | PR186, PR199  | Totally opposed to any further development. Particularly object to site south of Wards Crescent, Bodicote PR186 and site PR199 Wykham Park Farm, both have an adverse impact on the village of Bodicote. Bodicote has recently lost a large area for development to Longford Park and Blossom Fields. Bodicote has taken more than its fair share of new development and should not be expected to provide housing for Oxford's inability to meet their housing numbers. Access to site PR186 - none of the three access roads indicated are adequate to serve development on this land. Development would create even further traffic problems. Site PR199 - development can only increase traffic using Wykham Lane, a road totally unsuitable for heavy volume of users. |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                    | Small   | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR188         | This site abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to northwest. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry                     | Munday  |   | 11           |                         | PR19          | Improvements on the road to A4260 needed.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David                     | Smith   |   | 11           |                         | PR19          | Site PR19 the quarry at Bunkers Hill would be an interesting development opportunity.   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun                   | Breith  | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR19          | This site allocation encompasses Shipton quarry SSSI and Bunkers Hill Quarry LWS in their entirety as well as additional areas of farmland. Are very concerned about the potential allocation of this site for development and the effects development will have on the interest of the SSSI and the LWS. The site is also located within the Lower Cherwell CTA. Allocation of this site should be resisted.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 11           |                         | PR19          | This site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the south-east and the Hampton Gay, Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Conservation Area beyond. It is also within the setting of the grade II listed Shipton Lift Bridge and the grade II bridge at Shipton Weir and close to Hampton Gaye (listed and scheduled) and its church (highly graded listing). The isolation of this group is very evocative and contributes to the significance of this historic group by helping tell the story of the decline and depopulation of this settlement. Development of the part of this site to the east of the railway line may be visible from Hampton Gaye and compromise this sense of isolation. A site visit needs to be made to investigate further and the impact of development on the setting of all these historic assets should be assessed as part of any further consideration of this site, with reference to the conservation area character appraisals. |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 11           |                         | PR19          | This site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the south-east and the Hampton Gay, Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Conservation Area beyond. It is also within the setting of the grade II listed Shipton Lift Bridge and the grade II bridge at Shipton Weir. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of these designated heritage assets, with reference to the conservation area character appraisals.   |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb          |  | 11           |                         | PR19          | There are biodiversity constraints to developing this site PR19 due to the rare wetland habitat and its margins. There are clean water pools, which is an incredibly rare resource in the nitrate polluted countryside of today.   |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver      | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   | 11           |                         | PR19          | Object as unsustainable location and the scale of infrastructure required makes this site unviable   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson       | Environment Agency   | 11           |                         | PR19          | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4786817116; Flood Zone 2 or 3 - FZ3 at east of site. Watercourses - Lakes on site. Main river forms eastern boundary; SSSI - Rushy Meadows SSSI Shipton-on-Cherwell and Whitehill Farm quarries SSSI on site   |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan         | Molyneux      | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 11           |                         | PR19, PR29    | Shipton Quarry will provide an excellent opportunity for a mixed use 'garden village' development with potential for a variety of house types, sizes and scales, set within a unique landscape structure. In addition the site will provide potential employment land to serve either the development proposal or the surrounding area. The rep goes on to describe the types of facilities that could be provided. The development area could also link with Shipton-on-Cherwell and there is the opportunity to build a small development in the village. There are no other significant sites nominated on previously developed land.   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane        | Olds          | Caversfield Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR190         | Not supported by the Parish Council since 2009. The infrastructure and services are not adequate to support 480 dwellings, with an additional 900 dwellings it would make it worse. This site is a long way from any form of public transport, pedestrian and vehicular access in to both Fringford Road and the Buckingham A4421 difficult. The narrow rural Fringford Road is not suitable for additional traffic and access onto the Buckingham Road would be dangerous.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 11           |                         | PR191         | This site abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to the north. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday        |  | 11           |                         | PR194         | Airport could be Park and Ride.  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth   | Moore         |  | 11           |                         | PR194         | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun     | Breith    | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR194         | This site adjoins Langford Meadows LWS raising concerns about direct and indirect impacts on this site, which might compromise the ecological interest of this site. An appropriate buffer will need to be provided should the site be considered further.   |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb      |   | 11           |                         | PR194         | Site PR194 is west of a local wildlife site of wet rushy grassland important to wetland birds and with diverse flora. Development here would be detrimental and I strongly object.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson   | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR194         | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4782415260; Watercourses - River adjoins southern part of eastern boundary  |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick        | Alston    | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd         | 11           |                         | PR194         | This site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of LOA has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds). The erection of buildings on other sites within the Safeguarded Area would require appropriate controls to be imposed that limit heights in order to be acceptable (for the purposes of policy-preparation recommend assuming the benchmark heights defined on the Safeguarding Map, which would require refinement at the planning application stage via detailed testing). This should be read in conjunction with their earlier representation dated 11th March 2016 and 6th July 2016, in particular the 'London Oxford Airport Sustainable Development Opportunity, Position Paper' (dated March 2016). |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday    |   | 11           |                         | PR195         | Airport could be Park and Ride.  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth   | Moore     |   | 11           |                         | PR195         | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney |   | 11           |                         | PR195         | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson   | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR195         | No obvious constraints, but site is currently shown on map as business park/telecommunication depot, and adjoins airport. Any potential for contamination? Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4767115265  |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick        | Alston    | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd         | 11           |                         | PR195         | This site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of LOA has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds). The erection of buildings on other sites within the Safeguarded Area would require appropriate controls to be imposed that limit heights in order to be acceptable (for the purposes of policy-preparation recommend assuming the benchmark heights defined on the Safeguarding Map, which would require refinement at the planning application stage via detailed testing). This should be read in conjunction with their earlier representation dated 11th March 2016 and 6th July 2016, in particular the 'London Oxford Airport Sustainable Development Opportunity, Position Paper' (dated March 2016). |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR196         | This site is adjacent to the site of an Iron Age Romano-British settlement and Roman Road. Although neither are scheduled, any development of this site should have regard to the setting of these heritage assets.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F    | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR196         | Objects to any extension to NW Bicester Eco Town   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger       | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR198         | Banbury - Flood Risk, bounded by M40 and Rail Line   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa     | Goss      | Bloxham Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR199         | Concerned about the impact on the A361   |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0957 | Martin         | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR199         | The site is within the setting of the grade II listed Wykham Farmhouse. This is one of a number of proposed sites containing or near to isolated listed farmsteads, which would be surrounded by development if these sites were allocated, which in turn is likely to have a major impact on their significance. Their historical interest is often bound up in the relationship with the land from them and their aesthetic value is often enhanced by an isolated rural setting. We suggest that an analysis of the impact of development on the significance of the farmstead is undertaken and feeds into the consideration of any sites taken forward. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting. |
| PR-B-1095 | Val            | Russell  | Bodicote Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR199         | Objects to the promotion of this site for housing due to its impact on Bodicote. They have already lost a large portion of the Parish to the Longford Park development and currently there are 2 developments approved on the south part of the Parish at Blossom Fields.<br>This site is considered as a major problem. Vehicles will use Wykham Lane, which is narrow, winding, country lane, already in a poor condition and subject to near misses. It is not appropriate to build here and use Wykham Lane to enter and exit the site.   |
| PR-B-1280 | Peter          | Offord   | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers                                 | 11           |                         | PR199         | Object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected. This site is along nature reserves, local wildlife sites, Conservation Target Areas and general intrusion into the countryside.   |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom            | Hockaday |   | 11           |                         | PR199, PR20   | Site PR199 is pleasant, rural agricultural land unsuitable for housing, especially as there are already plans for 3000 houses south of Banbury. When permission was granted for development to the north of PR199 it agreed to preserve the country lane aspects of Wykham Lane. There is a risk of merging Bodicote with Bloxham. Site PR20 seems ideal to boost the growth potential for the high tech sector at Begbroke Science Park.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry          | Munday   |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Not east of Railway line.   |
| PR-B-0240 | Mrs Carole     | Walton   |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Site PR20 is an excessively large site to develop for houses. Part of this site is liable to flooding and in Yarnton Road the water pressure is low and there are sewage issues elsewhere. A large development would increase pressure on these services. There appears to be no provision for extra schools or recreational facilities and health services are already at capacity.  |
| PR-B-0241 | Richard        | Walton   |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is mainly unspoilt countryside, well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L              | Allen    |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Site PR20 Begbroke Science Park appears to be in GB so should not be developed on as agreed in the local plan. Further development would merge Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington thus losing their identities, increase traffic problems and add to unsafe conditions for bus users crossing the A44 without a pedestrian crossing. This area provides a wildlife corridor and supports thriving populations of different species including Water voles seen at Rowell Brook. New homes will bring cats and dogs which will impact on species currently thriving. It also contains agricultural land, gardening allotments and high quality walking which must not be lost.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary | Shirley  |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | The sites encompass whole villages affecting all residents and likely to cause traffic gridlock. Concerned about what measures will be taken to combat flooding as the A44 drains into Rowel Brook and gardens regularly flood.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname   | Organisation                         | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth       | Moore     |                                      | 11           |                         | PR20          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.  |
| PR-B-0782 | Andrew and Emma | Mundy     |                                      | 11           |                         | PR20          | Site PR20 has been identified as being adjacent to where I live in Begbroke. Concerns over the severe and regular flooding in Fernhill Road makes it unsuitable for houses. Building here would have a very detrimental effect on all the surround properties which is totally unjust.  |
| PR-B-0789 | Lynne           | Whitley   | Yarnton Parish Council               | 11           |                         | PR20          | Object for policy reasons as the site is in the Green Belt. Policy ESD14 seeks to prevent coalescence of settlements and safeguards the countryside from encroachment. It plays a strong role in preventing the coalescence of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington.<br>Policy ESD13 seeks to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, particularly in urban fringe locations.<br>Policy Villages 1 categorises Yarnton as Begbroke as category A villages. Thus only minor development, infilling or conversion is allowable in, or alongside these communities.<br>Exceptional circumstances to allow development in the Green Belt cannot be demonstrated.   |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive           | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group  | 11           |                         | PR20          | This site appears next most appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction on Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line; this would be well placed to improve the transport services of Oxford, whilst being less attractive to London commuters (since the route would be slower than from Oxford Parkway), hence housing at this location would be more likely to serve Oxford's need (rather than London's) than if placed elsewhere. OCS believes there is great potential for a development -related Swift Rail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. In addition to this they suggest making an initial release of parts of the site which are accessible to existing bus services on the A44. |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard         | Cutler    | Bloombridge LLP                      | 11           |                         | PR20          | This is an exceptionally ambitious housing site. How will this site relate to the regeneration of Kidlington, and the village centre, or accessibility to Oxford? The University's previous position proposing just a 2.5ha extension to the science park is noted. Reference is made to the County wide GB Study undertaken by LUC.  |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter           | Nicholson |                                      | 11           |                         | PR20          | Objects to development of this site for housing. Development would destroy the function of the GB and cause devastation to the historic character and setting of Begbroke village. Has raised concerns on a range of issues that have been discussed in detail in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0881 | James Kenneth   | Jutton    |                                      | 11           |                         | PR20          | Site PR20 if built upon would effectively destroy the individual village identities of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke.  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun         | Breith    | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust | 11           |                         | PR20          | This site is a large development area especially together with sites PR23 and PR24. It adjoins the Lower Cherwell CTA and the Rushy Meadows SSSI raising concerns about direct and indirect impacts on the SSSI. Expect that any development in this area to retain a minimum buffer of 50m. Considering the overall quantum of development in the area are particularly concerned about cumulative impacts on the SSSI, which might compromise the condition and ecological interest of the site in the long term. In addition would expect development to provide enhancements in line with the CTA aims and objectives.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0906 | Steve and Anne | Handsley      |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Site PR20 borders the Oxford Canal to the east of Kidlington. The canal runs through a semi-rural area, fields to the east and backing onto gardens to the west. Development would alter the character of the canal walks. The Environment Agency website shows that this area is prone to flooding, therefore housing should not be built here.  |
| PR-B-0928 | Stephanie      | White         |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Objects to the development of this site. She considers that there are footpaths through these fields are very well-used by local people; the sense of space when walking through the fields has a very positive effect on people's wellbeing  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin         | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR20          | This site includes the grade II listed Begbroke Hill Farmhouse and abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the east. The grade II listed Tudor Cottage is located just outside the site. Any development of this site should retain the Farmhouse and have regard to the setting of these assets, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A    | Webb          |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Strongly object to development at Site PR20 which closes the green gap between Yarnton and Kidlington, making one conurbation that will destroy the distinctiveness of the two villages. Ancient hedgerows could be lost at Sandy Lane to accommodate traffic and at Begbroke Lane. Wildlife corridors along the west bank of the canal would be lost and the wetland wildlife corridor of Rowel Brook. Development of site PR91 and PR20 would surround and isolate Rushy Meadow SSSI.   |
| PR-B-0997 | George         | Thomas        |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Site PR20 it is totally unacceptable to build in a small village like Begbroke. I chose to live here because of this and also its great local community spirit. If had wanted to live in a larger village or town then would of chosen to do so. Choice will be taken away if you decide to build in this area.   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew         | Hornsby-Smith |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | This site forms the gap between Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. He highlights all the site constraints and landscape character and its relationship with Rushy Mead SSSI and Oxford Meadows in addition to the part the landscape plays for these communities. Has provided a criteria based assessment in his representation. Considers that if developed this site has a potential impact of destroying the separate identities of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David          | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Begbroke Science Park scores very highly in terms of transport as a potential development location to meet Oxford's unmet needs. The rep goes on to discuss and describe various transport options that are available. It concludes by stating that taken as a whole, the high potential for sustainable transport accessibility at Begbroke presents a sustainable location for housing and employment development that Cherwell and Oxford require to unlock their potential for low carbon economic growth.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David          | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 11           |                         | PR20          | The SHMA takes in to account the need to provide for employment growth. Hence there is a need to align policies and provision for housing and employment generating development in the partial review. There is a need to provide additional employment space at Begbroke Science Park both in relation to the needs which arise up to 2031 but also for those beyond the plan period. The provision of housing close to the Science Park for both key worker housing and to meet general housing needs would ensure an integrated development where the need to travel could be minimised and where provision is able to be explored which could include Park and Ride which are both car and railway based. |
| PR-B-1052 | Andrew         | Mundy         |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | These fields and all of the properties in Fernhill road suffer from regular and serve flooding, making it unacceptable for development, building here would have a detrimental effect on all of the surrounding properties which is totally unjustified.  |
| PR-B-1088 | Bryan          | Rugg          |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | Object to site PR20 as it joins Kidlington to Yarnton causing both villages to lose their individual identities.  |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul           | Mayhook       |   | 11           |                         | PR20          | If site PR20 were developed then Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton would become one settlement. The land is in GB to prevent this from happening.  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey        | Wright        | Begbroke Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR20          | The development of this site would be contrary to green belt policy, which proposes "Protecting Green Belt Land" - extract from the NPPF (paragraphs 79 to 90)  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific    | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis          | Davies          |   | 11           |                         | PR20             | Why was the University of Oxford's proposal to build a Park and Ride facility on the Begbroke Science Park, PR20 omitted from the consultation as this confirms that their intention is to build on all the GB land that separates Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton. The consequence of this is that GB will disappear and create an urban sprawl with loss of natural habitats and wildlife.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith         | Johnson         | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR20             | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4823313142; Flood Zone 2 or 3 - 2 and 3 in north and eastern part of the site. Extensive in east. Watercourses - Cross N part of site, adjoin E, and cross S part of site; SSSI - Rushy Meadows SSSI adjoins NE corner of site  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry          | Brougham        |   | 11           |                         | PR20             | Any development at site PR20 should take account of the need to maintain a clear physical and visual separation between Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton. There should be a green corridor along the Oxford Canal.  |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne        | Willson-Higgins |   | 11           |                         | PR20             | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. She has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew         | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 11           |                         | PR20             | The sites around Begbroke and Yarnton should only be used to the extent that they don't allow coalescence.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre        | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR20             | There is a clear defensible boundary along the canal and a clear gap between the canal and Yarnton. The narrow bridge over the canal is a constraint for inter-connectivity and integration. The degree of development to the west of the A44 warrants further consideration, as this would offer potential for planned growth close to employment centres with direct access to Oxford along a major transport corridor. This would however need careful design and the creation of new defensible boundaries to address landscape impacts, and preserve gaps between settlements.   |
| PR-B-1326 | Jan and Chris  | Lacey and Plant |   | 11           |                         | PR20             | Objection to any development on site PR20. This is a natural wildlife corridor with frequent sightings of a variety of mammals, bats and birds. There is a site of special scientific interest near to the canal. There are also mature trees, shrubs and bushes either side of the brook. The corridor acts as a link for the surrounding countryside of Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Concerned with the impact of flooding and drainage at this site. Rowell Brooks natural flood plain is in the fields south of the brook. Increased building and non-soak away surfaces south of Rowell Brook and north of Begbroke Hill and the Begbroke Science Park will have a serious impact to the flood plain. This would impact residents who would want to be compensated for this. With the increased development and population it would upset the balance with irreversible consequences not only on the wildlife but all of those with the Oxfordshire area. |
| PR-B-1339 | Dr Christopher | Wedge           |   | 11           |                         | PR20             | Site PR20 concerned with this site as it covers a large flood plain. The area would become one large housing area by linking Yarnton and Kidlington together. Why has this site been considered for housing given the flooding in Oxford immediately downstream from here in the recent years.  |
| PR-B-0751 | Dr Katrin      | Kiessling       |   | 11           |                         | PR20, PR14, PR27 | Site PR20, PR14 and PR27 concerns to all of these sites regarding flooding. Site PR20 has identified that building here would allow Begbroke and Yarnton to merge and that traffic is already heavy on the A44.   |
| PR-B-1338 | Philip         | Camp            |   | 11           |                         | PR20, PR21       | Wish to object to sites PR20 and PR21 but not exclusivity these. Site PR20 has been identified round the back of Begbroke and the paths between Begbroke and Kidlington are used heavily by walkers, runners and cyclists. In addition the surrounding fields and footpaths are used for recreation. This area is a habitat for four different bat species. They use habitat around the bridleway for roosting, feeding and as a transit corridor. The loss of this habitat would be devastating to their population. Object to the plan and wish CDC to reject the proposal from Oxford City to build these homes.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| PR-B-1186 | Christina        | Miskin     |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR23, PR24, PR51, PR74                                 | Am opposed to development at sites PR74, PR23, PR24, PR20 and PR51 where additional traffic will make the A44 impossible. At peak times, in bad weather and when there's events at Blenheim the road is unable to cope. There will be damage to the environment as Greenfields are destroyed losing flora and fauna.   |
| PR-B-1134 | Neil             | McKendrick |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR23, PR24, PR34, PR47                                 | Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke are villages with separate identities and history. Development at sites PR20, PR23, PR24, PR34, PR47 will flout the purpose of GB and do not believe exceptional circumstances have been demonstrated.  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis      |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR23, PR24, PR34, PR48, PR51, PR74, PR118, PR126, PR92 | GB and higher grade agricultural land should be withdrawn from the review. Some of these sites are close to or adjacent to Begbroke's conservation area and listed buildings, the historic nature of Begbroke and Yarnton requires a sensitive approach. Site PR51 is enjoyed by many for its views and walks and the number of houses proposed would be disproportionate to both villages. There are ancient footpaths, medieval ridge and furrow and Begbroke is described in the 'Doomsday Book'. At Spring Hill the ground is wet and during heavy rain the A44 and Rutten Lane flood due to run-off. Some fields at PR51 are currently used for growing crops that produce methane for the National Grid. In view of a recent planning application refusal in Begbroke for a green house adjacent to a listed building it would seem ludicrous to consider building 9,000 houses. |
| PR-B-1105 | Norman and Janet | Bates      |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR23, PR24, PR48, PR51                                 | Object specifically to sites PR20, PR23, PR24, PR48 and PR51. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. PR20 is already prone to flooding and building would increase this risk at Fernhill Road.  |
| PR-B-0712 | Sonya            | Willoughby |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24   | Sites PR20 and PR24 loss of GB. The area is prone to flooding. Used by walkers and cyclists, loss of wildlife. No infrastructure for a development of this size.   |
| PR-B-1076 | Jana             | Gnappova   |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24   | Yes, see general comments  |
| PR-B-1278 | Helena           | Boyce      |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24   | Sites PR20 and PR24 threaten to impact on the flood plain, potentially creating serious problems somewhere else.   |
| PR-B-0880 | Rhiannon         | Davies     |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR07, PR126, PR34, PR92, PR49, PR75, PR39        | Totally against any building in the GB. Concerns in particular to sites PR20, PR24, PR07, PR126, PR34, PR92, PR49, PR75, PR39. The impact to nature will be awful, there's already pressure on wildlife and a loss to their habitat is already a problem. We need to protect the countryside to keep birds, insects and flowers which are important and vital to our lives. We need these green spaces and our nature. Concerns to flooding and putting at risk houses that are currently safe. Traffic has increased and so has the noise, this will get worse with development. This will destroy the quiet and peaceful nature of Begbroke.   |
| PR-B-1337 | Marcus           | Lloyd      |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR14, PR27                                       | Sites PR20, PR24, PR14 and PR27 all provide walks and paths around Kidlington for everyone to enjoy along, the green areas support wildlife and provide relaxing views for all. Loss of GB is irreversible and the reasons given do not provide sufficient evidence of exceptional circumstances.  |
| PR-B-1341 | Olga Lascano     | Choperena  |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR14, PR27                                       | All provide walks and paths around Kidlington for everyone to enjoy along, the green areas support wildlife and provide relaxing views for all. Loss of GB is irreversible and the reasons given do not provide sufficient evidence of exceptional circumstances.  |
| PR-B-1337 | Marcus           | Lloyd      |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR14, PR27, PR125, PR178, PR38, PR50, PR16       | Sites PR20, PR24, PR14, PR27, PR125, PR178, PR38, PR50 and PR16 would cause additional traffic and environmental damage. Travelling to Oxford or across the ring road would be further congested. Fix the current transport and infrastructure issues before you add extra houses and problems for existing residents.   |
| PR-B-1341 | Olga Lascano     | Choperena  |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR14, PR27, PR125, PR178, PR38, PR50, PR16       | Sites PR20, PR24, PR14, PR27, PR125, PR178, PR38, PR50 and PR16 would cause additional traffic and environmental damage. Travelling to Oxford or across the ring road would be further congested. Fix the current transport and infrastructure issues before you add extra houses and problems for existing residents.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname            | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                       | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| PR-B-0904 | Jill               | Grain              |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR34, PR126             | All the sites identified will only exacerbate the traffic problems experienced locally. New transport links proposed will be too little and too late. Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. Sites PR20, PR24, PR34 and PR126 would destroy the separate identities of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke which is not acceptable. Site PR20 needs to be discounted as it includes a flood plain.  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi              | Lancaster          |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR34, PR126, PR178      | Sites PR20, PR24, PR34, PR126, PR178 are on GB and exceptional circumstances to allow building have not yet been provided. It appears that Oxford wishes to grow economically without thought to the effect on the local environment.  |
| PR-B-1296 | Graciela Inglesias | Rogers             |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR34, PR51              | Sites PR20, PR24, PR34, PR51 are of particular concern as these are known for occasional flooding and they were once the site of a quarry so liable to subsidence. At present the peaceful historic villages of Yarnton and Begbroke would end up as an urban sprawl and would become breeding grounds of social discontent. Transport systems in the area are already at breaking point with increased traffic from the Oxford-London airport and the Parkway station, it will only get worse. There is a lack of bus services and good cycle routes into Oxford. The proposal fails to mention the type of housing to be offered on these sites and who they are intended for. Also fail to see plans for schools, GP surgeries and police stations. |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G             | Shirley            |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR24, PR74, PR48              | Each village should be kept separate and not merged together. Rowel Brook floods so there can be no guarantee that houses won't flood in the future. When originally purchased all areas were GB.  |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford           | Jones              |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR32, PR39, PR50, PR51        | Loss of GB, with well used footpaths and home to flora and fauna. The impact on local traffic  |
| PR-B-1049 | Maria              | Page               |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR34, PR126                   | Sites PR20, PR34 and PR126. Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington would merge losing their individual identities. Countryside, views and nature would be lost. The flood plain in the area would impact all three villages, causing heartache for all.  |
| PR-B-1321 | Catherine R        | Mundell            |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR34, PR126, PR51, PR49, PR92 | Object to nearly all areas of this plan but in particular to the infill between Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke which are sites PR20, PR34, PR126, PR51, PR49 and PR92, including the surrounding of Begbroke Wood and the destruction of the area around the Canal Path. The destruction that this will bring to these areas will leave the local residents marooned in a huge mass of suburban sprawl, losing forever priceless green and wild space and destroying the character of Kidlington, Begbroke, and Yarnton.   |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri       | Dyson              |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR38, PR50, PR51              | Kingfishers live on GB land alongside the Oxford Canal. One has been spotted at site PR20. Yellowhammers live on GB surrounding Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton, they have been heard at sites PR38 and PR50. Sightings have been made at site PR51.  |
| PR-B-1314 | Nicole and Eugene  | Brooks and Griffin |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR48, PR51, PR75, PR126       | Sites PR20, PR48, PR51, PR75, PR126 are areas of concern due to the loss of GB and open countryside. The impact to nature and to the local traffic. However many of the proposed sites show disrespect for the areas countryside and there is a clear lack of thought to finding alternatives which would have less damage.  |
| PR-B-0966 | E                  | Nicholson          |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR51                          | Building in areas that are prone to flooding such as PR20 and PR51 will only aggravate the situation. Flooding happens from run-off from the impermeable higher ground at PR51 and from Rowel Brook at site PR20   |
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria           | Campbell           |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR91                          | Sites PR20 and PR91 have been identified as being close to Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton all with individual communities. Their boundaries need to be protected to prevent merging and urban sprawl. To fill in the gap between Kidlington and Begbroke that is used by many residents for recreational purposes, for their health and wellbeing is extremely important. These sites are a haven for wildlife who's habitats would be destroyed.  |
| PR-B-1313 | Helen              | Broxap             |              | 11           |                         | PR20, PR91                          | Sites PR20 and PR91 are of particular concern. But concerns are for any of the GB being developed on.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific               | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--|
| PR-B-0882 | Julia      | Trowles  |   | 11           |                         | PR20,PR24, PR34, PR39, PR41 | Sites PR20,PR24, PR34, PR39 and PR41 this would damage the amenity value of the Oxford Canal with the removal of open countryside views and loss of habitat for birds and small mammals.   |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter      | Trowles  |   | 11           |                         | PR20,PR24, PR34, PR39, PR41 | Sites PR20,PR24, PR34, PR39 and PR41 this would damage the amenity value of the Oxford Canal with the removal of open countryside views and loss of habitat for birds and small mammals.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR200                       | This site may be within the setting of the Weston-on-the-Green Conservation Area to the east. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR201                       | This site is within the setting of the grade II listed Church of St Lawrence to the north-west. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday   |   | 11           |                         | PR21                        | Road and rail needs widening   |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin   | Noke Parish Meeting   | 11           |                         | PR21                        | This proposal would be inappropriate for a small village like Noke and put unnecessary burden on the infrastructure services and facilities in the village.  |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter      | Collins  | Islip Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR21                        | This site comprises existing agricultural land within the Green Belt. Developing this site would lead to a scale of development that would be excessive.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson  | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR21                        | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP5218414085   |
| PR-B-1319 | Mr and Mrs | Unwin    |   | 11           |                         | PR21, PR30, PR55, PR181     | Development at these sites would result in loss of GB, loss of open countryside with views and walks and have an impact on wildlife habitats and local road traffic. Islip has a very poor transport facility with no effective bus or rail service, narrow roads and ancient river bridge. The addition of 100 houses at Islip would put a huge strain on services such as the primary school and GP's surgery and destroy the character of a small rural village. None of the proposals constitute exceptional circumstances to justify overriding GB restrictions.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday   |   | 11           |                         | PR22                        | Noted a rejection 15/1/2105 for 1500 homes, north corner of Shipton road needs improving.  |
| PR-B-0176 | Robert     | McGurrin | Woodstock Action Group  | 11           |                         | PR22                        | Objects to the development of this site. The concern is that the cumulative impact of recently approved housing and those in the pipeline would result in approximately 2000 homes in Woodstock doubling the size and population of the town. The existing infrastructure would be unable to cope with this increase. This would be an extension to Woodstock with all of the adverse affects associated with expansion, which would be harmful to the ancient 900 - year town rich with charm, character and site of Blenheim Palace.   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth  | Moore    |   | 11           |                         | PR22                        | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun    | Breith   | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR22                        | This site is located at the boundary with West Oxfordshire District and adjoins a site that is being considered by West Oxon DC for development. Consider it important that effects of development are not assessed in isolation but are considered comprehensively. This will require liaison with West Oxon DC.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR22                        | This site contains the Blenheim Villa, a Roman villa and associated field system 200m north east of Little Cote scheduled monument. The development of this site would have an unacceptable impact on the monument and its setting and should not be taken forward.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR22                        | The Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site and Registered Historic Park and Garden is located to the south-west of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the Park.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation                                  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                 | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson       | Environment Agency                            | 11           |                         | PR22                          | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4592416184   |
| PR-B-1228 | Juliet     | West          | ICOMOS-UK                                     | 11           |                         | PR22                          | In 2015, ICOMOS-UK commented on the impact on the Blenheim WHS and its setting of an application (14/02004/HYBRID) which included the development of site PR22. In our comments, we argued that the site should remain open and undeveloped. The application was subsequently refused. ICOMOS-UK continues to take the view that any development of PR22 would have a harmful impact on the setting of the Blenheim WHS. The setting of Blenheim Park and the royal hunting park from which it developed has been predominantly an open rural one since its first enclosure in 12th century. PR22 allows those approaching the WHS on the main route from Oxford and London to appreciate the contrast between the enclosed park on one side and the open country on the other. This is important in understanding an aspect of the social and cultural significance of the WHS. |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes        | West Oxfordshire District Council             | 11           |                         | PR22                          | This site adjoins its boundary. It is on the site of a recently refused planning application on land south east of Woodstock. It would have significant landscape and heritage implications.   |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony    | Matthews      | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR22 and PR25                 | Woodstock expansion - consider these entirely inappropriate for the provision of Oxford's needs by reason of its remote location in relation to the city. Concern is that the current infrastructure - particularly in relation to road network is overloaded and would be totally inadequate in its current form. Is it intended that there will be some system of ensuring that appropriate occupiers are found and retained for this purpose-designed accommodation?  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd                      | 11           |                         | PR22, 20, 23, 24, 74, 126, 51 | Object due to scale of growth proposed and the loss of settlement character.   |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris      | Robbins       |   | 11           |                         | PR22, PR183                   | Site PR22 lies outside the GB, with excellent transport links to Oxford due to the introduction of a new service via Kidlington and Oxford Parkway. Sites PR22 and PR183 at Kirtlington should be considered.  |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin      | Carrit        |   | 11           |                         | PR22, PR25                    | Fully support the need for more housing in Woodstock, 600-800 houses over the course of the plan period seems appropriate, and would prevent the decline of the town and ensure infrastructure needs are met. However WODC are also proposing 670 homes so it's essential that CDC and WODC co-ordinate their planning response whilst consulting with the residents of Woodstock.   |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson     |   | 11           |                         | PR22, PR25, PR30, PR34, PR51  | Sites PR22, PR25, PR30, PR34 and PR51 are positioned in areas affording attractive views and development would ruin the visual amenity and biodiversity of these zones. Particularly PR51 which is rich in flora and fauna and would impinge on the ancient footpath Frogwelldown Lane.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday        |   | 11           |                         | PR23                          | Can aircraft in trouble land here?   |
| PR-B-0643 | L          | Allen         |   | 11           |                         | PR23                          | Site PR23 land at Langford Lane appears to be in GB and should not be developed on as agreed in the local plan. It contains good agricultural land and supports a range of wildlife that is linked to PR24 and PR74. It is near the end of Oxford airport runway so noise pollution could result in build costs increasing, due to the additional insulation required. The proximity could also affect operations of the airport. It will add to the unsafe conditions that exist at Begbroke, for residents crossing the A44 without a pedestrian crossing, for the bus or other village amenities.   |
| PR-B-0681 | Dr Hilary  | Maddicott     |   | 11           |                         | PR23                          | Site PR32 is unsuitable for development for the same reasons as above. As well as being GB these fields are in the Kidlington Conservation Area protected from even minor changes to existing buildings. They provide a safe, popular walking area loved for their views of the historic listed building, where modern buildings would be intrusive. The fields are good agricultural land and a haven for wildlife. Mill Street to Evans Lane is low lying and has flooded in recent years so a large scale development would increase that risk. The exit from the site is narrow and congested and already has traffic problems.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth  | Moore      |   | 11           |                         | PR23          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive      | Booth      | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                     | 11           |                         | PR23          | This site appears next most appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction on Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line; this would be well placed to improve the transport services of Oxford, whilst being less attractive to London commuters (since the route would be slower than from Oxford Parkway), hence housing at this location would be more likely to serve Oxford's need (rather than London's) than if placed elsewhere. OCS believes there is great potential for a development -related Swift Rail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. |
| PR-B-0827 | Paul       | Staniforth |   | 11           |                         | PR23          | Believe this site has previously been refused planning permission on the grounds of its proximity to the flight paths of the airport (which was much smaller at the time) - noise and safety grounds.   |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter      | Nicholson  |   | 11           |                         | PR23          | Objects to development of this site for housing. Development would destroy the function of the GB and cause devastation to the historic character and setting of Begbroke village. Has raised concerns on a range of issues that have been discussed in detail in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M    | Rugg       |   | 11           |                         | PR23          | Site PR23 is at the end of the runway at Oxford Airport rendering it unsuitable for housing due to noise and potential danger.  |
| PR-B-1088 | Bryan      | Rugg       |   | 11           |                         | PR23          | Object to site PR23 as it is right at the end of and almost in- line with the airfield runway.  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey    | Wright     | Begbroke Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR23          | The development of this site would be contrary to green belt policy, which proposes "Protecting Green Belt Land" - extract from the NPPF (paragraphs 79 to 90)  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis      | Davies     |   | 11           |                         | PR23          | Land next to the Airport, PR23 is unsuitable as it is close to the runway. It also provides a gap between the airport and Begbroke.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson    | Environment Agency                                      | 11           |                         | PR23          | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4708614579;   |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick       | Alston     | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd | 11           |                         | PR23          | This site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of LOA has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds). The erection of buildings on other sites within the Safeguarded Area would require appropriate controls to be imposed that limit heights in order to be acceptable (for the purposes of policy-preparation recommend assuming the benchmark heights defined on the Safeguarding Map, which would require refinement at the planning application stage via detailed testing). This should be read in conjunction with their earlier representation dated 11th March 2016 and 6th July 2016, in particular the 'London Oxford Airport Sustainable Development Opportunity, Position Paper' (dated March 2016).  |
| PR-B-0856 | David      | Smith      |   | 11           |                         | PR23, PR24    | Sticking to the Kidlington options, in favour to those to the north in the Langford Lane area and north of Begbroke, site PR23 and PR24.  |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson  |   | 11           |                         | PR23, PR24    | Building on sites PR23 and PR24 would cause coalescence of the village of Begbroke with the neighbouring airport and retail zone, and generate extra noise, light and traffic pollution. Part of central Kidlington is already an AQMA zone (of poor air quality) any further development could extend this and have health implications.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation                                     | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk    | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust | 11           |                         | PR23, PR24   | Sites PR23 and PR24 are in sustainable location with a direct route to Oxford City via the A44. They comprise Cherwell's most sustainable sites, closest to Oxford City, within the A44 Corridor.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk    | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust | 11           |                         | PR23, PR24   | Sites PR23 and PR24 are in sustainable location with a direct route to Oxford City via the A44. They comprise Cherwell's most sustainable sites, closest to Oxford City, within the A44 Corridor.   |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford   | Jones     |  | 11           |                         | PR23, PR24, PR34, PR38, PR48, PR49, PR75, PR118, PR126, PR167          | The impact on local road traffic and the loss of GB.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP         | Lyes      |  | 11           |                         | PR23, PR24, PR49, PR178, PR125, PR68, PR177, PR41, PR124, PR195, PR194 | These sites would have the least damaging impact on Kidlington. However sites PR38, PR39 and PR41 would be undesirable as they would effectively connect Oxford to Kidlington. Sites Pr27 and PR14 are furthest from village services and Oxford. Site PR32 is in a highly sensitive location near the historic centre.   |
| PR-B-0966 | E          | Nicholson |  | 11           |                         | PR23, PR24, PR74   | Consideration needs to be given to the plans to build a Technology Park at Langford Lane. If development was to then go ahead at sites PR23, PR24 and PR74 it would be disastrous for traffic congestion, air quality, noise and light pollution. Access to green space, agricultural land and wildlife habitats would be lost.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday    |  | 11           |                         | PR24   | Can aircraft in trouble land here?  |
| PR-B-0643 | L          | Allen     |  | 11           |                         | PR24   | Site PR24 Begbroke Lane North East field appears to be in GB and should not be developed on as agreed in the local plan. Development would close the gap between Begbroke and the immigration centre and other developments in Langford Lane thus losing individual community identities. This site is landlocked with respect to A44 and Langford Lane access and any new access will add to traffic problems. It will add to the unsafe conditions that exist at Begbroke, for residents crossing the A44 without a pedestrian crossing, for the bus or other village amenities. It contains good agricultural land and supports a range of wildlife and their habitats that is linked to PR23 and PR74. New homes will bring cats and dogs which will impact on species currently thriving.  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth  | Moore     |  | 11           |                         | PR24   | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive      | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group              | 11           |                         | PR24   | This site appears next most appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction on Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line; this would be well placed to improve the transport services of Oxford, whilst being less attractive to London commuters (since the route would be slower than from Oxford Parkway), hence housing at this location would be more likely to serve Oxford's need (rather than London's) than if placed elsewhere. OCS believes there is great potential for a development -related Swift Rail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific           | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| PR-B-0862 | Peter      | Nicholson     |   | 11           |                         | PR24                    | Objects to development of this site for housing. Development would destroy the function of the GB and cause devastation to the historic character and setting of Begbroke village. Has raised concerns on a range of issues that have been discussed in detail in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0928 | Stephanie  | White         |   | 11           |                         | PR24                    | Objects to the development of this site. Considers that large-scale building in this area would lead to a huge increase in the volume of traffic through Begbroke and would cause significant disruption to local residents  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | 11           |                         | PR24                    | This does not compromise the strategic purposes of the Green Belt, though it does lessen the gap between Begbroke and Kidlington. Has provided a criteria based assessment. Supports development of this site.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey    | Wright        | Begbroke Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR24                    | The development of this site is in complete contravention to council policies. Category 2 villages have fewer services and/or are remote with limited public transport and limited potential for development.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson       | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR24                    | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4759214272; SSSI's - Rushy Meadows SSSI ~130m to E of site.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham      |   | 11           |                         | PR24                    | Any development at site PR24 should take account of the need to maintain a clear physical and visual separation between Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton. There should be a green corridor along the Oxford Canal.   |
| PR-B-0238 | D A        | Burt          |   | 11           |                         | PR24, PR20              | At sites PR24 and PR20 there is a restricted byway known as Begbroke Lane which is part of the National Cycle Network. It is well used, accessible for all and has views of open countryside.  |
| PR-B-0827 | Paul       | Staniforth    |   | 11           |                         | PR24, PR20              | Site PR24 - present field acts as a security barrier round the immigration detention centre. The southern boundary is a county lane know as Begbroke Lane., which is only wide enough for one-way traffic if cars are parked on one side. This boundary is common along part of its length with part of the northern boundary of site PR20. Development of site PR24 and the northern projection of site PR20 (north of Rowel Brook) would result in Begbroke East becoming a spur of Kidlington. Destroying the country walks enjoyed by Begbroke residents along the lane. A brook separates Begbroke West from most of site PR20, development of this site would turn Begbroke into a disjointed district of the "town" Kidlington. |
| PR-B-0739 | G          | Gelder        |   | 11           |                         | PR24, PR20, PR126, PR34 | Sites PR24, PR20, PR126 and PR34 Loss of space, walks and wildlife habitats.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday        |   | 11           |                         | PR25                    | North corner of Shipton road needs widening  |
| PR-B-0176 | Robert     | McGurrin      | Woodstock Action Group  | 11           |                         | PR25                    | Objects to the proposal to develop this site. The main reason is its location on a sharp bend along Shipton Road. There have been incidents on this road, including a serious one involving children from Marlborough School. The temporary paved road through the site providing access to the Marlborough Phase 1 construction site will become the access for Phase II of this development and the proposal for the 300 homes (16/01364/OUT). They are concerned at the current situation and are very concerned that the situation can worsen with development on this site.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson       | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR25                    | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4582316851   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes        | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 11           |                         | PR25                    | This site is on the edge of Woodstock and would form an extension to this town in West Oxfordshire. The cumulative implications in terms of landscape impact and infrastructure of both sites PR22 and PR25 need to be fully considered, as West Oxfordshire is already proposing three urban extensions for this town.  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg       | Blaquiere     | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 11           |                         | PR25, PR22              | This rep provides detailed comments and justification to support the allocation of Land NW of Oxford Airport and land East of Marlborough School, Woodstock.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0870 | Stewart          | Patience | Anglian Water Services Ltd                                      | 11           |                         | PR26          | The available capacity at Water Recycling Centres (formerly known as sewage treatment works) for each site is within Anglian Water's area of responsibility, and is considered to have an impact on its infrastructure. Have not considered the cumulative impact of these developments on their existing infrastructure; therefore ask CDC that further consideration is given to the cumulative impact on our existing water recycling centres as part of the preparation of the current review and that this is reflected in the expected timing of development sites. Sewerage network - foul (or used water) flows from growth will have an impact on its existing network. This will depend on the location, size and phasing. Initial assessment is undertaken when they are approached by developers on a site by site basis. |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F         | Hickman  | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR26          | Objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements  |
| PR-B-1124 | Chris            | Thornton | Ardley with Fewcott Parish Council                              | 11           |                         | PR26          | Objects to the site for the following reasons:<br>The site is in Category C village where only infill and extensions are allowed.<br>It lacks immediate relationship to Oxford the distance being 17 miles<br>There will be a huge impact on the outlook from both sides<br>There is a potential for 200 dwellings which would drastically change the size of Ardley/Fewcott.<br>The increase in traffic is unsustainable with the present infrastructure at full capacity at a variety times throughout the day.   |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly       | Foster   | Fritwell Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR26          | Objects to this site as it would increase car use on unsuitable roads in the area and traffic on the B430 which is already heavily congested at peak times. Every effort should be made to preserve and enhance the rights of way and connectivity across our rural areas and preserve the landscape and views.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry            | Munday   |   | 11           |                         | PR27          | For Kidlington people only, rail station need parking for bikes and cars and a Park and Ride.   |
| PR-B-0742 | Keith and Hilary | Prince   |   | 11           |                         | PR27          | Site PR24 has a large number of deer living on it and is adjacent to an area heavily used by walkers and families.  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth        | Moore    |   | 11           |                         | PR27          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard          | Cutler   | Bloombridge LLP   | 11           |                         | PR27          | Bloombridge are not promoting this site. We believe we control access to PR27.  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun          | Breith   | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR27          | This site adjoins Langford Meadows LWS and the Lower Cherwell CTA. Are concerned about direct impacts and indirect impacts (e.g. recreational impacts) that might compromise the ecological interest of this site. This is particularly the case in light of potential cumulative effects in the area and more specifically PR14. It should also be noted that some areas to the west of the development site are considered to meet LWS criteria and are proposed to be designated as LWS in the future.   |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie            | Lodwick  |   | 11           |                         | PR27          | Strongly objects to the development of this site. This site should be safeguarded from encroachment. Has listed all the details of the site benefits to the community and the important part it plays in the Green Belt surrounding Kidlington in her representation.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin           | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR27          | This site abuts the Church Street Conservation Area to the east and the Oxford Canal and the Hampton Gay, Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Conservation Areas to the west. The site also abuts the grade II listed Sparrowgap Bridge over the Oxford Canal. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation areas, with reference to the conservation area character appraisals and the setting of the bridge.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name            | Surname                  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                   | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| PR-B-0959 | Clrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |   | 11           |                         | PR27                            | Object to any development on this site and consider that this site is inappropriate for development; therefore should be removed from the consultation process. This site to the north of Kidlington with no development on it. It is also an area that is hugely important to local wildlife and residents. The loss of this area would be detrimental to the area.  |
| PR-B-0960 | M                     | O'Mahoney                |   | 11           |                         | PR27                            | Objects to the development of this site which is in the GB.Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1055 | Philippa              | Mullineux                |   | 11           |                         | PR27                            | Object to the development around St Mary's Church and associated conservation area. The development of this site would fundamentally affect the setting of the listed building including the historic views across the fields to St Mary's. There is a huge array of flora and fauna including blackbirds, robins, wrens, owls, jays, woodpeckers, flocks of finches, blue, black and long tailed tits, gold crests, Mistle and Song thrushes, Red kites (nesting) and kestrels, cuckoo, kingfishers along the Cherwell, larks, swifts, starlings and over the winter very occasional waxwings. There are bats (pipistrelle and Leisler's), weasels, adders, toads, and frogs not to speak of the roe and Muntjak deer as well as badgers and rabbits. This list is far from comprehensive or scientific, but provides an indication of the loss of natural habitat that would result from development. |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan                  | Lodwick                  |   | 11           |                         | PR27                            | Site PR27 has well used footpaths, enjoyed by many, it provides fine views of the historic church and home to wildlife. Access to the site would be from The Moors which already has traffic problems, and adding any more would be unacceptable.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith                | Johnson                  | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR27                            | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4896915139; Flood Zone 2 or 3 - 2 and 3 close to (may adjoin) most of N boundary of site. Watercourses - May adjoin N of site   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry                 | Brougham                 |   | 11           |                         | PR27                            | Site PR27 should be rejected as its development would affect the setting of St Mary's Church and the accompanying conservation area. It would also affect the setting of the Cherwell Valley flood plain.   |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew                | Gant                     | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 11           |                         | PR27                            | This site has good potential for making better use of the historic setting of the Parish Church, which is currently detached from the rest of the village.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre               | Wells                    | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR27                            | This site a continuous open farmed landscape between the village and the River Cherwell. It preserves part of the visible rural setting of Kidlington, a green approach to the City and a substantial recreation asset for Kidlington and the local area. Any new development on this site would channel additional traffic through the village centre. Development should not extend into this very important open land, which is of exceptional beauty and frequently used as recreation land by local residents.   |
| PR-B-1166 | Jane                  | Hennell                  | The Canal and River Trust   | 11           |                         | PR27, 39, 41, 49, 91, 124, 177) | Whilst the Canal and River Trust offer no comments on the acceptability or otherwise of these possible sites we would like to raise concerns that if too many of these sites are chosen then the rural character of this section of the Oxford Canal will change as the area becomes more urban. Careful consideration must therefore be given to the waterside treatment at any of the sites and we would request that further consideration and consultation takes place with the Trust as a key stakeholder.   |
| PR-B-1166 | Jane                  | Hennell                  | The Canal and River Trust   | 11           |                         | PR27, 39, 41, 49, 91, 124, 177) | Although these sites are located on the offside future residents would undoubtedly use the canal towpath as a sustainable transport route to access local centres and Oxford itself. The implications of additional usage on the towpath, which is owned and maintained by the Trust, should be considered when the traffic implications of each site is assessed as improvement to the towpath infrastructure may be required to ensure that the towpath can meet the additional usage that the allocations of these sites may bring. We assume that any towpath improvement required as a result of a site allocation will be covered by a S106 contribution.   |
| PR-B-0739 | G                     | Gelder                   |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR14                      | Sites PR27 and PR14 would have a loss of countryside, walks and an impact on nature.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname   | Organisation                                  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                               | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-0754 | Philippa Jane          | Nelson    |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR14                                  | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, leaving a small area between the banks of the Cherwell and Stratfield Bank. Increased risk of flooding. Natural habitats have already suffered. Sites PR27 and PR14 important sites for birds. Quality of life impacted. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations. Relies on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county. Its the residents of outlying areas who will pay the price. |
| PR-B-1175 | Clare                  | Cooper    |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR14                                  | Concerns for the impact on wildlife and proximity to the flood plain at sites PR27 and PR14.  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi                  | Lancaster |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR14, PR125, PR50, PR39, PR24         | Sites PR27, PR14, PR125, PR50, PR39 and PR24 are very close to flood plains and important for drainage. If built upon will increase the risk of flooding.   |
| PR-B-0676 | John F                 | Morris    |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR14, PR32                            | Sites PR27, PR14 and PR32 are shown to border the flood plain and in recent years have extended well beyond this region, up Mill Street towards The Moors. Given the likely effects of climate change building so close to the flood plain would be contrary to common sense and government advice.   |
| PR-B-1281 | G M J                  | Taylor    |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR14, PR32                            | Am absolutely against building on these sites. The whole area between The Moors and the River Cherwell must be protected. This area is greatly valued by all the residents of Kidlington. One of the few beauties of Kidlington is once you walk down to St Mary's Church into the conversation area, your out into the open Oxfordshire countryside. Where deer roam and in the summer the water meadows are full of swallows. The area is not overlooked by houses and the peace and quiet of the area needs protecting.  |
| PR-B-0234 | Prof Roger             | Davies    |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR14, PR32, PR94, PR195, PR24, PR91   | Sites PR27, PR14 and PR32 are widely used for recreation and contain important wildlife habitats. New housing in these areas will increase the volume of traffic and cause further congestion.  |
| PR-B-0759 | R L                    | Davies    |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR14, PR32, PR94, PR195, PR24, PR91   | Sites PR27, PR14 and PR32 are part of the northern boundary of Kidlington. Used for recreation, the areas crossed by footpaths and has important natural habitats, not to sacrificed to housing. Sites PR94, PR195, PR24 and PR91 at the northern edge of Kidlington would increase traffic, cause congestion before reaching the Sainsbury roundabout.   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street    |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR32, PR50, PR125                     | Do not support sites PR27 and PR32 consider these to be of natural beauty and a regular amenity used and enjoyed by Kidlington and beyond. Do not support PR50 as to the encroach on GB. Do not support PR125 as the risk of flooding is potentially high.  |
| PR-B-1177 | Sandra and Richard     | Tyrrell   |   | 11           |                         | PR27, PR34, PR39, PR91, PR118, PR194, PR195 | Would have liked information regarding the sites in good time to digest, but do have concerns with regards to sites PR27, PR34, PR39, PR91, PR118, PR194 and PR195. All sites will increase traffic causing noise, pollution, delays and general nuisance to current residents. Some of the fields are flood plain, but also home to many species of wildlife and wildflowers where the effect on the environment will be felt. Assurance is required about the infrastructure including water, sewage, gas and electric before any steps are taken to build on an already fragile society.           |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger                  | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council                        | 11           |                         | PR28  | Banbury - Flood risk - adding to congestion to Southam Road   |
| PR-B-1280 | Peter                  | Offord    | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers               | 11           |                         | PR28  | Object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected. This site is an area of tranquillity.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry                  | Munday    |   | 11           |                         | PR29  | improvements on the road to A4260 needed.   |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony                | Matthews  | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR29  | Shipton Quarry - consider these entirely inappropriate for the provision of Oxford's needs by reason of its remote location in relation to the city. Concern is that the current infrastructure - particularly in relation to road network is overloaded and would be totally inadequate in its current form. Is it intended that there will be some system of ensuring that appropriate occupiers are found and retained for this purpose-designed accommodation?  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth  | Moore     |   | 11           |                         | PR29          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun    | Breith    | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR29          | This is a narrow site that adjoins the Shipton-on-Cherwell Quarry SSSI. It appears to be a disused railway line that acts as a good connector in this agricultural countryside. Are concerned about potential impacts on the SSSI and the adverse impact on the wider ecological network if the site was developed. Development on this site should be resisted.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson   | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR29          | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4786716876; Flood Zone 2 or 3 - FZ at eastern end of site. Watercourses - ? Watercourse at western boundary; SSSI - Shipton-on-Cherwell and Whitehill Farm quarries SSSI adjoins N boundary of site  |
| PR-B-0777 | Mark       | Longworth | Ambrosden Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR3           | Strongly object to this site, as it will lead to the coalescence of Ambrosden with the urban extension of Bicester at Graven Hill. And Ambrosden.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR3           | A grade II listed barn lies just to the north of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the barn.  |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura      | Precious  | Quod on behalf of Albion Land                                   | 11           |                         | PR3           | Albion Land are promoting this site. Quod have provided a very detailed report with an SA, TA and other evidence for the promotion of this site. Have also discussed in detail the Green Belt policy and the justification to consider the sites outside the Green Belt in Area of Search E to meet Oxford's unmet need.   |
| PR-B-0011 | Simon      | Marsh     | The Battlefields Trust  | 11           |                         | PR30          | This site is likely to lie on the 1645 Islip Bridge battlefield. Site has local and national significance. There is likely to be surviving battlefield archaeology on the site which should be investigated. The lap needs to establish whether the development of the site outweighs the public benefit of preserving this battlefield heritage.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday    |   | 11           |                         | PR30          | Islip rail station needs parking   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton    |   | 11           |                         | PR30          | Site PR50 some 50 houses here would have the support of the local community.   |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin    | Noke Parish Meeting   | 11           |                         | PR30          | This proposal for 50 dwellings would be inappropriate for the size of the village.   |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter      | Collins   | Islip Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR30          | In favour of developing this site for limited development of 50 houses with a 50 bed care home/sheltered housing scheme.   |
| PR-B-1005 | SP and SA  | McQuillan |   | 11           |                         | PR30          | With site PR30 some development of Islip is supported by the village. On that basis, support their proposal. Caution remains that any development must come with Section 106 and CIL money invested directly in the local area. 100 houses will bring additional 600+ residents, so consideration needs to be taken with school extensions, an additional doctor and a footbridge for crossing the river bridge. These need planning approval in the first instance and not to be considered at a later date.  |
| PR-B-1012 | Calum      | Miller    |   | 11           |                         | PR30          | Strongly support the limited development of the brownfield site PR30. The Parish Council has engaged with the developer, who commitments to develop a limited area of this site. Approximately five acres to create 50 new houses and 60 places in a nursing home. Such a development would contribute appropriately to Cherwell's target for housing and would support Islip's sustainability as a village.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson   | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR30          | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP5255914642; Watercourses - ? Watercourse at northern boundary   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0870 | Stewart           | Patience  | Anglian Water Services Ltd | 11           |                         | PR31          | The available capacity at Water Recycling Centres (formerly known as sewage treatment works) for each site is within Anglian Water's area of responsibility, and is considered to have an impact on its infrastructure. Have not considered the cumulative impact of these developments on their existing infrastructure; therefore ask CDC that further consideration is given to the cumulative impact on existing water recycling centres as part of the preparation of the current review and that this is reflected in the expected timing of development sites. Sewerage network - foul (or used water) flows from growth will have an impact on its existing network. This will depend on the location, size and phasing. Initial assessment is undertaken when approached by developers on a site by site basis.   |
| PR-B-0870 | Stewart           | Patience  | Anglian Water Services Ltd | 11           |                         | PR31          | The available capacity at Water Recycling Centres (formerly known as sewage treatment works) for each site is within Anglian Water's area of responsibility, and is considered to have an impact on its infrastructure. Have not considered the cumulative impact of these developments on their existing infrastructure; therefore ask CDC that further consideration is given to the cumulative impact on existing water recycling centres as part of the preparation of the current review and that this is reflected in the expected timing of development sites. Sewerage network - foul (or used water) flows from growth will have an impact on its existing network. This will depend on the location, size and phasing. Initial assessment is undertaken when approached by developers on a site by site basis. This site is considered as asset encroachment. Have provide detailed explanation in their representation. |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger             | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council     | 11           |                         | PR31          | Finmere - Why not a large development on the old airfield?   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry             | Munday    |                            | 11           |                         | PR32          | Only open land east of Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0078 | Anthony           | Churchill |                            | 11           |                         | PR32          | Area PR32 is adjacent to a conservation area and I'm concerned about drainage and flooding.  |
| PR-B-0150 | Patrick and Julia | Marcks    |                            | 11           |                         | PR32          | Object as it's GB land that provides walks and home to wildlife. It provides drainage and is prone to flooding. There will be a serious impact on local road traffic.  |
| PR-B-0680 | Dr John           | Maddicott |                            | 11           |                         | PR32          | Site PR32 is wholly unsuitable for development as it's within GB and the Kidlington Conservation Area. CDC's paper lists the tight controls which govern the area, where housing is now being considered. There are many medieval and listed buildings within this conservation area and a housing development would be completely inappropriate for this fine historic setting. The fields are abundant with wildlife including badger sets which under current legislation would have to be relocated. The area borders the flood plain and is close to the river so it is exceptionally wet. Climate change may well increase the risk of flooding and any building could result in surplus water flowing into Mill Street which has flooded. Access to the site would be through Mill Street which is narrow.  |
| PR-B-0742 | Keith and Hilary  | Prince    |                            | 11           |                         | PR32          | Site PR32 concerns regarding flooding on this site and its close proximity to the river. There's also insufficient access for traffic.   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth         | Moore     |                            | 11           |                         | PR32          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.   |
| PR-B-0764 | Steven            | Daggitt   |                            | 11           |                         | PR32          | Site PR32 unsuitable as it is part of GB and wholly contained within the heart of the Church Street Conservation Area defined and protected by CDC. It forms part of the "Church Fields Character Area". The rep is quoting from page 34 of CDC "Kidlington Conservation Areas Appraisal May 2009", section 5.12.4 Threats.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname                  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0809 | Karen                  | Selway                   |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Why is site PR32 being considered? Wholly object to it being built upon, it is GB and has a bio-diversity order upon it and is prone to flooding. Enjoyed by walkers. Natural habitats will be destroyed, open countryside and views will be lost forever. No public park in Kidlington the area is needed for public well being and health.   |
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie                  | Lodwick                  |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Strongly objects to the development of this site. This site should be safeguarded from encroachment. Has listed all the details of the site benefits to the community and the important part it plays in the Green Belt surrounding Kidlington in her representation.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                 | Small                    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR32          | This site is within the Church Street Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal is not entirely clear about the contribution of these fields to the special interest, character or appearance of the Conservation Area, but it is presumed that they are considered to provide an attractive setting to the village, and the Appraisal does identify a positive vista across the land towards the village. It would seem likely therefore that the loss of its openness would be detrimental to that interest, character and appearance, and therefore we consider that this site should not be taken forward |
| PR-B-0959 | Cllrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Object to any development on this site and consider that this site is inappropriate for development; therefore should be removed from the consultation process. This site to the north of Kidlington with no development on it. It is also an area that is hugely important to local wildlife and residents. The loss of this area would be detrimental to the area.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M                      | Mahoney                  |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A            | Webb                     |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Object to development on site PR32 which has historic ridge and furrow pasture fields that provide walks.  |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan                   | Lodwick                  |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Site PR32 lies in an important historic part of Kidlington within the conservation area and in close proximity to listed buildings. An important and well used footpath providing unique views and with wildlife interests passes close by the site. It should not be developed in line with the 2014 SHLAA.   |
| PR-B-1192 | Robert                 | Selway                   |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Object to site PR32 being considered, it is GB, it has a biodiversity order upon is and is prone to flooding. Natural habitats including a newly built badgers sett will be destroyed and walks and views enjoyed by many will be lost. Kidlington does not have a public park so the area is needed for the well being of residents.  |
| PR-B-1207 | Douglas and Louise     | Lloyd                    |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Strongly object to the proposals to build on site PR32 which will have a huge impact on residents of Webbs Way and Vicarage Road. There would be a significant increase in traffic to what is a quiet no through road. Views and walks would be lost and a home for the wildlife. The area is also on the cusp of a flood plain and development would increase the risk of flooding  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith                 | Johnson                  | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR32          | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4917015035; Flood Zone 2 or 3 - 2 and 3 on N and E of site (~50%)  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry                  | Brougham                 |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Site PR32 should be rejected as its development would affect the setting of St Mary's Church and the accompanying conservation area.   |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew                 | Gant                     | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                               | 11           |                         | PR32          | This site has good potential for making better use of the historic setting of the Parish Church, which is currently detached from the rest of the village.   |
| PR-B-1266 | Linda                  | Ward                     |   | 11           |                         | PR32          | Specifically object to consideration of site PR32 for development, this was decided to be unsuitable for development in the most recent evaluation since it is part of the Church Street conservation area , which status is unchanged.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific    | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre        | Wells         | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR32             | This site forms a continuous open farmed landscape between the village and the River Cherwell. It preserves part of the visible rural setting of Kidlington, a green approach to the City and a substantial recreation asset for Kidlington and the local area. Any new development on this site would channel additional traffic through the village centre. Development should not extend into this very important open land, which is of exceptional beauty and frequently used as recreation land by local residents.  |
| PR-B-1320 | Vassilis       | Athanassoglou |   | 11           |                         | PR32             | Concerned that development on site PR32 would be a loss to the valuable GB and the impact that this will have on nature and especially the badger habitats. There is limited access to this site, extra housing will have significant implications on the local traffic. The site is also close to the flood plain, which would affect groundwater drainage and the sewage system. Building many houses in a small plot will impair the beautiful countryside views.   |
| PR-B-1339 | Dr Christopher | Wedge         |   | 11           |                         | PR32             | Object strongly to the destruction of GB around Kidlington's historic centre. This is one of the nicest and unspoilt part of Kidlington with wonderful views of St Mary's Church from the footpaths and cycle way towards Hampton Poyle, this should be protected from development.  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve          | Pickles       | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                         | 11           |                         | PR32 and PR 91   | Both of these sites are located in sustainable locations on the edge of Kidlington with good access to services and facilities, with excellent foot and cycle connections. This representation includes a detailed Transport Appraisal, and a landscape and visual appraisal of these sites. The Webb's Way site is eminently suitable for residential development with the Langford Locks site more suitable for employment development. The site is also identified in the Kidlington Masterplan as a suitable location for a new cycle route and a Canal Hub. It is important to note that without an allocation for development on the Langford Locks site the improved cycleway connection will not take place nor would it be financially viable to provide the canal hub. |
| PR-B-1081 | Lynn           | Pilgrim       |   | 11           |                         | PR32, PR14, PR27 | Sites PR32, PR14 and PR27 are in GB made up of ancient meadow with a rich and diverse wildlife and flora. There are important populations of reptiles and amphibians. Skylarks which are fully protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981, nest in the fields. The areas have an extremely high water table and are prone to flooding not helped by inadequate Victorian drains. The fields are an important amenity for residents and visitors that enjoy the walks and views as recognised in the planning enquiry in the mid 1990's. Development at these sites would damage the conservation area and setting for listed buildings.   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane           | Olds          | Caversfield Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR33             | Dismissed at appeal in 2014 on character and appearance of the area with regard to the built up limits of Bicester and Caversfield, the proposed green buffer and the planned expansion of Bicester and Caversfield and housing land supply; the surrounding landscape; the setting of adjacent listed buildings/heritage assets. The access was also not adequate.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin         | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR33             | The RAF Bicester Conservation Area lies just to the east of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger          | Bellamy       | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR33             | Caversfield - Flood Risk   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry          | Munday        |   | 11           |                         | PR34             | Begbroke next to railway line must be securely fenced.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L              | Allen         |   | 11           |                         | PR34             | Site PR34 south of Sandy Lane appears to be in GB and should not be developed on. It contains good agricultural land which in times of rising populations should not be sacrificed, and supports a range of wildlife. Access to the site would be limited by narrow lanes. There is a plot of waste land closer to Yarnton, once used as a gravel pit then refuse dump, which should be considered.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                  | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------|---------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------|---|
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth   | Moore   |   | 11           |                         | PR34                           | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.  |
| PR-B-0789 | Lynne       | Whitley | Yarnton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR34                           | Site is wholly in the Green Belt. ESD14 safeguards the countryside from encroachment. The site is isolated, poorly served by a narrow Class C road. Adjacent to a well used railway line, and potentially development will affect the setting of the Oxford Canal Conservation Area.  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive       | Booth   | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                             | 11           |                         | PR34                           | This site appears next most appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction on Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line; this would be well placed to improve the transport services of Oxford, whilst being less attractive to London commuters (since the route would be slower than from Oxford Parkway), hence housing at this location would be more likely to serve Oxford's need (rather than London's) than if placed elsewhere. OCS believes there is great potential for a development -related Swift Rail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb    |   | 11           |                         | PR34                           | Site PR34 is at the edge of the sewage works which may need to expand and where there will be pest fly problems.  |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul        | Mayhook |   | 11           |                         | PR34                           | If site PR34 were developed then Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton would become one settlement. The land is in GB to prevent this from happening. This site is isolated and there are issues with the Oxford-Birmingham railway.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey     | Wright  | Begbroke Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR34                           | The development of this site is in complete contravention to council policies. Category 2 villages have fewer services and/or are remote with limited public transport and limited potential for development.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR34                           | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4865712959; Flood Zone 2 or 3 - 2 and 3 on N and E of site. Watercourses - Culverted main river at eastern boundary   |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris       | Robbins |   | 11           |                         | PR34, PR38, PR50, PR118, PR167 | All sites PR34, PR38, PR50, PR118, PR167 perform an important function preventing coalescence of communities, under no circumstances to be considered for development.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small   | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR35                           | The western end of this site is within the Bloxham Conservation Area, the character appraisal for which identifies this part of the conservation area as a "significant green space". The appraisal also identifies a positive view over this land and the adjacent land, also part of the potential housing site, to the horizon. Although have not been able to visit the site, the western end would therefore appear to contribute to the character and appearance of the conservation area, and consider that it should remain undeveloped. If the site is taken forward, any development on the site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt        | Todd    |   | 11           |                         | PR35, PR50                     | Sites PR38 and PR50 are in GB which must be preserved and not lost. Building on these sites will allow the urban merging of Kidlington and Oxford. Impact on traffic already A40 is problematic. Loss of countryside, walks and views. The impact on large variety of wildlife, birds and mammals. Implications to flooding. Cutteslowe Park a great public amenity to Oxford, this would be compromised and traffic is already an issue in this area, this needs to be taken into consideration if any development would go ahead.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small      | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR36          | This site abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to the north. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F   | Hickman    | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR36          | Objects to the promotion of this site and any extension to RAF Upper Heyford   |
| PR-B-1347 | Zahra      | Alrashed   | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of Kenley Holdings  | 11           |                         | PR36          | Supports an increase in the housing numbers for CDC, and have put forward their site at Letchmere Farm as a location for residential development. Strategic Master planning of the RAF Upper Heyford allocation should incorporate this site based on the positive sustainable contribution it can make towards the delivery of new homes early in the plan period and consider that this site would be a logical extension to an existing allocation. Have provided a detailed statement with the representation.   |
| PR-B-0260 | Chris      | Pack       |   | 11           |                         | PR37          | Totally opposed to development on this site which lies within the conservation area, and GB land that is of exceptional value to Kidlington for its views and walks. In the Inspectors Report 1991 it was described as an "area of High Landscape Value". Its river terrace is only just above flood plain and parts have historically experienced flooding. Access to transport is poor.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F   | Hickman    | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR37          | Objects to any extension to NW Bicester Eco Town   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger      | Bellamy    | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR37          | Bicester - Remote, No facilities, car access only.   |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex       | Wilson     | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd              | 11           |                         | PR37, PR197   | Note that site PR197 relates to land included in the original NW Master Plan submitted to CDC in March 2014. This area of land was excluded from Policy Bicester 1. Site PR37 relates to a new area of land promoted by P3Eco, which falls outside the NW Bicester Master Plan area. Any land identified for development adjacent or close to NW Bicester should be subject to the same Eco Town criteria that underpin the development.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday     |   | 11           |                         | PR38          | where will the golf course go?   |
| PR-B-0712 | Sonya      | Willoughby |   | 11           |                         | PR38          | Site PR38 would join us to Cutteslowe and use a large amount of GB along with the golf course. Consideration to Southfield golf course in Oxford for development.  |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim        | Green      | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association                      | 11           |                         | PR38          | Consider that this site is not suitable for reasons of traffic congestion on the roads and around the area particularly at peak hours. There are other large developments which will have additional impact on congestion. These are made up of GB land, which should be protected. Development of these sites would lead to Kidlington merging with Oxford. There are areas of rich wildlife and biodiversity, which is widely enjoyed by local communities. Lack of education and health infrastructure. These sites border Cutteslowe Park, which is Oxford's largest park and which is heavily used by local and more remote communities. Building up to the Park would be extremely detrimental to its setting which is currently in wide open countryside. Cutteslowe Park is at capacity at peak times and is inadequate for even the current numbers of visitors which will increase when the new splash pool opens. |
| PR-B-0828 | Roger      | Smith      | Savills on behalf of Croudace Homes                             | 11           |                         | PR38          | The land at St Frideswide Farm adjoined Site PR 38. Site PR 38 is supported as the most suitable location for strategic housing development to help meet Oxford's unmet needs. Much of PR 38 is also owned by Christ Church which would help ensure a comprehensive approach to the development of both sites should Oxford City Council allocate the Croudace land.   |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha    | Eliot      | Oxford Preservation Trust                                       | 11           |                         | PR38          | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues   |
| PR-B-0936 | Tim        | del Nevo   | Friends of Cutteslowe and Sunnymead Park                        | 11           |                         | PR38          | Development would require the provision of additional park leisure facilities and should not rely on Cutteslowe Park.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small      | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR38          | This site is a grade II* listed St Frideswide Farmhouse is located just outside the site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the Farmhouse.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                        | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|
| PR-B-0960 | M                   | O'Mahoney       |   | 11           |                         | PR38                                 | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew              | Hornsby-Smith   |   | 11           |                         | PR38                                 | This site provides a leisure facility and should be protected as GB land. Its use for housing would seriously undermine GB policy and contribute to urban sprawl.Has provided a criteria based assessment.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain                | Johnson         |   | 11           |                         | PR38                                 | The size of proposed development will fill up this space entirely and more than double the size of the suburb of Cutteslowe. This is too big. The green space between Oxford and Kidlington with views of the countryside will disappear. GB is there to protect against such urban sprawl. There is no provision to deal with the road congestion and no consideration of the additional cars, sources of particulate pollution degrading the air quality and health.  |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher         | Hardman         | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum  | 11           |                         | PR38                                 | Strongly objects to this site. Have a range of concerns that are listed in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith              | Johnson         | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR38                                 | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP5004911260; Flood Zone 2 or 3 -Small area of FZ3 @ SE corner (near Cutteslowe Park). Watercourses - Possible w/c at north of golf course  |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne             | Willson-Higgins |   | 11           |                         | PR38                                 | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. She has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew              | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 11           |                         | PR38                                 | Oxford and Kidlington must maintain a substantial green barrier between the two settlements, and must now allow housing adjacent to busy roads, for reasons of noise, air pollution etc. The plans showing Northern Gateway as undeveloped is misleading.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre             | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR38                                 | This area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD) |
| PR-B-1049 | Maria               | Page            |   | 11           |                         | PR38, PR122, PR123, PR50, PR38 [sic] | Sites PR38, PR122, PR123, PR50 and PR38 [sic] would add to the loss of the countryside and adding traffic to the roads would be horrendous.   |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings        |   | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50                           | This rep includes a map with a suggested area of development. Sites PR38 and PR50 are both in GB and extend across an area of natural beauty, destroying walks and views enjoyed by locals and thousands of visitors to Cutteslowe Park. Apart form the sweeping view across the Cherwell valley it's home to a wide range of wildlife.   |
| PR-B-0262 | Peter and Christine | Stevenson       |   | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50                           | Development on PR38 and PR50 will mean significant loss of GB, including a golf course which provides a valuable green lung to north Oxford. Kidlington and Oxford will merge and open countryside and the natural beauty and amenity of Cutteslowe park largely destroyed. The addition of the Northern Gateway will already increase traffic problems and without considerable infrastructure improvements the roads will be unable to cope.  |
| PR-B-0641 | J                   | Willoughby      |   | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50                           | Should not allow Oxford to be joined with Kidlington. It would destroy a large proportion of quiet unspoilt land of great benefit to residents. Cutteslowe park is enormously appreciated and GB needs to be preserved for future residents.  |
| PR-B-0743 | John                | Tremlett        |   | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50                           | Only sites PR38 and PR50 have been looked at. The western most part of PR38 the triangle between Peartree and the railway is suitable for housing.Would prefer the smaller development area to the west of the golf course (as in PR38).  |
| PR-B-0796 | David               | Tighe           |   | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50                           | Object in particular to sites PR38 and PR50. Loss of GB, walks and views. Impact on wildlife. Coalescence of Kidlington and Oxford. Lack of infrastructure and impact on traffic. Pressure on schools and health care. Flooding and drainage.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard   |                 | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Reasons why sites PR38 and PR50 should not be proposed. Considerations have not been taken for GB, increased traffic, the current improvements to the area have not improved. Destroy the countryside and biodiversity. Flood plan to which development will greatly increase in this area and within North Oxford. No provision for additional amenities. The development will greatly affect the outlook and character of Cutteslowe Park, its needs protecting. No consideration for the destruction of the GB and the impact on the local surrounding areas. Do not agree with the excepted circumstances stated. Used as a commuter belt for London etc. No consideration into the CPRE survey which 76% surveyed in Oxford want GB protected. Oxford City has enough brownfield sites to develop. |
| PR-B-0801 | Janet            | Stott      |                 | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Particularly concerned about site PR38 and PR50. Walk in the fields appreciating the wildlife seen. Concerned the removal of hedgerows and trees would remove irreplaceable habitats. Particularly concerned for the population of the grass snakes on these sites. Grass snakes are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981, and classified as a Priority Species in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Loss of habitats and GB would have a devastating effect on their population. Social needs not been considered. Cutteslowe Park views will be transformed to urban sprawl.   |
| PR-B-0812 | Tim              | Stott      |                 | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Particularly concerned about site PR38 and PR50. Walk in the fields appreciating the wildlife seen. Concerned the removal of hedgerows and trees would remove irreplaceable habitats. Particularly concerned for the population of the grass snakes on these sites. Grass snakes are protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 1981, and classified as a Priority Species in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan. Loss of habitats and GB would have a devastating effect on their population. Social needs not been considered. Cutteslowe Park views will be transformed to urban sprawl.   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor     |                 | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | The rep provides a detailed objection to site PR38 and PR50.  |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson     |                 | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Cutteslowe Park is a major amenity for the whole of Oxfordshire, the views are its main assets. Sites PR38 and PR50 indicated come down to the boundary of the park, destroying most of the view. The bottom field is susceptible to flooding a large development would exacerbate the situation. Have infrastructure considerations such as education and health been taken into consideration for site PR38 and PR50.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard          | Cutler     | Bloombridge LLP | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | PR50 is in open countryside and will have a high impact on the GB. PR38 would fill in views from the Banbury Road into open countryside and requires North Oxford Golf Club to move. As evidenced by the slow progress on the Northern Gateway, there are also very challenging transportation and infrastructure constraints in this area of Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter            | Hainsworth |                 | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Sites PR38 and PR50 either together or separately will have a terrible impact on traffic. Oxford and Kidlington will become one with no benefits for either. Countryside views would be lost and wildlife would be damaged. People will lose the benefits of the open rural spaces which contributes to well-being. Cutteslowe Park will be affected a resource that is enjoyed by many locals and those from further afield.   |
| PR-B-0873 | Jenyth           | Worsley    |                 | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Objection to sites PR38 and PR50. Loss of GB, countryside, walks and views. The impact on local wildlife. Concerns to flooding and drainage. Added pressure on schools and health care. Kidlington and Oxford coalescing. Major impact on traffic, already an issue with Oxford Parkway and the general lack of infrastructure. Cutteslowe Park is the only green space in north Oxford. There will be a major impact on its amenities, this park gives pleasure and recreational facilities to many.   |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul             | Buckley    |                 | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Sites PR 38 and PR50 just to the north of Oxford, such a flagrant disregard to GB policy. Proposals to build on GB made without indication to why circumstance are 'exceptional' as required by the national policy. Sites PR38 and PR50 would effectively join up Oxford and Kidlington, this violates the most fundamental principle of GB, to prevent the merging of separate communities by 'urban sprawl'.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric      | Sidebottom |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Concerned with sites PR38 and PR50 would see the coalescence of Kidlington and Oxford. GB loss and the impact to the countryside, walks and views. Increased traffic and pollution. Pressure to the schools and health services which are at breaking point. The effect to Cutteslowe Park would be immense, this is used by locals and those from further afield it's an important part of our heritage that needs to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0939 | Lynne        | Tighe      |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Concerned with sites PR38 and PR50 would see the merging of Kidlington and Oxford. GB loss and the impact to the countryside, walks and views. Increased traffic and congestion especially on the Banbury Road between Kidlington and Cutteslowe roundabout. Implications to flooding and drainage. Pressure to the schools, healthcare and infrastructure in general. The effect to Cutteslowe Park would be immense. Please do not underestimate the consequences of building homes up to the park boundaries. It's an important part of our heritage that needs to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0983 | Suzanne      | Morris     |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Concerned with sites PR38 and PR50 would see the loss of GB open countryside, walks, runs and views. Coalescence of Kidlington and Oxford. Increased traffic and congestion on the local network. Implications to flooding and drainage. Pressure to primary and secondary schools. Pressure to healthcare, it takes ten days to get a non urgent appointment which isn't acceptable and it will only increase. General lack of infrastructure, commuter trains to London from Oxford and into Oxford are already full. The effect to Cutteslowe Park would be immense. The natural beauty and amenity that the park provides along with the varied wildlife would be lost for all that vest from far and wide. It's an important part of our heritage that should be protected by its boundaries and beyond. |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret | Sidebottom |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Naturally concerned with site PR38 and PR50. Coalescence of Kidlington and Oxford. Loss of GB, walks and views. Impact on traffic and pollution which is already intolerable. Pressure on schools and health care which is at breaking point. The effect to Cutteslowe Park would be immense. The natural beauty and amenity that the park provides along with the varied wildlife would be lost for all that visit from far and wide. It's an important part of our heritage that should be protected by its boundaries and beyond.  |
| PR-B-1046 | William      | Hodgson    |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Object to Kidlington and Oxford being joined by a stagnant dormitory housing block. This is a desperate display of development greed, hidden behind a facade of false pretences. The future of the living soil is threatened with any loss of GB. The beauty of Cutteslowe Park is that it nestles against the open country and is not strangled by a noose of concrete, brick and tarmac.  |
| PR-B-1097 | Caroline     | Hayes      |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | At sites PR38 and PR50 the loss of GB will have a negative impact on the quality of life for those living in and around the area. There will be potential problems with flooding, loss of wildlife, huge increase in traffic and pressure on schools and healthcare. Lack of infrastructure will make the area unpleasant to live in. Cutteslowe Park is well used and should be protected.   |
| PR-B-1101 | Catherine    | Dobson     |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Loss of GB and countryside amenity and the encouragement of urban sprawl between Kidlington and Oxford. The destruction of Cutteslowe Park which is a popular amenity and the additional traffic.   |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul         | Mayhook    |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Sites PR38 and PR50 both include North Oxford Golf Course and the area to the east of Oxford Road is valuable open space and contributes to the rural setting of Oxford Parkway.  |
| PR-B-1182 | Alison       | Noel       |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Development at sites PR38 and PR50 would lose GB with its walks and views and impact on local wildlife. Traffic in the area is already saturated and pollution levels exceed permitted European levels. Pressure will increase on schools and health care and there will be implications for flooding. The natural beauty and amenity value of Cutteslowe Park will be affected which is important to many people.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1227 | Richard         | Silvester |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Am concerned that if sites PR38 and/or PR50 are developed then GB will be lost in the coalescence of Oxford and Kidlington. There will be an impact on traffic, and wildlife and increased pressure on schools, health services and local amenities. It will be detrimental to the natural beauty of the area, particularly around Cutteslowe Park which provides recreation for the local and larger community.  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M           | Green     |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | The land to the north of Cutteslowe Park should be retained either as farmland or an extension to the park. Development at sites PR38 and PR50 would increase pressure on health services, schools and other amenities.   |
| PR-B-1231 | Prof J M        | Baker     |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Sites PR38 and PR50 are in the GB so should be strongly protected from development. They would effectively merge Oxford with Kidlington, to the detriment of both. There would be significant loss of green field land and open countryside of high landscape value. Traffic on the Banbury Road would increase. There would be increased pressure on local amenities, which would increase pressure for further development to ease the strain on existing infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-1245 | Jason and Petra | Tyrell    |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Loss of GB is unjustifiable and irreversible at sites PR38 and PR50 where wildlife and open countryside will be lost. Consideration needs to be given to tree preservation, flooding issues, impact on the already constrained traffic network and infrastructure and the impact on Cutteslowe Park.  |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan           | Silvester |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Am concerned that if sites PR38 and/or PR50 are developed then GB will be lost in the coalescence of Oxford and Kidlington. There will be an impact on traffic, and wildlife and increased pressure on schools, health services and local amenities. It will be detrimental to the natural beauty of the area, particularly around Cutteslowe Park which provides recreation for the local and larger community.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia           | Sheppard  |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Sites PR38 and PR50 are totally unsuitable for development. There is the impact on the GB. Kidlington and Oxford become joined with a loss of open countryside and an impact to wildlife. There would be added pressure on transport links. The impact to Cutteslowe Park would be immense changing the feel and nature of the park which is enjoyed by many. How does this fit in with other policies for promoting health and access to green spaces. Schools, GP's and hospital's are at full capacity how will these cope.  |
| PR-B-1257 | Charles         | Fletcher  |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Sites PR38 and PR50 are a concern, due to the loss of GB, open countryside and the impact on the local wildlife. There would be coalescence of Kidlington and Oxford. Impact to traffic and the local network. Concerned with flooding and drainage. The proposed sites flood every year. Oxford has suffered with flooding since housing was built on the Thames flood plains, we should not make the same mistake. Schools and healthcare services would be put under pressure. Ten days to get a non urgent appointment is not acceptable. General lack of infrastructure and accessibility to the city centre. The damage and effect that would be put upon Cutteslowe Park. The loss of views and the variety of wildlife, the park is valued by residents and those from far and wide. Its an important part of our heritage that needs protecting. |
| PR-B-1258 | Hilary          | Fletcher  |              | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Sites PR38 and PR50 are a concern, due to the loss of GB, open countryside and the impact on the local wildlife. There would be coalescence of Kidlington and Oxford. Impact to traffic and the local network. Concerned with flooding and drainage. Schools and healthcare services would be put under pressure. Ten days to get a non urgent appointment is not acceptable. General lack of infrastructure and accessibility to the city centre. The damage and effect that would be put upon Cutteslowe Park. The loss of views and the variety of wildlife, the park is valued by residents and those from far and wide. Its an important part of our heritage that needs protecting.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific            | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| PR-B-1259 | Mircea     | Popa      |  | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50               | Sites PR38 and PR50 are a concern, due to the loss of GB, open countryside and the impact on the local wildlife. There would be coalescence of Kidlington and Oxford. Impact to traffic and the local network. Concerned with flooding and drainage. Schools and healthcare services would be put under pressure. Ten days to get a non urgent appointment is not acceptable. General lack of infrastructure and accessibility to the city centre. The damage and effect that would be put upon Cutteslowe Park. The loss of views and the variety of wildlife, the park is valued by residents and those from far and wide. Its an important part of our heritage that needs protecting.  |
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard  |  | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50               | Sites PR38 and PR50 are not suitable due to the impact on the valued GB. Development of this size would merge Kidlington and Oxford together. Recent changes around Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts are still under pressure, this will only get worse, even before the full impact of the Chiltern line through to Oxford. There would be a vast loss of open countryside which is vital for health and wellbeing. Wildlife would be impacted. There would be a negative impact on Cutteslowe Park, which is a natural beauty and provides many amenities to locals and those from far a field. What consideration has been given to drainage and flooding on these sites. There would be added pressure on the already over stretched infrastructure, service, schools and healthcare. |
| PR-B-1263 | Katie      | Silvester |  | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50               | Sites PR38 and PR50 are a concern as this is GB land which would be lost in the coalescence of Oxford and Kidlington. Impacting traffic, pressure on the infrastructure like schools healthcare and other amenities. The impact to local wildlife and the natural beauty of the area, in particular the area around Cutteslowe Park which serves as a source of tranquillity and recreation not only for the local community but for the whole of Oxford and its surroundings.   |
| PR-B-1271 | Rebecca    | Hodgson   |  | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50               | Sites PR38 and PR50 would extend the urban sprawl into Kidlington and increase the urbanisation of Oxford. Causing a loss of open countryside around the edges of Oxford which provides benefits to all. The impact to local wildlife would be immense and GB would be lost. The local infrastructure cannot cope now and further development would make matters worse. Schools and health services like the JR will not be able to cope with the increase to the population. Concerns with flooding on either of these sites. The rural views of Cutteslowe Park will be lost.  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim        | Perkins   | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50, PR123, PR167 | These sites also score 'HIGH' in the GB study. Note the substantial representation from Oxford City Council which promotes major development around Oxford Parkway station. Whilst can see benefits from locating close to the station there is clearly a risk that this area would encourage London commuters, driving up house prices and would not help in solving Oxford's housing needs. Also: the eastern fringes of this area is within flood zones 2 and 3; there are listed buildings at Frideswide Farm and Water Eaton; The golf club is an important leisure facility which is protected as Green Space within the adopted Local Plan; Considerable archaeological importance including the site of Cutteslowe Deserted Medieval village.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham  |  | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50, PR178        | Any development within sites PR38, PR50 and PR178 should take account of the need to maintain a clear physical and visual separation between Kidlington and Oxford.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-0944 | David                  | Stone         |   | 11           |                         | PR38, PR50, PR41, PR177, PR178, PR167, PR168, PR126, PR128, PR124, PR123, PR12, PR122, PR118, PR9 | These sites are GB and should not be built on. Equally you have wrongly evaluated the consequent congestion issues which devalue the case for the proximity of proposed development.  |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street        |   | 11           |                         | PR38,PR39,PR41, PR49,PR51,PR75, PR91, PR118, PR123, PR167   | Support sites PR38, PR39, PR41, PR49, PR51 and PR75. Site PR91 could make the most of the canal corridor as an amenity. Support site PR118 the airport area. Makes sense to being close to Langford Lane but wonder how realistic it is. Support site PR123 the golf course. Suitable in terms of traffic not passing through Kidlington. Support site PR167 by Oxford Parkway. Cater for housing for those to easily use the train and P and R to access Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry                  | Munday        |   | 11           |                         | PR39  | Allow room for road widening.   |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha                | Eliot         | Oxford Preservation Trust   | 11           |                         | PR39  | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun                | Breith        | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                                    | 11           |                         | PR39  | This site adjoins a LWS (Meadows West of Oxford Canal) as well as the Lower Cherwell CTA. Are concerned about direct and indirect impacts as well as cumulative effects of nearby proposed developments on this site.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                 | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR39  | This site includes the grade II listed Frieze Farmhouse. Any development of this site should retain the Farmhouse and have regard to its setting.   |
| PR-B-0966 | E                      | Nicholson     |   | 11           |                         | PR39  | Site PR39 encroaches on a large area of the Kidlington Gap which separates North Oxford from Kidlington and could lead to the gap closing entirely in the future. This GB gap provides access to the countryside for health and recreation, retaining an attractive natural landscape and "green lung" for the City of Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew                 | Hornsby-Smith |   | 11           |                         | PR39  | Supports the development of this site.  |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher            | Hardman       | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum  | 11           |                         | PR39  | If this site is developed, there would be loss of farmland. It is surrounded by major roads on all sides and safe access for pedestrians and cyclists to schools, shops etc. is only available to the north. It favours car use.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith                 | Johnson       | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR39  | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4935611606; Flood Zone 2 or 3 -Small area of FZ2 around buildings to W of canal. Watercourses - w/c (possibly canal?) borders west of site  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew                 | Garraway      | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 11           |                         | PR39  | This representation provides detailed comments on site PR39. In support of this site the rep includes a comprehensive site assessment covering the key areas of The Green Belt, Urban Form, Transport and Sustainability. Supporting documents include a 'Concept Study'; a 'Preliminary Access Options Study'; a Preliminary Ecology Appraisal'; a Heritage Assessment.  |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew                 | Gant          | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                                       | 11           |                         | PR39  | Oxford and Kidlington must maintain a substantial green barrier between the two settlements, and must now allow housing adjacent to bust roads, for reasons of noise, air pollution etc. The plans showing Northern Gateway as undeveloped is misleading.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre                | Wells         | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR39  | This area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD) |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                                       | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| PR-B-0739 | G           | Gelder        |   | 11           |                         | PR39, PR177, PR41, PR124, PR22                      | Sites PR39, PR177, PR41, PR124 and PR22 increase pressure on the roads system and close to a flood plain.  |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter       | Webber        |   | 11           |                         | PR39, PR178, PR125, PR167, PR50, PR38, PR122, PR123 | Strongly oppose sites PR39, PR178 and PR125 and possibly parts of PR167, PR50, PR38, PR122 and PR123 due to their proximity to Oxford Parkway which will attract London commuters. It would be better to keep these areas as open spaces to replace other land used.   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim         | Perkins       | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC        | 11           |                         | PR39, PR41, PR124, PR168, PR177                     | This group of sites performs 'HIGH' against two of the four GB purposes in the GB study and again is important in preventing urban sprawl and merging of Kidlington and Oxford. The sites are adjacent to the Oxford Canal which is a very important recreational corridor and designated Conservation Area within the District. The corridor is protected through Policy ESD16 of the adopted Local Plan. Development in this area has the potential for adverse effects on the canal.  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris       | Dicks         |   | 11           |                         | PR39, PR49  | Sites PR39 and PR49 are not appropriate as they are adjacent to the Stratfield Brake nature area and PR49 would result in the loss of the historic Stratfield Farm setting.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday        |   | 11           |                         | PR41  | Allow room for road widening.  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth   | Moore         |   | 11           |                         | PR41  | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha     | Eliot         | Oxford Preservation Trust                                       | 11           |                         | PR41  | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun     | Breith        | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR41  | This site adjoins two LWSs (Dukes Lock Pond, Loop Farm Flood Meadows) and two CTAs (Lower Cherwell, Oxford Meadows and Farmore). It also comes close to Oxford Meadows SAC and are concerned about direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the SAC and LWSs. Impacts of development on this site will need to be appropriately assessed in line with environmental legislation and LP policy ESD9.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR41  | This site includes the grade II listed Oxford Canal Tilting Bridge and is partly within the Oxford Canal Conservation Area. The majority of the western boundary of the site abuts the Conservation Area. Any development of this site should retain the Tilting Bridge and Canal and have regard to the setting of both, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney     |   | 11           |                         | PR41  | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb          |   | 11           |                         | PR41  | Housing at site PR41 may damage the adjacent green canal wildlife corridor, rain collects here and there is noise and pollution from major roads. This rep provides lengthy details of the impact development could have on Osney Mead hay meadow (BBOWT) part of the SAC and New Marston Meadows SSSI by changing access.   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew      | Hornsby-Smith |   | 11           |                         | PR41  | Supports the development of this site. It would form a new community separated from the housing and shops and facilities at the Northern Gateway, and does not compromise the strategic purposes of the GB. Has provided a criteria based assessment.  |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman       | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum                                  | 11           |                         | PR41  | This site is surrounded by major roads to the south and west and the planned link road will cross it. There are limited public transport possibilities for access to Oxford so it favours car use and pedestrians and cyclists would have to cross major roads.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR41  | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4903410883; Flood Zone 2 or 3 -Small area of FZ3 @ w boundary, near canal. Watercourses - Canal crosses site N-S, w/c also crosses southern part of site e-w  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells   | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR41  | This area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)   |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford   | Jones   |   | 11           |                         | PR41, PR124, PR125  | Loss of GB, with impact on the flora and fauna. The impact on local traffic, and risk of flooding.  |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia | Banbury Town Council  | 11           |                         | PR43  | This site does not provide strong road connections with Oxford both road and rail. It would increase road traffic within Banbury and further decreasing connectivity between the town and Banbury.  |
| PR-B-1280 | Peter      | Offord  | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers   | 11           |                         | PR43  | Object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.   |
| PR-B-1143 | Dr Pamela  | Roberts |   | 11           |                         | PR43, PR45, PR95, PR112, PR146, PR27, PR52, PR39, PR91, PR168, PR177, PR28, PR199, PR15, PR54 | Object to strategic development sites that degrade the countryside, namely sites that are along bridleways and footpaths - PR43, PR45, PR95, PR112, PR146, canals - PR27, PR52, PR39, PR91, PR168, PR177, rivers - PR28, areas of tranquillity - PR199, nature reserves, local wildlife sites, Conservation Target Areas and general intrusion into the countryside - PR15, PR54.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia | Banbury Town Council  | 11           |                         | PR45  | This site does not provide strong road connections with Oxford both road and rail. It would increase road traffic within Banbury and further decreasing connectivity between the town and Banbury.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small   | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR45  | Historic England consider that, this site is within the setting of the grade II listed Withycombe Farmhouse and attached stable, immediately to the west. This is one of a number of proposed sites containing or near to isolated listed farmsteads, which would be surrounded by development if these sites were allocated, which in turn is likely to have a major impact on their significance. Their historical interest is often bound up in the relationship with the land from them and their aesthetic value is often enhanced by an isolated rural setting. Suggest that an analysis of the impact of development on the significance of the farmstead is undertaken and feeds into the consideration of any sites taken forward. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of these listed buildings. |
| PR-B-1280 | Peter      | Offord  | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers   | 11           |                         | PR45  | Object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry   | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 11           |                         | PR45  | Support Site Ref: PR 45 – Land adjoining Dover Avenue and Thornbury Drive as a potential extension to Strategic Site Banbury 3: Land West of Bretch Hill.   |
| PR-B-1034 | Anita      | Spencer | Sibford Ferris Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR46  | The village infrastructure is not sufficiently robust to sustain the scale of development proposed. In particular, the concerns are regarding the size and scale of the roads and existing traffic problems, failure of the existing sewerage system many times over the past decade, rural character, lack of immediate relationship to Oxford, impact on countryside.<br>Housing in Sibford Ferris would not provide people convenient, affordable, sustainable travel opportunities to the city's places of work study and recreation and to its services and facilities.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0889 | Helen      | Priestley |   | 11           |                         | PR46, PR66    | This rep. has provided a lengthy objection to sites PR46 and PR66 with detailed comments to; Access limitations, Inaccuracies on the submission – facilities and Protecting the rural nature of the area and rural jobs for residents and horse riders.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR47          | This site would be likely to have an impact on the setting of, and particularly views out of, the grade I registered Rousham Park. The key view out of the park is from the statue of the Dying Gaul. Here the surrounded landscape has been co-opted to enhance the park with designed views to an eye-catcher placed to the north outside the park boundary. An important part of the effect created by the park is of an idealised rural landscape with views out into the wider landscape. Any major development intruding into these views would seriously harm the significance of the park. PR47 would be particularly damaging one, as this would occupy a scarp on one side of the valley. We therefore consider that this site should not be taken forward. In addition, the western end of this site lies within the Rousham Conservation Area and the site abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to the north. It is not clear from the Rousham Conservation Area statement how the land to the east of Port Way contributes to the special interest, character and appearance of the conservation area and further investigation (with an updated conservation area character assessment) should be undertaken to ascertain this |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR47          | The western end of this site lies within the Rousham Conservation Area and the site abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to the north. It is not clear from the Rousham Conservation Area statement how the land to the east of Port Way contributes to the special interest, character and appearance of the conservation area and further investigation (with an updated conservation area character assessment) should be undertaken before this site is taken forward in the entirety shown. Any development of this site should also have regard to the Upper Heyford Conservation Area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F   | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR47          | Objects to the promotion of this site and any extension to RAF Upper Heyford  |
| PR-B-0643 | L          | Allen     |   | 11           |                         | PR48          | Site PR48 land south of Solid Sate Logic appears to be in GB and should not be developed. It is a major wildlife habitat and near to Begbroke conservation area and is likely to be unsightly. Traffic problems will be a major issue as it will add to the already unsafe conditions at Begbroke. Here residents have to cross the A44 dual carriageway without a pedestrian crossing to access village amenities and the bus stop.  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth  | Moore     |   | 11           |                         | PR48          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike       | Gilbert   | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd                                       | 11           |                         | PR48          | Yes. There are no environmental constraints to the development of site PR48 (a brief description is provided). It could also easily be combined with the northern part of PR51 if it was felt that a larger site is needed to fulfil the purpose of a 'sustainable strategic development site'.   |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter      | Nicholson |   | 11           |                         | PR48          | Objects to development of this site for housing. Development would destroy the function of the GB and cause devastation to the historic character and setting of Begbroke village. Has raised concerns on a range of issues that have been discussed in detail in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey    | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR48          | The development of this site is in complete contravention to council policies. Category 2 villages have fewer services and/or are remote with limited public transport and limited potential for development.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific    | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| PR-B-1223 | Judith           | Johnson   | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR48             | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4697513718; Flood Zone 2 or 3 -No flooding on site, but access/egress appears to be via FZ3 on A44 at roundabout  |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick             | Alston    | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd         | 11           |                         | PR48             | This site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of LOA has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds). The erection of buildings on other sites within the Safeguarded Area would require appropriate controls to be imposed that limit heights in order to be acceptable (for the purposes of policy-preparation recommend assuming the benchmark heights defined on the Safeguarding Map, which would require refinement at the planning application stage via detailed testing). This should be read in conjunction with their earlier representation dated 11th March 2016 and 6th July 2016, in particular the 'London Oxford Airport Sustainable Development Opportunity, Position Paper' (dated March 2016).   |
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard | Miles     |   | 11           |                         | PR48, PR51, PR20 | Immediate concerns with sites PR48, PR51 and PR20, development would merge Begbroke and Yarnton, their historic significance settings and character lost. Loss of countryside, wildlife and habitats for protected species, rural pathways and habitats that need to be preserved rather than becoming part of the Oxford sprawl. Flooding is a issue and concern west to the A44, measures already taken to prevent this are not successful. Further developments could increase the problems. Existing infrastructure and road network already overburdened. Schools oversubscribed and Begbroke catchment areas need to be reviewed. Regarding option A due to the proximity of this area to West Oxfordshire borders and the proposals for development there, what considerations are being made to ensure that there is not an over development of the areas surrounding the A44? No benefit to key workers and employment areas but rather used for London commuters using Oxford Parkway and not serving Oxford City. |
| PR-B-0966 | E                | Nicholson |   | 11           |                         | PR48, PR51, PR75 | Development on sites PR48, PR51 and PR75 would destroy the historic aspect and setting off the villages of Begbroke and Yarnton which are in close proximity to listed buildings.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry            | Munday    |   | 11           |                         | PR49             | This is creep towards Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0742 | Keith and Hilary | Prince    |   | 11           |                         | PR49             | Site PR49 here will be serious problems with residents trying to exit their estates in the morning and the roundabout at Sainsbury's and the roads south will be totally gridlocked.   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth        | Moore     |   | 11           |                         | PR49             | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David            | Smith     |   | 11           |                         | PR49             | Site PR49 add land west of drain to Stratfield Brake wildlife conservation area. In any area bordering on the canal at least 5 metres should be allowed on both sides of the canal.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin           | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR49             | This site includes the grade II listed Stratfield Farmhouse and abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the west. This is one of a number of proposed sites containing or near to isolated listed farmsteads, which would be surrounded by development if these sites were allocated, which in turn is likely to have a major impact on their significance. Their historical interest is often bound up in the relationship with the land from them and their aesthetic value is often enhanced by an isolated rural setting. Suggest that an analysis of the impact of development on the significance of the farmstead is undertaken and feeds into the consideration of any sites taken forward. Any development of this site should retain the Farmhouse and have regard to its setting and that of the Conservation Area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname                  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|--------------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                 | Small                    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group         | 11           |                         | PR49   | This site includes the grade II listed Stratfield Farmhouse and abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the west. Any development of this site should retain the Farmhouse and have regard to its setting and that of the Conservation Area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0959 | Cllrs Neil and Maurice | Prestidge and Billington |   | 11           |                         | PR49   | This site is adjacent to Stratfield Brake sports ground. Would like to see any development on this site to be a mixture of recreation and housing so that the range of sports at Stratfield Brake can be expanded. The council also need to take into consideration the nature reserve at Stratfield Brake and any impacts future developments might have   |
| PR-B-0960 | M                      | O'Mahoney                |   | 11           |                         | PR49   | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.                                 |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M                | Rugg                     |   | 11           |                         | PR49   | Site PR49 is close to an area that has congestion so any increase in traffic would cause gridlock.  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey                | Wright                   | Begbroke Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR49   | This site is a good suggestion for development.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith                 | Johnson                  | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR49   | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4946612446; Watercourses - Canal adjoins W of site, and w/c crosses western part of site   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre                | Wells                    | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR49   | Objects to the development of this site. This area will be unacceptably narrow. It is the important gap between Kidlington and the City. This site is adjacent to Stratfield Brake facility, and has been considered as a potential site for much needed additional Recreational Land and Open Space to serve the village.  |
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria               | Campbell                 |   | 11           |                         | PR49   | Site PR49 has poor drainage and is susceptible to flooding. Stratfield Brake playing field is often wet and boggy, development would make this worse and impact those who frequently use this playing field. The wildlife in the area would be impacted. The traffic would be compromised, to leave Kidlington by car after 07:15 is impossible due to the extreme congestion at the Kidlington roundabout. |
| PR-B-1312 | Carl                   | Parker                   |   | 11           |                         | PR49   | Any expansion to this site at Garden City is not suitable due to the crippling effects of increased people and the number of vehicles on the Banbury Road and Sainsbury roundabout at peak times. This is the centre of the village from the south so traffic needs to be flowing, not congested.   |
| PR-B-0222 | Malcolm                | Axtell                   |   | 11           |                         | PR49, PR178, PR125, PR16                               | These site are of particular concern along with any other sites which would result in Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke merging into one sprawl and losing their village identities. A great deal of people enjoy the walks and wildlife in this area. Kidlington already has a flooding problem in a number of areas including Garden City  |
| PR-B-1281 | G M J                  | Taylor                   |   | 11           |                         | PR49, PR178, PR125,PR39,P R168, PR177,PR41, PR124.     | Sites PR49, PR178, PR125,PR39,PR168, PR177,PR41 and PR124. Am not against building on these sites.  |
| PR-B-1049 | Maria                  | Page                     |   | 11           |                         | PR49, PR27, PR14, PR178, PR125                         | Sites PR49, PR27, PR14, PR178 and PR125 would be more preferable if Kidlington had to deal with more housing as it would be added to the outskirts and yet still accessible.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris                  | Robbins                  |   | 11           |                         | PR49, PR91, PR125, PR178, PR74, PR75, PR21 PR30, PR181 | Sites PR49, PR91, PR125 and PR178 all form natural extensions to Kidlington and Gosford. Site PR74 is a natural extension to Begbroke. Site PR75 is a natural extension to Yarnton. Site PR21, PR30 and PR181 are natural extensions to Islip. These sites should be considered first if GB development is necessary.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry                  | Munday                   |   | 11           |                         | PR50   | Where will the golf course go?  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0819 | Tim         | Green           | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association                      | 11           |                         | PR50          | Consider that this site is not suitable for reasons of traffic congestion on the roads and around the area particularly at peak hours. There are other large developments which will have additional impact on congestion. These are made up of GB land, which should be protected. Development of these sites would lead to Kidlington merging with Oxford. There are areas of rich wildlife and biodiversity, which is widely enjoyed by local communities. Lack of education and health infrastructure. These sites border Cutteslowe Park, which is Oxford's largest park and which is heavily used by local and more remote communities. Building up to the Park would be extremely detrimental to its setting which is currently in wide open countryside. Cutteslowe Park is at capacity at peak times and is inadequate for even the current numbers of visitors which will increase when the new splash pool opens. |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha     | Eliot           | Oxford Preservation Trust                                       | 11           |                         | PR50          | This site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues   |
| PR-B-0856 | David       | Smith           |   | 11           |                         | PR50          | Site PR50 east of Oxford Road only.  |
| PR-B-0936 | Tim         | del Nevo        | Friends of Cutteslowe and Sunnymead Park                        | 11           |                         | PR50          | Development would require the provision of additional park leisure facilities and should not rely on Cutteslowe Park.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small           | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR50          | This site includes the grade II* listed St Frideswide Farmhouse and the grade II listed wall to the north-east of the Farmhouse. A site visit is needed to fully understand the context and setting of the building but consider that major development on the eastern part of this site is likely to entail a high level of harm to the significance of the building. Therefore consider that this site should not be taken forward.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small           | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR50          | This site includes the grade II* listed St Frideswide Farmhouse and the grade II listed wall to the north-east of the Farmhouse. Any development of this site should retain the Farmhouse and wall and have regard to their setting.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney       |   | 11           |                         | PR50          | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb            |   | 11           |                         | PR50          | Site PR50 will not provide affordable housing due to its proximity to Oxford Parkway.  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew      | Hornsby-Smith   |   | 11           |                         | PR50          | This site serves as an effective open area preventing the merging of Kidlington with Cutteslowe and North Oxford. Discusses important views from Water Eaton towards Cutteslowe and that development would undermine GB policy. Has provided a criteria based assessment. As within the Kidlington gap site should be protected.   |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M     | Rugg            |   | 11           |                         | PR50          | Site PR50 is at Oxford Golf Course which would be a loss of a major leisure amenity and GB where housing does not constitute special reason to use it.   |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman         | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum                                  | 11           |                         | PR50          | Strongly objects to this site. Have a range of concerns that are listed in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson         | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR50          | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP5057311240; Flood Zone 2 or 3 -Approx. 31 hectares of FZ2 and 3 (mainly 3) along eastern side of site; Watercourse - Watercourse forms eastern boundary   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne     | Willson-Higgins |   | 11           |                         | PR50          | Priority should be given to sites outside the GB and brownfield sites before considering GB locations, as set out in the NPPF. She has provided a more detailed statement in the representation and discussed the Green Belt Study carried out by Oxfordshire Growth Board in relation to this site.   |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew      | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group                               | 11           |                         | PR50          | Any development at this site should be at the northern part of the identified site. However considers that this housing will be attractive to London commuters (already evidenced by anecdotal information from estate agents), which, while not a bad thing in itself, will of course do nothing to meet the housing need of either Oxford or CDC.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific           | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre           | Wells      | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         | PR50                    | The Parish consider that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)                                 |
| PR-B-1337 | Marcus            | Lloyd      |   | 11           |                         | PR50, PR125, PR27, PR32 | Sites PR50, PR125, PR27 and PR32 are all right next to areas that flood and would exacerbate the risk in these areas. Increased drainage usage for these houses would overload the drains and only add to the flooding issues that have been experienced over the years.   |
| PR-B-1341 | Olga Lascano      | Choperena  |   | 11           |                         | PR50, PR125, PR27, PR32 | Sites PR50, PR125, PR27 and PR32 are all right next to areas that flood and would exacerbate the risk in these areas. Increased drainage usage for these houses would overload the drains and only add to the flooding issues that have been experienced over the years.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry             | Munday     |   | 11           |                         | PR51                    | Allow room for road widening.  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG    | Oldfield   |   | 11           |                         | PR51                    | Particularly concerned by the inclusion of Site PR51, which encompasses Spring Hill, it is in the GB and is adjacent to our village of Begbroke. Spring Hill is an area of exceptional natural beauty, with ancient paths (Frogwelldown Lane, Dalton Lane and The Shakespeare Way), and is enjoyed by many . It should not be under consideration.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                 | Allen      |   | 11           |                         | PR51                    | Site PR51 surrounding Begbroke Wood appears to be in GB and should not be developed on. The site sits on a hill and would be visually imposing. It would make an island of Begbroke so would have a serious impact on the sustainability of wildlife and lose country walks. It has the potential to cause major traffic disruption on the A40 and A44 and add to the unsafe conditions at Begbroke. Here residents have to cross the A44 dual carriageway without a pedestrian crossing to access village amenities and the bus stop.   |
| PR-B-0740 | Richard and Linda | Jurd       |   | 11           |                         | PR51                    | Site PR51 is a large area of GB. Consideration to the name "Spring Hill". The village suffers from flooding and this would make it far worse. This site doesn't do well in the Transport Assessment and should be removed.   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth         | Moore      |   | 11           |                         | PR51                    | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0789 | Lynne             | Whitley    | Yarnton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR51                    | Object on policy grounds. LP Policy ESD14 - prevents coalescence of settlements of Yarnton, Begbroke. Green Belt Policy ESD14 0 safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Policy Villages 1 - Yarnton and Begbroke are Category A villages where only minor development, infilling or conversion is permitted. In addition, surface water run-off from this elevated site frequently causes significant flooding in Yarnton along Cassington Road and Rutten Lane, a problem which can only be made worse by additional hardstanding areas within any development.   |
| PR-B-0827 | Paul              | Staniforth |   | 11           |                         | PR51                    | Development of site PR51 would make Begbroke part of Yarnton   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard           | Cutler     | Bloombridge LLP   | 11           |                         | PR51                    | This large site is the wrong side of the A44 some distance from Kidlington, with no obvious defensible GB boundary.  |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter             | Nicholson  |   | 11           |                         | PR51                    | Objects to development of this site for housing. Development would destroy the function of the GB and cause devastation to the historic character and setting of Begbroke village. Has raised concerns on a range of issues that have been discussed in detail in the representation.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|---------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0881 | James Kenneth | Jutton  |   | 11           |                         | PR51          | Site PR51 building on elevated land west of Yarnton could aggravate flooding and drainage issues. With heavy rain witnesses surface water running off the fields across Rutten Lane and down Cassington Road just like a river.   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun       | Breith  | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR51          | This site adjoins two LWSs, which are also designated Ancient Woodlands (Bladon Heath and Begbroke Wood). Development is proposed on all sides of Begbroke Wood resulting in this becoming isolated. This will compromise the ecological interest and survival of this woodland in the long term and as such development resulting in impacts and isolation of these sites should be resisted. Should development take place expect that a minimum buffer of 50m is provided between the development and the LWS/AW and that no development to take place West of Begbroke Wood to ensure retained connectivity with Bladon Heath in the long-term.   |
| PR-B-0928 | Stephanie     | White   |   | 11           |                         | PR51          | Objects to the development of this site. This area is of huge historical significance and the footpaths offer stunning views over the surrounding countryside; it would be a tragedy to build here  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin        | Small   | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR51          | This site includes the grade II listed Spring Hill and is within the setting of a number of listed buildings to the south-east. Any development of this site should retain Spring Hill and have regard to the setting of these listed buildings.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A   | Webb    |   | 11           |                         | PR51          | Site PR51 encloses a woodland where biodiversity would not survive in the middle of a housing estate without wildlife corridors. An example of this can be seen at Magdalen Wood West in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert        | Davies  | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford              | 11           |                         | PR51          | PR51 is in a sustainable location to meet Oxford's need and in close proximity to Oxford City with strong transport links and associated infrastructure making it well connected to the City and its employment hubs. The site boundary for PR51 is too large and in reality initial phases for development would be provided on a smaller area concentrated to the east of the site at its boundary with the existing settlement of Yarnton. Have provided a masterplan with the representation for consideration- showing a capacity for 900 dwellings, potential extension to William Fletcher Primary School and green infrastructure. More detailed reasons for promoting PR51 are provided in the representation. |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul          | Mayhook |   | 11           |                         | PR51          | This is valuable open space with a nice walk.   |
| PR-B-1136 | Giles         | Lewis   |   | 11           |                         | PR51          | Dstrongly objects to the development of this site in the GB. Concerns are set out in detail in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey       | Wright  | Begbroke Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR51          | The development of this site is in complete contravention to council policies. Category 2 villages have fewer services and/or are remote with limited public transport and limited potential for development.   |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis         | Davies  |   | 11           |                         | PR51          | Building on PR51 will create a ribbon like development along the A44 as well as destroying the separate identities of Begbroke and Yarnton. It will also adversely affect the wildlife along Frogwell lane.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith        | Johnson | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR51          | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4677012612; Flood Zone 2 or 3 -No flooding on site, but access/egress appears to be via FZ3 on A44 at roundabout; Watercourse - Small watercourses on site (in N and S – near STW)   |
| PR-B-1275 | Dagmar        | Carr    |   | 11           |                         | PR51          | Site PR51 is specific area of objection. Loss of GB, open countryside, views and walks along with the impact to nature. The purpose of GB is to check urban sprawl, to stop towns and villages merging and to safeguard the countryside and its historic settings. The implications to flooding and drainage which can already be seen from development at Cassington Road and Spring Hill. Increase to traffic in the local area, which is already a problem at Rutten Lane and the adjacent roads, with a danger to the Primary School children. Local infrastructure such as the schools and doctors are under pressure. The same objections are relevant to all other sites proposed.                               |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1276 | John       | Carr      |   | 11           |                         | PR51          | Site PR51 is specific area of objection. Loss of GB, open countryside, views and walks along with the impact to nature. The purpose of GB is to check urban sprawl, to stop towns and villages merging and to safeguard the countryside and its historic settings. The implications to flooding and drainage which can already been seen from development at Cassington Road and Spring Hill. Increase to traffic in the local area, which is already a problem at Rutten Lane and the adjacent roads, with a danger to the Primary School children. Local infrastructure such as the schools and doctors are under pressure. The same objections are relevant to all other sites proposed.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes    | West Oxfordshire District Council                               | 11           |                         | PR51          | This site is in the open countryside to the west of Yarnton and would have significant landscape implication..  |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick       | Alston    | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd         | 11           |                         | PR51          | This site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of LOA has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds). The erection of buildings on other sites within the Safeguarded Area would require appropriate controls to be imposed that limit heights in order to be acceptable (for the purposes of policy-preparation recommend assuming the benchmark heights defined on the Safeguarding Map, which would require refinement at the planning application stage via detailed testing). This should be read in conjunction with their earlier representation dated 11th March 2016 and 6th July 2016, in particular the 'London Oxford Airport Sustainable Development Opportunity, Position Paper' (dated March 2016).  |
| PR-B-0750 | Niels      | van Kuijk |   | 11           |                         | PR51, PR75    | Object strongly to sites PR51 and PR75 being developed. Impact to Yarnton will be huge, especially on the local roads. Loss of the GB is terrible.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR52          | Objects to the development of this site, they consider that it is likely to have an impact on the setting of, and particularly views out of, the grade I registered Rousham Park. The key view out of the park is from the statue of the Dying Gaul. Here the surrounded landscape has been co-opted to enhance the park with designed views to an eye-catcher placed to the north outside the park boundary. An important part of the effect created by the park is of an idealised rural landscape with views out into the wider landscape. Consider that any major development intruding into these views would seriously harm the significance of the park. In addition this site lies almost entirely within the Rousham Conservation Area. It is not clear from the Rousham Conservation Area statement how this land contributes to the special interest, character and appearance of the conservation area and further investigation (with an updated conservation area character assessment) should be undertaken to ascertain this. |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR52          | This site lies almost entirely within the Rousham Conservation Area. It is not clear from the Rousham Conservation Area statement how this land contributes to the special interest, character and appearance of the conservation area and further investigation (with an updated conservation area character assessment) should be undertaken before this site is taken forward.   |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip     | Boxall    |   | 11           |                         | PR52          | Site PR52 is completely disproportionate in size. The communities of Lower Heyford and Caulcott are dwarfed. Regarding the railway station in Lower Heyford understanding is that the capacity of the line in relation to through passenger and freight trains means that it would not be possible to augment the current small number of trains which stop at Lower Heyford. The bridge at Rousham is being damaged with the current rate of heavy traffic including construction lorries, and there is very limited parking at the station with a dangerous junction for cars drawing out of the station. It is important to preserve the views from historic Rousham House.  |
| PR-B-1280 | Peter      | Offord    | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers                                 | 11           |                         | PR52          | Object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger      | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR54          | Banbury - Flood risk - Merges Hanwell into Banbury  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1280 | Peter      | Offord   | Banbury and North Oxon Ramblers                                 | 11           |                         | PR54          | Object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected. This site is along nature reserves, local wildlife sites, Conservation Target Areas and general intrusion into the countryside.  |
| PR-B-0011 | Simon      | Marsh    | The Battlefields Trust  | 11           |                         | PR55          | This site is likely to lie on the 1645 Islip Bridge battlefield. Site has local and national significance. There is likely to be surviving battlefield archaeology on the site which should be investigated. The LPA needs to establish whether the development of the site outweighs the public benefit of preserving this battlefield heritage.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday   |   | 11           |                         | PR55          | Road and rail improvements needed.   |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin   | Noke Parish Meeting   | 11           |                         | PR55          | This proposal would be inappropriate for a small village like Noke and put unnecessary burden on the infrastructure services and facilities in the village.  |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter      | Collins  | Islip Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR55          | This site comprises existing agricultural land within the Green Belt. Developing this site would lead to a scale of development that would be excessive.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson  | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR55          | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP5234614359   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton   |   | 11           |                         | PR55, PR181   | Site PR55 and PR181 are both unsuitable and would put more traffic onto Islip's already inadequate road system and the B4027. Similarly all the sites around Arncott, Bicester and junction 9 will generate traffic through Islip which cannot cope with existing traffic levels.  |
| PR-B-0870 | Stewart    | Patience | Anglian Water Services Ltd                                      | 11           |                         | PR56          | The available capacity at Water Recycling Centres (formerly known as sewage treatment works) for each site is within Anglian Water's area of responsibility, and is considered to have an impact on its infrastructure. Have not considered the cumulative impact of these developments on their existing infrastructure; therefore ask CDC that further consideration is given to the cumulative impact on our existing water recycling centres as part of the preparation of the current review and that this is reflected in the expected timing of development sites. Sewerage network - foul (or used water) flows from growth will have an impact on its existing network. This will depend on the location, size and phasing. Initial assessment is undertaken when approached by developers on a site by site basis. |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F   | Hickman  | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR56          | Objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements   |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster   | Fritwell Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR56          | Concerned that commercial development would give rise to warehousing and storage use wanting easy access to M40 and servicing needs across long distances. Do not consider that this will give rise to local employment to support economic development in Oxfordshire. Are concerned that development on this site would be very close to Fritwell and Ardley and contribute to destroying the rural aspects and valued space between the villages. It will be very visible from the rural footpaths on this side of Fritwell parish and produce light and visual pollution in this essential rural area. Every effort should be made to preserve and enhance the rights of way and connectivity across our rural areas and preserve the landscape and views.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia  | Banbury Town Council  | 11           |                         | PR58          | This site does not provide strong road connections with Oxford both road and rail. It would increase road traffic within Banbury and further decreasing connectivity between the town and Banbury.   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun    | Breith   | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR62          | This site adjoin or come close to the Arncott Wood LWS, part of which is also designated as Ancient Woodland. Are concerned about direct and indirect impacts on this site (e.g. recreational pressure) and consider it important that any potential development retains a minimum distance of 50m to the woodland edge.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR63          | Development of this site would out of character with the existing settlement pattern, a linear form of development, and so this site should not be taken forward.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR66          | Site abuts the Sibford Ferris Conservation Area to the west. The open rural approach to Conservation Area is a very important part of its character. Development here as proposed would entail a high level of harm and therefore consider that this site should not be taken forward.   |
| PR-B-1034 | Anita      | Spencer   | Sibford Ferris Parish Council                                   | 11           |                         | PR66          | The village infrastructure is not sufficiently robust to sustain the scale of development proposed. In particular, the concerns are regarding the size and scale of the roads and existing traffic problems, failure of the existing sewerage system many times over the past decade, rural character, lack of immediate relationship to Oxford, impact on countryside.<br>Housing in Sibford Ferris would not provide people convenient, affordable, sustainable travel opportunities to the city's places of work study and recreation and to its services and facilities.   |
| PR-B-0870 | Stewart    | Patience  | Anglian Water Services Ltd                                      | 11           |                         | PR67          | The available capacity at Water Recycling Centres (formerly known as sewage treatment works) for each site is within Anglian Water's area of responsibility, and is considered to have an impact on its infrastructure. Have not considered the cumulative impact of these developments on their existing infrastructure; therefore ask CDC that further consideration is given to the cumulative impact on existing water recycling centres as part of the preparation of the current review and that this is reflected in the expected timing of development sites. Sewerage network - foul (or used water) flows from growth will have an impact on its existing network. This will depend on the location, size and phasing. Initial assessment is undertaken when approached by developers on a site by site basis. This site is considered as asset encroachment. Have provide detailed explanation in their representation. |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F   | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR67          | Objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements   |
| PR-B-1124 | Chris      | Thornton  | Ardley with Fewcott Parish Council                              | 11           |                         | PR67          | Objects to the site for the following reasons:<br>The site is in Category C village where only infill and extensions are allowed.<br>It lacks immediate relationship to Oxford the distance being 17 miles<br>There will be a huge impact on the outlook from both sides<br>There is a potential for 200 dwellings which would drastically change the size of Ardley/Fewcott<br>The increase in traffic is unsustainable with the present infrastructure at full capacity at a variety times throughout the day.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger      | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR67          | Ardley - Flood Risk, close to M40 junction (noise and pollution)   |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster    | Fritwell Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR67          | Objects to this site as there is no sustainable transport (bus service) and residential development would result in an increase in car traffic on unsuitable roads through the rural villages. It addition, access is likely to be needed onto the narrow Ardley/Fritwell Road on a steep bend giving rise to safety concerns. Every effort should be made to preserve and enhance the rights of way and connectivity across our rural areas and preserve the landscape and views.   |
| PR-B-0777 | Mark       | Longworth | Ambrosden Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR7           | Object to this site, due to the affect on the setting on listed buildings and it will lead to the coalescence of Ambrosden with the urban extension of Bicester. This land should be maintained and a green buffer zone between Graven Hill and Ambrosden.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR7           | A grade II listed barn lies just to the south of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the barn.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR73          | This site is within the setting of the Weston-on-the-Green Conservation Area to the west. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday    |   | 11           |                         | PR74          | Use the field to the north.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0238 | D A        | Burt          |   | 11           |                         | PR74          | Site PR74 is a haven for wildlife with many species of birds and animals and access to this site is potentially dangerous.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L          | Allen         |   | 11           |                         | PR74          | Site PR74 land at no. 40 and rear of 30-40 Woodstock Road East appears to be part brownfield and the rest GB. A recent planning application for a workshop facility was rejected due to it being in GB so it is difficult to see how this has changed. Part of the site is uncultivated and provides a habitat for wildlife, a corridor should be left to allow wildlife access to sites PR23 an PR24. Access to the site is difficult and will add to the unsafe conditions at Begbroke. Here residents have to cross the A44 dual carriageway without a pedestrian crossing to access village amenities and the bus stop.   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth  | Moore         |   | 11           |                         | PR74          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.  |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive      | Booth         | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                   | 11           |                         | PR74          | This site appears next most appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction on Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line; this would be well placed to improve the transport services of Oxford, whilst being less attractive to London commuters (since the route would be slower than from Oxford Parkway), hence housing at this location would be more likely to serve Oxford's need (rather than London's) than if placed elsewhere. OCS believes there is great potential for a development -related Swift Rail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. In addition to this they suggest making an initial release of parts of the site which are accessible to existing bus services on the A44. |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter      | Nicholson     |   | 11           |                         | PR74          | Objects to development of this site for housing. Development would destroy the function of the GB and cause devastation to the historic character and setting of Begbroke village. Has raised concerns on a range of issues that have been discussed in detail in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | 11           |                         | PR74          | This site is suitable for development as it is close to the proposed Park and Ride. Although not a strategic site it would not have much impact on the purpose of the GB. Has provided a criteria based assessment.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey    | Wright        | Begbroke Parish Council                               | 11           |                         | PR74          | Understand this to be partly a brownfield site and consider that it has potential for development.  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis      | Davies        |   | 11           |                         | PR74          | Begbroke has a brownfield site, PR74 which could have been suggested.   |
| PR-B-1187 | Nigel      | Homent        |   | 11           |                         | PR74          | Strongly object to housing on this site. It is liable to flooding, is a haven for wildlife, and access is problematic. A44 is already congested. The consultation has been very poorly publicised and it was difficult to find the documents on the Council's website. Choosing to hold the consultation over the Christmas period is not reasonable.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson       | Environment Agency                                    | 11           |                         | PR74          | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4747614231;   |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother       | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies | 11           |                         | PR74          | This site has previously been submitted as part of the 'Part 1 partial review Issues Consultation' in January 2016. It has an area of 4.39ha, and could accommodate between 130 to 220 dwellings. The rep gives a detailed justification and reasons for the allocation.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0704 | J                 | Kershaw   | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 11           |                         | PR74, PR51    | With the exception of site PR74 none of the proposed sites around Begbroke are suitable for development. Begbroke has a conservation area and some of the potential sites are located close and in some cases adjacent to it. PR51 is of particular concern. Development would essentially link Begbroke with Yarnton. The land is of great scenic and historic importance and is very rich in biodiversity.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David             | Smith     |  | 11           |                         | PR74,PR23     | Site PR74 OK but not with site PR23. Developments south of Frieze Way are unlikely to benefit Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry             | Munday    |  | 11           |                         | PR75          | Does the school have a playing field?  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 11           |                         | PR75          | Object to the proposal of this site for housing development. Consider that it would cause sever harm to the quality of the local environment and the amenities of local residents. The area around this site is characterised by narrow lanes. Visibility at the junction of Church Lane with Cassington Road is already severely restricted by parked cars. The local road system is simply not capable of accommodating the significant additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed new housing.<br>This site is not well related to the established settlement pattern. Its development would be contrary to policy in the local plan. The open character of this area is important to both to the rural setting of the village and to the landscape setting of the Grade II* listed Yarnton Manor and its Grade II listed historic gardens, which border the site. It should also be noted that the Church is a Grade I listed building, and the setting of this building would also be adversely affected by the intrusion of significant new housing development in such close proximity. |
| PR-B-0740 | Richard and Linda | Jurd      |  | 11           |                         | PR75          | Site PR75 is a large area of GB covering an area off Church Lane one of the oldest parts of the village with historic significance. The single track lane would require massive improvements to support increased traffic. This site encroaches over a footpath which is used by residents. Cassington Road only other entrance would destroy the only pub in the village and other houses. Development to Sheltered Accommodation for the elderly is not an ideal location. The site doesn't do well in the Transport Assessment and should be removed.   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth         | Moore     |  | 11           |                         | PR75          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.   |
| PR-B-0789 | Lynne             | Whitley   | Yarnton Parish Council   | 11           |                         | PR75          | Object to development of this site for policy reasons. Site lies wholly within Oxford Green Belt. Policy ESD14 seeks to prevent urban sprawl and safeguard countryside from encroachment. Policy Villages 1 categorises Yarnton as a Category A Village, where minor development, infilling and conversion is permitted.<br>In addition, access to this site would be poorly served by the single track Church Lane, leading on to the traffic-calmed Cassington Road  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin            | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 11           |                         | PR75          | This site abuts the grade II registered Yarnton Manor historic park and garden to the south. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the park.   |
| PR-B-1180 | RA                | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd         | 11           |                         | PR75          | Yarnton is not a suitable location for development sites capable of accommodating at least 100 homes. The area in the vicinity of site PR75 is characterised by narrow rural lanes. Visibility at the junction of Church Lane with Cassington Road is already severely restricted by parked cars. The local road system is not capable of accommodating the additional traffic that would be generated by the proposed new housing.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname             | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson             | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR75          | Approx. NGR at centre of site - SP4762511835;   |
| PR-B-1323 | Karen      | Suter               |   | 11           |                         | PR75          | Specifically concerned about the sites in Yarnton in particular site PR75 near to Cassington Road. Currently the houses have views to the countryside and fields are there for everyone to enjoy. Residents chose to live here because of these green spaces. If the proposals were to proceed the countryside and wildlife and nature would be significantly impacted with its removal. Increased housing could have a detrimental effect on primary schools, the church, local traffic and other community spaces.      |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun    | Breith              | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR77          | This site appears to be a central open space for the village and the aerial photograph suggests that it comprises a mosaic of habitats, which have the potential to support priority habitats and/or protected and notable species. Are concerned about the potential loss of this potentially wildlife rich site and that any loss of public open space will increase pressure on wildlife in the surrounding countryside.   |
| PR-B-0777 | Mark       | Longworth           | Ambrosden Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR8           | Parish may support the development of 30% of this site. This is subject to the provision and creation of significant areas of open space, which could include community facilities and sporting facilities such as playing fields, allotments, skate board park and dog walking areas, could provide significant benefits for the settlement of Ambrosden, which are unlikely to be achieved in any other way.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small               | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR80          | This site is within the setting of the grade II listed Farnell Fields to the north-east. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small               | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR82          | This site is within the setting of the Weston-on-the-Green Conservation Area to the west. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor              | Aitchison Rafferty  | 11           |                         | PR82, PR83    | Client is the owner of site WG019 which has consent for 20 units leaving 7.7 ha for further development. The potential to further develop the land would provide continuity of the village as the built form lies west of Northampton Road. This is in contrast to sites PR82 and PR83 which would result in development to the east of the B430 and would therefore be out of character with the village.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small               | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR83          | This site may be within the setting of the Weston-on-the-Green Conservation Area to the west. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss                | Adderbury Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR87          | This site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proved housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up settlement and landscape.   |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher             | Rosconn Group   | 11           |                         | PR88          | The site is well served by public transport, S4 bus service and Banbury train station. In addition to that it is within reasonable cycling distance from Kings Sutton train station, providing a regular 23 minute journey time to Oxford. These services enable a realistic alternative to the private car to access jobs and the universities. The site itself if available, suitable, achievable, and viable and located close to existing facilities and services within Adderbury, which is a Category A settlement. |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss                | Adderbury Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR88          | This site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proved housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up settlement and landscape.   |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian     | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories                                    | 11           |                         | PR9           | Strongly object to the development of this site and consider them thoroughly unsuitable. Details of the site specific issues are discussed in detail in their representation.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun     | Breith     | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR9           | This site is one of four development sites within Steeple Aston and it comprises a disused quarry that has been not disturbed for several decades. As a result a mosaic of habitats appears to have developed that is highly likely to support priority habitats and protected and notable species. It has also been brought to our attention that the site might accommodate a population of adders. Adders are extremely rare in Oxfordshire and this could be the only known population in the north of the county. Are concerned that this site is proposed for development. Urge the Council to ensure that the ecological value of the site is adequately assessed before the site being considered further for development. |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small      | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR9           | This site may be within the setting of the Steeple Aston Conservation Area to the south. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday     |   | 11           |                         | PR91          | Employment, canal and rail line fence.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L           | Allen      |   | 11           |                         | PR91          | Site PR91 appears to be near a SSI so a larger gap needs to be left to avoid any detrimental effect on the SSSI area and wildlife  |
| PR-B-0712 | Sonya       | Willoughby |   | 11           |                         | PR91          | Site PR91 Boggy swamp area haven for wildlife.   |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth   | Moore      |   | 11           |                         | PR91          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment.   |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun     | Breith     | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PR91          | This site is located completely within the CTA Lower Cherwell and adjoins Rushy Meadows SSSI raising concerns about direct and indirect impacts on the SSSI. Expect that any development in this area to retain a minimum buffer of 50m to the SSSI boundary. Considering the overall quantum of development in the area are particularly concerned about cumulative impacts on the SSSI, which might compromise the condition and ecological interest of the site in the long term. In addition, would expect development to provide enhancements e.g. in form of providing appropriate management and measures that are in line with the CTA aims and objectives.  |
| PR-B-0928 | Stephanie   | White      |   | 11           |                         | PR91          | Objects to the development of this site. This area is a real haven for wildlife, and routinely floods  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small      | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR91          | This site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area and the grade II listed Roundham Lock to the west. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of these assets, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney  |   | 11           |                         | PR91          | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb       |   | 11           |                         | PR91          | Site PR91 is low lying land prone to flooding and would be best used as a green buffer for supporting Rushy Meadow SSSI. Object to development here as the SSSI needs green corridors so it is not isolated to maintain species. The usefulness of canal banks as wildlife corridors is reduced with adjacent housing by disturbance, light and garden rubbish dumping. The Roundham lock north is a much valued walk.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson    | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR91          | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4828314157; Watercourses - Canal adjoins w Boundary of site   |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth   | Moore     |   | 11           |                         | PR92          | Opposed to the development of this site within the Green Belt as it would result in urban sprawl and preserve the countryside and its landscapes and environment. The claim that development on this massive scale can be sanctioned as a legitimate 'exception' to the inviolability of the Green Belt must be challenged. The Government in its manifesto pledged to protect the Green Belt, and must be reminded of, and required to uphold, that undertaking. Has provided detailed comments on the increased traffic and congestion, inadequate infrastructure, loss of landscape and rural views, loss of the surrounding countryside damage to the natural environment. |
| PR-B-0789 | Lynne       | Whitley   | Yarnton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR92          | The site lies wholly within the Oxford Green Belt, although part of it is considered to be brownfield. ESD14 seeks to encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. However, access to the A44 from this site is totally inadequate, highly dangerous, and the danger can only be exacerbated if further development were to be allowed.   |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith      | Johnson   | Environment Agency  | 11           |                         | PR92          | Approx. NGR at centre of site -SP4870412173; Watercourses -Main river forms south eastern boundary of site   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry       | Munday    |   | 11           |                         | PR93          | Residential, near rail line.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ          | French    | Deddington Development Watch                                    | 11           |                         | PR94          | This is a greenfield site outside built-up limits comprising very good quality (Grade 2) agricultural land, except site PR98 is Grade 3. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.  |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ          | French    | Deddington Development Watch                                    | 11           |                         | PR95          | This site is a greenfield site, which abuts the Conservation Area. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.  |
| PR-B-0777 | Mark        | Longworth | Ambrosden Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR97          | Significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there has been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane        | Olds      | Wendlebury Parish Council                                       | 11           |                         | PR97          | Objects - this site represents a direct extension to the village (Category C), which only permits infilling. It would put undue strain on the existing infrastructure. The site is on higher ground, which would lead to flooding and drainage problems for the village. The site has historic agricultural ridge and furrow across the majority of it and dew ponds close to the church. The site lies outside the village built up area. The village has no services except a pub, which would lead to residents having to use private motor cars.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR97          | This site lies just to the south-west of the grade II listed church of St Giles. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting.  |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb      |   | 11           |                         | PR97          | Object to Site PR97 which has ancient ridge and furrow and would swamp little Wendlebury village.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F    | Hickman   | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 11           |                         | PR97          | Objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger       | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 11           |                         | PR97          | Wendlebury - Bounded by A41 and M40 (noise and pollution)  |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ          | French    | Deddington Development Watch                                    | 11           |                         | PR98          | This site is a greenfield site, which abuts the Conservation Area. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|--|
| PR-B-0787 | Corinne    | Hill      | Shenington with Alkerton Parish Council                         | 11           |                         | PR99           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Inaccessibility to Oxford. Shenington due to its location in the north-west of the county 30 miles from Oxford.</li> <li>* The site is unlikely to deliver 100 dwellings due to its size, topography, capacity, net developable area, etc.. The parish has a population of 425; an increase of 32 dwellings would be wholly disproportionate.</li> <li>* Part of the site is in the Northern Valleys Conservation Target Area</li> <li>* The Shenington with Alkerton Conservation Area Appraisal (Feb 2009) clause 4, Archaeology, identifies much of the site as Old Quarry</li> <li>* Building on the site would extend the village boundary. It would totally alter the approach to the Shenington with Alkerton Conservation Area from the west. * The eastern end of the site abuts the Conservation Area boundary.</li> <li>* The sewerage system in Shenington is not capable of serving a large number of extra homes and waste would have to be pumped uphill to connect to it.</li> </ul> <p>Shenington is a Class C village, which only allows conversions and in-filling.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The site is exposed to noise from the adjacent airfield (karting circuit, and powered aircraft and winches launching gliders)</li> <li>* The village school is consistently full year-on-year.</li> </ul> |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small     | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 11           |                         | PR99           | This site is just within the setting of the Shenington with Alkerton Conservation Area to the east. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.  |
| PR-B-0886 | Ivor       | Davies    |   | 11           |                         | PR-A-019, PR14 | Yes regarding previous PR-A-019 site ref 14. There are plenty of grounds. Loss of completely open unsullied countryside much used by walkers for informal recreation, part of the setting of the Cherwell valley. Loss of habitats. Effect on already congested local roads. Groundwater flooding at the eastern end (impossible to mitigate?). Possibility of exacerbating flooding by runoff.  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun    | Breith    | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                            | 11           |                         | PT157          | This relatively small development area is located on the west side of Noke and comes close to Prattle Wood LWS and Ancient Woodland. Are concerned about potential effects of development on this site on the LWS (e.g. recreational pressure) and consider it important that a minimum buffer of 50m is retained to the site edge. In addition, the western side of Noke is part of the Otmoor CTA and large swathes of grassland within this area are proposed to be designated as LWS to compliment Otmoor SSSI and to work towards achieving the aims and objectives of the CTA.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M          | O'Mahoney |   | 11           |                         | PTR194         | Objects objects to the development of this site which is in the GB. Has discussed in detail the harm that would be caused to the rural character of Kidlington, harm to the GB, pressure on services and facilities, lack of infrastructure to support a large scale development, impact on the existing transport infrastructure and services, etc. in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday    |   | 11           |                         |                | Strongly disagree with any GB being built on.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday    |   | 11           |                         |                | Strongly object to any Oxford homes being built at Kidlington/Gosford.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday    |   | 11           |                         |                | Area C will require new roads, and services.   |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall      |   | 11           |                         |                | There should be no building at all on the GB or flood plain.   |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony    | Hall      |   | 11           |                         |                | There is no justification for using GB and Kidlington should not be an extension of Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue        | Mackrell  | Bicester Town Council   | 11           |                         |                | Suggest that only the sites within areas A and B should be considered.   |
| PR-B-0081 | Linda      | Beattie   |   | 11           |                         |                | Whilst understanding the need for housing, GB should remain as that. The open countryside is important for our well being, wildlife and flood plain. The infrastructure and services at Kidlington already struggle, and it doesn't need to expand. Any houses that are built should be affordable and for locals.   |
| PR-B-0082 | Felicity   | Emptage   |   | 11           |                         |                | Whilst I understanding the need for housing, GB should remain as that. The open countryside is important for our well being, wildlife and flood plain. The infrastructure and services at Kidlington already struggle, and it doesn't need to expand. Any houses that are built should be affordable and for locals.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A        | McCall    |   | 11           |                         |                | The area between Oxford Parkway and North Oxford will cause loss of GB.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname          | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0154 | Hannah           | Hale             |  | 11           |                         |               | Combining the area of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke will lose open countryside with its views and walks and have implications for flooding and drainage. There is already congestion on the A44 especially when events at Blenheim. Feel that the consultation has been poorly publicised and that possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter            | Worth            |  | 11           |                         |               | Mostly agreeable, however there are other land opportunities that could be considered which provide less than 100 houses. If other pieces of land were said to be suitable, some would become available due to the increase in land value.  |
| PR-B-0181 | Diane and Darryl | Bates-Brownsword |  | 11           |                         |               | Section 16 and 50 are sites of particular concern as they are fields that flood and development would mean there is nowhere for water to run off. The increase in insurance claims for flooding and water damage will increase insurance premiums.  |
| PR-B-0213 | Linda            | Browning         |  | 11           |                         |               | All areas and particularly around Yarnton and Begbroke are totally inappropriate, the NHS and education services are only just sufficient for the size of the villages as they are.   |
| PR-B-0648 | Patricia         | Perisi           |  | 11           |                         |               | Object strongly to the proposed development of 4,400 houses on GB, which should be protected. Have lived in Kidlington 80 years and do not want to see my village joined to Oxford and lose its character. The development will destroy the countryside and wildlife and bring chaos to the area. Traffic is already heavy and the doctors surgery at capacity  |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn           | Phillips         |  | 11           |                         |               | Yes. The GB around Kidlington is the local park, it is not just a green lung but a vital asset to Oxfordshire.  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA               | Humphreys        | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 11           |                         |               | Consider that Yarnton is not a suitable location for development sites capable of accommodating 100 homes. There is universal objection to housing in Yarnton.  |
| PR-B-0752 | Keeley           | Middleditch      |  | 11           |                         |               | Concerned the new houses will be overcrowded and no allowances for parking. Kidlington already has parking problems. Concerned with the recreational areas in Kidlington. Influx from Blackbird Leys when the Groveland's estate was built. Kidlington generally looks scruffy, an example is the market, new buildings are never in keeping with the village.  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin           | Palmer           |  | 11           |                         |               | Hope that view on this has been made clear with previous answers given.   |
| PR-B-0776 | Anthony          | East             |  | 11           |                         |               | Creating urban sprawl linking Oxford to Woodstock, the respective locations of Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton will be lost forever. With Oxford Parkway they become commuter homes serving London which cannot be in CDCs objective. Loss of GB, countryside and the impact on nature. Concerns with flooding and drainage along with the impact on the local traffic. Proposals to Heyford vehicle park were rejected due to traffic infrastructure, what's been proposed is far worse and in no way addresses traffic.  |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip           | Morley           | North Oxford Golf Club   | 11           |                         |               | Considers that the 88 hectares needed for the 4400 homes can be found with minimal impact on the vital Green Belt areas within CDC. From Question 10, CDC appears to require 88 hectares for 4400 homes. If site 50 is considered, then the 4400 homes can be fully achieved within site 50 (150.77 ha) by using only the land east of the Banbury Road. If more than one site is to be used, which would be a very good way of achieving the "balanced communities" described in the draft Vision, and if site 38 is considered, then the 50+ hectares of site 38 (out of a total 89.48 ha) east of the Banbury Road would give over half the homes, without creating one large single new community for the whole Unmet Need. |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce            | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire                      | 11           |                         |               | No specific comments relating to individual sites.  |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus           | Campbell         | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group                             | 11           |                         |               | Note that the more remote or rural areas pose additional challenges due to distance from existing surgeries, and lack of sustainable options for new local surgeries. Have provided a detailed response in a separate statement as part of their representation.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard          | Hills            |  | 11           |                         |               | None at all – they are all worthy of development.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0857 | Mark       | Christodoulou |  | 11           |                         |               | Dubious calculations the figures are based on assumptions that are no longer valid, given the recent decision to leave the EU, this needs re-assessed to confirm the true numbers required. The number of houses would double the size of Kidlington. Road infrastructure can not cope as it is and if this was expected to double in size. Additional infrastructure for education and health would have to be found. Resources to keep the extra streets safe and clean. Additional security such as policing for the area. None of which appears to be covered in the plans.  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim        | Perkins       | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | 11           |                         |               | 1) Consider that priority should be given to the consideration of non-GB sites and brownfield sites before any consideration of GB locations. This is supported by para 17 of NPPF. 2) All the identified sites within the parish are within the GB. Housing development within the GB is by definition 'inappropriate development' and should only be allowed in 'very special circumstances.' The OGB Green Belt Study shows that all the parcels of land within the Parish score 'HIGH' against one or more of the GB purposes. In other words the area is very important in contributing to the GB and preventing Kidlington/Gosford and Oxford merging.   |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer   | McFadden      |  | 11           |                         |               | Opposed to the location particularly to sites PR38 and PR50 as on GB. Cutteslowe Park is a key recreational resource used by families for sports. Loss of the views and open spaces. Another key effect is the traffic congestion with the increased number of expected cars. Its bad along the Banbury Woodstock Roads despite the recent roundabouts. Air pollution would also increase and there are health concerns linked with busy roads and dementia. The footpaths would disappear into the housing estates. There must have an effect on the local wildlife with the habitats being displaced. The creation of one large urban conglomerate effectively joining Oxford and Kidlington. Concerns with flooding and drainage. The local infrastructure needs more consideration regarding schools, healthcare and facilities. |
| PR-B-0877 | David      | Flavin        | Oxfordshire County Council                               | 11           |                         |               | Provided a detailed RAG assessment in response to this question on Transport Strategy, Education, Public Health, Oxford Meadows, Greenbelt, Agricultural Land, Public Rights of Way, Travel Plan, Drainage and Waste Management.   |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia      | Trowles       |  | 11           |                         |               | Object to the conclusion of all sites within GB. Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Do not agree that search areas A and B are reasonable options.  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter      | Trowles       |  | 11           |                         |               | Object to the conclusion of all sites within GB. Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Do not agree that search areas A and B are reasonable options.  |
| PR-B-0888 | Haidrun    | Breith        | Berks, Bucks and Oxon Wildlife Trust                     | 11           |                         |               | Make reference to the comments sent on 11 March 2016 in response to the issues consultation. These comments should be taken into consideration while assessing these sites. There are further comments provided in detail as part of this representation which are in addition to the comments provided in March 2016. Have discussed in detail the Impacts of designated areas, Development in CTA's, Cumulative effects of development on landscape and their concerns of the cumulative impact of development in it,, Green Infrastructure Planning (that the Green Infrastructure Strategy is developed alongside to inform the growth agenda, Biodiversity in development, Biodiversity Management. In addition to that Quantum of development and Evidence base are also discussed.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0902 | Vanessa    | Pinder    |   | 11           |                         |               | Concerned with development in around the Kidlington gap. It's an important breaker between Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. It's important to prevent all villages to merging. These areas are prone to flooding little consideration has been taken into account. Frequent traffic issues in rush hour would be impacted with development. Local facilities unable to cope and its hard to get a doctors appointment. Development will not bring benefits to the local people it will only make matters worse.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall  | CPRE Oxfordshire  | 11           |                         |               | It is impossible to comment sensibly on the 137 sites selected, particularly given the limited information provided. Some of these may be appropriate for development, but many will have constraints that make them inappropriate for consideration. As a consultation exercise this method of scatter gun selection is seriously flawed and unhelpful. As a basic rule no development should be allowed on the Oxford Green Belt unless there are specific exceptional circumstances  |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo  |   | 11           |                         |               | If you develop area A, Kidlington will become part of Oxford. GB and the green lung needs to be maintained between these two. Developing on the land close to Cutteslowe Park will have a significant and detrimental effect on this wonderful open space.  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk      | Banbury Civic Society   | 11           |                         |               | Disappointed to note how much effort has been involved in assessing sites which have no possible chance of meeting the criteria set out in this study. Sites have been suggested (offered) which are obviously opportunistic attempts by landowners, agents and / or developers that, by inspection, do not meet the set down criteria for this study nor would they be considered under normal planning practice - far from transport or other necessary amenities which would lead to 'ribbon development' or isolated estates etc.   |
| PR-B-0963 | Mr and Mrs | Shepherd  |   | 11           |                         |               | The proposals are too big for Kidlington. To the west of the village the sites are huge compared to current housing. Kidlington would be joined to Begbroke and Yarnton. To the south of the village and train station provides no separation between Cutteslowe and Summertown. At all costs we need to prevent Kidlington becoming an extension of Oxford City. The value of green spaces and GB policy seems to of been overlooked. Look at Milton Keynes and the attention that planners gave to open green spaces, walk ways, open countryside etc. Have Cherwell considered this for Kidlington's' residents. What are the impacts going to be on flooding and drainage. Many of the areas become very wet in winter, the water would be diverted elsewhere causing problems for others. The quality of the location for these houses needs to be considered. Due to the size of the developments there would be a huge impact on traffic congestion and air pollution. |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd   | 11           |                         |               | Additional smaller sites should be identified in order to bring forward allocations with shorter 'lead in' times to ensure a deliverable housing supply. This potential has been acknowledged in the emerging West Oxfordshire LP.  |
| PR-B-0996 | Lucy       | Smith     |   | 11           |                         |               | Main concern is the development on the fields north of The Moors, the GB areas need to protected. As well as the loss of fields which we use regularly for walking our dog, our children love to explore out in the open countryside with their friends. It would be gutting to loose this vital area as this is used for running and walking in the fields which is good for the soul. If building does commence it is critical and very important that the works traffic is totally safe for the children of North Kidlington Primary School.   |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd   | 11           |                         |               | Additional smaller sites should be identified in order to bring forward allocations with shorter lead in times to ensure a deliverable housing supply. The potential of spreading the potential benefits of growth to rural communities has been acknowledged in the emerging West Oxfordshire LP, but not in the Partial Review.   |
| PR-B-1033 | Matthew    | Symons    | Hollins Strategic Land  | 11           |                         |               | It has demonstrated that there is potential for identified sites to be reduced in size because of the availability of smaller, more sustainable sites in the locality. Have provided more detailed information in their submitted representation  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice      | Suttie    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 11           |                         |               | There are no comments relating directly to the potential development sites identified, apart from drawing attention to the response given in Q9 above.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname    | Organisation                    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|------------|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1068 | Louise          | Crone      |                                 | 11           |                         |               | The area identified behind The Moors is very popular with locals and home to different species of birds and animals. The Pear Tree Park and Ride is not on GB and should be developed for housing rather than employment.   |
| PR-B-1082 | Nicholas Edward | Mullineux  |                                 | 11           |                         |               | Development around sites PR27 and PR14 would affect the setting of a listed building and historic views. It would result in the loss of habitat for a huge array of flora and fauna.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F        | Hickman    | Middleton Stoney Parish Council | 11           |                         |               | If the need arises, developments should be concentrated on the area defined by the OGB (2.37) of the Options Consultation   |
| PR-B-1098 | Michael         | Bott       |                                 | 11           |                         |               | The sites referenced will create a massive urban sprawl linking Oxford to Woodstock so the respective locations of Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton will be lost forever. The homes will serve London commuters which is not the objection of CDC. There will be loss of GB, open countryside, views and walks. Nature will also be impacted. There will be implications with flooding and drainage and the local roads will be impacted. Heyford Vehicle Park had their recent changes rejected due to traffic infrastructure what is being proposed. Here is far worse and does not address the traffic issues. |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan            | Storah     | Oxford City Council             | 11           |                         |               | It is important that there are a combination of sites in area of search A and B. It welcomes and supports such proposals.   |
| PR-B-1100 | Katherine       | Andrews    |                                 | 11           |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and the possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable. The council should be working with the local community and be open and transparent.   |
| PR-B-1134 | Neil            | McKendrick |                                 | 11           |                         |               | Very few of the sites in and around Kidlington are reasonable, they will result in loss of GB, space for recreation, and have implications for flooding and drainage. The current transport systems do not provide an efficient local travel network and will deteriorate further with additional traffic.  |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan            | Lodwick    |                                 | 11           |                         |               | As disagree with the underlying basis for this review namely the excessive estimates of the Oxfordshire SHMA do not consider that it is necessary to build on any of the identified sites. No sites in search areas A or B are suitable and that any further growth should be diverted away from Oxford elsewhere in the County or in the UK. No sites in the GB should be developed.   |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard         | Bennett    |                                 | 11           |                         |               | Too many sites are listed and are not fully clear on implications at this stage. Considerations to other alternatives need to be made before commenting on sites identified. Has railway and other transport links to potential brown sites further afield been fully considered?   |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim             | Spencer    |                                 | 11           |                         |               | Consider the area enclosed by Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton extending as far as the airport as a logical area for development both for employment and habitation. Having said that due consideration has to been given to flooding. If a large area is developed consideration is required for run off.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger           | Bellamy    | Hornton Parish Council          | 11           |                         |               | Some of these sites completely unsustainable for a variety of reasons   |
| PR-B-1166 | Jane            | Hennell    | The Canal and River Trust       | 11           |                         |               | Many of the possible strategic sites identified, particularly in Area A lie adjacent to the Oxford Canal. Most of these sites lie on the off-side of the canal. The canal acts as a major tourist attraction and brings large numbers of visitors to the district each year. The canal is also a designated Conservation area and the offside in particular provides habitat to the protected species which use the canal.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi            | Stokes     | Persimmon Homes Midlands        | 11           |                         |               | No comments   |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis           | Davies     |                                 | 11           |                         |               | There needs to be an assessment on the impact the development will have on the communities and infrastructure of Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi           | Lancaster  |                                 | 11           |                         |               | The land off Lyne Road is a green space so this seems at odds with Cherwell's Green Space Strategy. Lack of exposure to nature could lead to an increase in mental health problems as identified by 'nature deficit disorder'.  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi           | Lancaster  |                                 | 11           |                         |               | Building in the locations mentioned will lead to a strain on already stretched public services and infrastructure   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1188 | Carol      | Matheson |   | 11           |                         |               | The sites are within GB and are inappropriate development. Kidlington and Gosford will merge with Oxford and recreation land at North Oxford Golf course will be lost. Flooding is an issue and many sites are within the Flood Zone. There are listed buildings at Water Eaton and evidence of a medieval village and Roman road. The Oxford canal, an important leisure corridor is protected by Cherwell Local plan.  |
| PR-B-1221 | Martin     | Perisi   |   | 11           |                         |               | Yes, see general comments.   |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt     | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 11           |                         |               | The identified Potential Strategic Development Site ref.62 and 149 in Arncott are noted.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor   |   | 11           |                         |               | Have only been able to study the issues surrounding Begbroke, where the development would swamp the existing village with sprawl. Quality agricultural land and recreational fields enjoyed by many will be removed and promises to protect the GB breached. There is no infrastructure to cope with additional housing and flooding problems would be aggravated. There appears to have been insufficient study of individual sites prior to the proposals.   |
| PR-B-1266 | Linda      | Ward     |   | 11           |                         |               | Object strongly to the clear bias seen in the consultation papers and draft infrastructure assessment toward concentrating an extra 4,400 houses close to Oxford. This is exactly what GB exists to prevent. Cherwell have recently adopted the Kidlington Masterplan which stresses the importance of protecting the open, rural setting around the village. The policy is questionable.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells    | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 11           |                         |               | Larger sites require developer agreements. Are concerned about the lack of time for a site by site assessment; therefore have adopted an approach of considering group of sites and these comments are provided with this representation.<br><ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* North of the Village - PR14, PR27 and PR32</li> <li>* Land east of the village (between Bicester Road and A34: PR125 and PR178</li> <li>* South of the Village</li> <li>* West of the Village</li> <li>* Northern City Boundaries/south of Parkway site</li> <li>* Search Area B</li> </ul>  |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn  |   | 11           |                         |               | All sites within the GB are unsuitable for development on the basis of the OGB plan. The NPPF is clear that residential housing constitutes 'inappropriate development' on GB land. No case for 'very special circumstances' can be made according to the SHMA's analysis of housing need in the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area that might permit redrawing of GB boundaries. This rep refers to the Secretary of State's policy position, Paragraph: 034 Reference ID: 3-034-20141006 and a House of Commons briefing paper no. 00934. Paragraph: 045 Reference ID: 3-045-20141006. Oxford's 'unmet need' is principally for affordable housing. Addressing that need through a massive program of additional housing, purely in order to generate affordable housing as a by-product, is using the bluntest of instruments to address a difficult and complicated problem. It promotes unsustainable growth in market housing supply, with severe consequences for economic, social and environmental sustainability. To do this on GB land would be reckless and in contravention of NPPG. |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn  |   | 11           |                         |               | The alleged sustainability of the above land parcels and all other GB around Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton is based mainly on transport convenience and accessibility to jobs in Oxford. However the economic projections in the SHMA are clear that 4,400 additional homes will not find support in employment growth either in Oxford or Cherwell. These surplus homes will invite either speculative investment or long distance commuters, flatly contradicting the NPPF aim to promote sustainable commuting patterns. The Interim Transport Assessment and Interim Sustainability Appraisal ignore the specificity of Oxford's housing need and pay too little heed to the wider context of commuter transport development between Oxford and London and Birmingham.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation                | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1300 | Julia      | Hammett       |                             | 11           |                         |               | Object to the sites Cherwell has identified. The impact on nature and protected species will be devastating and contrary to local policies. There will be a loss of precious GB and open countryside. The implications on traffic and the already congested roads is unacceptable. There is a risk of flooding with the scale of the house building.  |
| PR-B-1318 | Laura      | Walton        |                             | 11           |                         |               | The suggested areas are completely inappropriate to build such a large scale development. Already Kidlington's limited resources, facilities and infrastructure are under strain and would collapse with the proposed amount of development.  |
| PR-B-1322 | Judy       | East          |                             | 11           |                         |               | My comments stand in relation to all of the sites being considered. Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington should be sacrosanct it is enjoyed by a large number of local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Oxford City needs to be held accountable and manage their own housing needs and not expect the surrounding villages to take their over spill resulting in the destruction of the countryside which would result in a vast amount of wildlife lost. Proposals based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd       | 11           |                         |               | Additional smaller sites should be identified in order to bring forward allocations with shorter 'lead-in' times to ensure a deliverable housing supply. The potential of spreading the potential benefits of growth to rural communities has been acknowledged in the emerging West Oxfordshire Local Plan. This potential has not been taken account of in the Cherwell Partial Review.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott   | Upper Heyford Village Group | 11           |                         |               | CDC has the onerous task of protecting a very rural region which sadly is being overrun by urban sprawl. It is not appropriate to build mini housing estates in small rural villages. House building should be restricted to infill and for a known local need e.g. rural exception sites.  |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat        | Clissold      |                             | 12           | E                       | PR141, PR142  | This rep provides a lengthy and detailed response to sites PR141 and PR142. These sites have been identified already in local plan part 2 but not yet in the LP1 partial review to meet Oxford's unmet needs. Wish to re-identify them together as done in LPA-A-055 and allow PR142 to be developed as a small retail outlet and leave PR141 as a wildlife site.   |
| PR-B-1027 | Jonathan   | Porter        | Archstone Projects Ltd      | 12           | PR128                   |               | A planning application has now been submitted for Site 128 Church Leys, Ambrosden (ref: 16/02370/F). Although the site is 3ha, the planning application is for 85 dwellings, so the site would not currently fall within the threshold (100 dwellings and above) for allocation through the Local Plan.   |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd    | 12           |                         | 41            | The Cherwell Local Plan Review consultation document and the preferred option sites fail to take in to account the evidence studies previously undertaken by Oxford City Council. Detailed references are made to Oxford's Informal Assessment (May 2014) 'Investigations in to the potential to accommodate urban extensions in Oxford's Green Belt' and 'The Oxford Strategic Growth Options - High Level Review of Opportunities' (October 2014). Simply Land(Oxford) has secured circa 8ha of land fronting the A44 which would open up a further 22.62ha immediately adjacent to the Peartree Interchange. Taking forward Site 41 would limit coalescence between Oxford and Kidlington. The site is capable of being brought forward as it has willing landowners and a promotor, and would preserve the manner in which Oxford has previously expanded over the years ensuring that fingers of green country could still penetrate in to the City Centre.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt      | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                     | 12           |                         | New site      | The 9.717ha site at Arcott Motoparc, Arcott was the subject in June 2014 of a response to the Council's 'Invitation to Submit Sites for Consideration within the SHLAA 2014 update. (Copy attached). It also included a Landscape, Townscape and Visual Appraisal by RPS dated Sept 2014 which also accompanies this representation. A further rep was also made in October 2014 in response to 'Consultation on Proposed Modifications to the Submission Cherwell Local Plan' (copy attached). The current rep is also accompanied by a Sustainability Report by RPS dated 22 December 2016 of the 9.717ha site at Arcott Motoparc for the Council's consideration. Having regard to the supporting evidence and the history of the site it ought to be included as an identified Potential Strategic Development Site in the Partial Review. |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren     | Bell      | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd             | 12           |                         | PR 8          | Hallam are promoting site PR 8 (Land North East of Ambrosden). An outline planning application was submitted in December 2016.   |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett   | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                   | 12           |                         | PR1           | Rep refers to detailed planning history of this site, particularly an outline planning application 16/01468/OUT. There were no 'technical' issues included in the reasons for refusal. It is expected that outline planning permission for residential development is capable of being secured. On the balance of planning considerations, it is considered that allocating the land for residential development will enable the delivery of an appropriate and comprehensive development. The allocation will assist the District's housing need, assist in the vitality and viability of small businesses and services within Cropredy, deliver public open space, enhance biodiversity, enhance existing vegetation, and improve accessibility and linkages to local services, in particular pedestrian links.                              |
| PR-B-0839 | Mark       | Rose      | Define on behalf of William Davies Ltd                                    | 12           |                         | PR110         | Advise that WDL are a house building company who have an interest in a site at Bloxham (Site PR110). Of the view that Bloxham could and should accommodate further growth in order to meet a proportion of Oxford's unmet need. The land is available and there are limited constraints to development. The rep outlines the aspirations and vision for the development of the site.   |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha    | Blackmore | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family                      | 12           |                         | PR114         | The representations made by Strutt Parker in March 2016 remain valid for this consultation. Since this time advanced discussions have taken place with a number of interested developers and land promoters, further representations and pre-application discussions will be undertaken by the chosen developer with the relevant statutory consultees and District Council prior to an applicant being submitted.   |
| PR-B-1117 | Georgina   | Tibbs     | Barton Willmore on behalf of Bellway Homes Ltd and Archstone Projects Ltd | 12           |                         | PR128         | Bellway Homes Ltd and Archstone Homes Ltd have promoted the Church Leys Farm site in Ambrosden through the Local Plan for several years and continue to promote the site as a sustainable location for new housing. The rep provides further justification and details of the site and current planning application.   |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards  | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                            | 12           |                         | PR129         | A Master Plan and a Design and Access Statement are provided which illustrate how this site could be developed.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds      | Wendlebury Parish Council   | 12           |                         | PR139         | Objects - inappropriate development within the Green Boundary Zone that protects merging the surrounding villages with Bicester. It represents an unsustainable form of development with no connection to major settlement for employment and other infrastructure. It will lead to increased congestion on roads around Bicester; therefore considered contrary to Objectives SO6, 11, 12 and 15 and LP Policies BSC11, ESD1, 6, 10, 13 and 15.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard    | Cutler    | Bloombridge LLP   | 12           |                         | PR14          | A series of drawings and conceptual diagrams are provided to support and illustrate the development potential at the Moors site. The Moors has no overriding constraints to development.   |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie      | Lewis     | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                     | 12           |                         | PR153         | Deddington is ideally placed to accommodate growth as an identified 'service village' and the inclusion of Site PR153 is strongly supported by M and G Real Estate being located adjoining the Deddington satellite of Hempton. The site remains in single ownership and is available.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific            | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton    |   | 12           |                         | PR157, PR30, PR55, PR181 | Site PR157 has been proposed as low density, and is sited so there is no additional traffic through Noke, but contributes to traffic flow in the surrounding area. I believe that there is a strong case for some additional housing in Noke, so that the community remains viable and attracts young families who are the life blood of the community. There are not a lot of services and amenities, an expansion would safeguard these and possibly enhance these for the future residents of Noke. Site PR50 some 50 houses here would have the support of the local community. Site PR55 and PR181 are both unsuitable and would put more traffic onto Islip's already inadequate road system and the B4027. Similarly all the sites around Arncott, Bicester and junction 9 will generate traffic through Islip which cannot cope with existing traffic levels. |
| PR-B-0930 | Philip     | Marsh     | Knights on behalf of Philip King Homes and Oxford City Charity          | 12           |                         | PR178                    | Cooperation between the Philip King Homes Trust and the Oxford City Charity would allow a more comprehensive approach to be adopted in the future development of Site PR178 and the adjoining parcel of land on its northern edge.  |
| PR-B-0156 | Val        | Colby     | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                                  | 12           |                         | PR184                    | Site PR184 is available for development and has been the subject of 2 planning applications by Gladman Developments. Whilst both applications were refused we consider the reasons for refusal on 15/01733/OUT can be overcome and the site can provide a development appropriate to the village.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage    | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 12           |                         | PR186                    | On behalf of Mr Bratt, RPS is currently promoting Site PR186. The site is just under 3ha, including a landscaping belt. Further land could be made available but would require further discussions regarding appropriate landscape mitigation measures. A brief description of the site, its capacity, and access is provided.  |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter      | Bateman   | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                                | 12           |                         | PR187                    | In the summer of 2016 a promotional pack and illustrative emerging Master Plan were submitted to the council to support the allocation of this site for housing development. These plans and documents remain relevant. In addition this representation includes an amended landscape summary produced by Aspect Landscape.   |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux  | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd    | 12           |                         | PR19, PR29               | Response includes an updated Land Use Plan and an illustrative Master Plan showing an indicative potential layout for the whole site. The Master Plan includes: area for up to 1000 homes, an employment area, junction improvements, new primary school, commercial centre, new rail station, marina, improved ecological/wildlife areas, exposed geological features. An appraisal of the ITA is appended.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds      | Wendlebury Parish Council   | 12           |                         | PR196                    | Objects to the inclusion of this site into the land already allocated into the Bicester Gateway employment scheme. Transport mitigation measures from the development affecting Wendlebury are not satisfactory. Any increase of traffic through the village are to be avoided. The village has no street lights or pavements. The village experiences high levels of traffic when there are accidents at Junction 9 of the M40. The objections stands until the develops can satisfy the Parish Council.   |
| PR-B-0935 | David      | Lock      | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates                    | 12           |                         | PR199, PR109             | Gallagher Estates have previously submitted details regarding Site 199(land north of Wykham Lane, Banbury) and Site 109 (Land at Bourne End, Hook Norton). These sites are available, deliverable and suitable for development. The sustainability credentials would become evident if a rigorous site by site SA were to be carried out across all Areas of Search, as conducted for Areas A and B.  |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk    | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 12           |                         | PR23, PR24               | Sites PR23 and PR24 are in sustainable location with a direct route to Oxford City via the A44. They comprise Cherwell's most sustainable sites, closest to Oxford City, within the A44 Corridor.   |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg       | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 12           |                         | PR25, PR22               | Full and detailed documentation provided in support of these promoted sites. Documents include a Technical Information Report, and Transport Strategy and Access Appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia   | Banbury Town Council  | 12           |                         | PR28                     | The Town Council has permission for this site for a change of use from agricultural land to Sui Generis (cemetery land) to expand Hardwick Cemetery, at land (not immediately) to the north of PR28.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname      | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific     | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|--------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| PR-B-0765 | Layla      | Vidal-Martin | NLP Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Taylor Wimpey         | 12           |                         | PR35              | Have acquired the freehold of this site and progressed further detailed design for residential (and potentially education) provision. The site could contribute approximately 240 homes.   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway     | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 12           |                         | PR39              | This representation provides detailed updated information on site PR39. In support of this site the rep includes a comprehensive site assessment covering the key areas of The Green Belt, Urban Form, Transport and Sustainability. Supporting documents include a 'Concept Study'; a 'Preliminary Access Options Study'; a Preliminary Ecology Appraisal'; a Heritage Assessment.  |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan   | Harbottle    | Land and Partners Ltd   | 12           |                         | PR46              | Site PR46 Land West of Hook Norton, Sibford Ferris.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike       | Gilbert      | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd   | 12           |                         | PR48              | Yes. There are no environmental constraints to the development of site PR48 (a brief description is provided). It could also easily be combined with the northern part of PR51 if it was felt that a larger site is needed to fulfil the purpose of a 'sustainable strategic development site'.  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert     | Davies       | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford                      | 12           |                         | PR51              | Have provided a Masterplan to promote this site, which is included with the representation. Have also provided a transport representation which sets out the credentials of that part of Site PR51 which could be developed from a sustainable transport perspective and provides additional information that could be considered alongside the findings of the ITP.   |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark       | Schmull      | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 12           |                         | PR55, PR181, PR21 | CCE continue to promote land at Islip that has been included as Potential Growth Areas, as well as further land as an expansion to Islip   |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother      | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 12           |                         | PR74              | No. As noted above, the site was previously put forward for consideration as part of the Issues Consultation in January 2016. It would be appreciated if the additional information presented could be added to the Council's database.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds         | Wendlebury Parish Council   | 12           |                         | PR77              | Objects to the inclusion of this site into the land already allocated into the Bicester Avenue Scheme. It is not satisfied with the transport mitigation measures proposed by the developer for this proposal. There is only one main road through the village which is its centre. It is directly affected by the increase in traffic due to external pressures from surrounding development or incidents on the M40 and causes serious harm to the vitality of the village. None of these sites comply with the stated objectives of the plan.<br>They represent opportunistic attempts by landowners to secure favourable allocation within the planning system when the local authority is under pressure to find sites for housing to satisfy 5 year supply to avoid unplanned and inappropriate development. |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher      | Rosconn Group   | 12           |                         | PR88              | PR88 was subject of a planning application (15/02359/OUT) which was refused, primarily on grounds of principle in view of there being a 5 year housing land supply at the time or otherwise for reasons which are not insurmountable and which could be addressed through a revised scheme as necessary.   |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle    | Land and Partners Ltd   | 12           |                         | PR94              | This site is intended to be delivered in line with the core principles they have developed that are proven to be commercially realistic and deliverable, having regard to the challenging and competitive market environment. They have listed the key principles in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle    | Land and Partners Ltd   | 12           |                         | PR94, PR95        | These sites are to be developed in line with the core principles of Land and Partners. These are local distinctiveness; culture and community; environmental gains. Further detail is given on these principles.   |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle    | Land and Partners Ltd   | 12           |                         | PR95              | This site is intended to be delivered in line with the core principles they have developed that are proven to be commercially realistic and deliverable, having regard to the challenging and competitive market environment. They have listed the key principles in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor       | Aitchison Rafferty  | 12           |                         |                   | See response to question 3.  |
| PR-B-0119 | C A        | McCall       |   | 12           |                         |                   | Look for other sites which are less controversial.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0171 | Peter                  | Worth     |  | 12           |                         |               | The Yarnton site scores so low on page 71 that it will result in new housing. Therefore Yarnton is not helping solve the housing shortage. This is not the way the community should operate with its proximity to Oxford, jobs and local economic hub.  |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole                 | Pack      |  | 12           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter                  | Webber    |  | 12           |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary         | Shirley   |  | 12           |                         |               | Do not understand the question.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick                   | Small     | Stagecoach   | 12           |                         |               | Stagecoach is not promoting any site for development.   |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony                | Matthews  | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                              | 12           |                         |               | Not to our knowledge  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                     | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited       | 12           |                         |               | Consider that Yarnton is not a suitable location for development sites capable of accommodating 100 homes. There is universal objection to housing in Yarnton.  |
| PR-B-0743 | John                   | Tremlett  |  | 12           |                         |               | Not applicable  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve                  | Pickles   | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                            | 12           |                         |               | Yes. Webb's Way - Landscape and Visual Appraisal by Aspect; Transport Statement. Langford Locks - Landscape and Visual Appraisal by Aspect; Transport Appraisal. These reports demonstrate that these sites could be developed without detrimental and landscape impacts as outlined in the response to Q11.  |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian                    | Sheppard  |  | 12           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris                  | Robbins   |  | 12           |                         |               | Have no connection with any site promoters, developers or landowners.   |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon                  | Joyce     | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire                            | 12           |                         |               | Not applicable  |
| PR-B-0837 | David                  | Jackson   | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 12           |                         |               | Updated supporting information relating to the North Oxford Triangle is provided. This information is provided under the following headings: Oxfordshire Growth Board; Oxford City Council Partial Review Issues; Interim Transport Appraisal and Sustainability Appraisal.   |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex                   | Wilson    | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                         | 12           |                         |               | There is an opportunity to improve the efficiency in the use of land within the allocation at NW Bicester (Policy Bicester 1)   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street    |  | 12           |                         |               | No comment. Do not own these neither do we seek to develop them.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip                 | Rawle     | Greenlight Developments  | 12           |                         |               | This site is subject to on-going discussions with officers and an immediate planning application is currently being prepared. Request that all the information already submitted be taken in to consideration when deciding whether to support this proposed allocation.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David                  | Stone     |  | 12           |                         |               | This is a disingenuous question? Promoting sites within the GB is not acceptable. This is in breach of National Planning Guidance. Sites within Oxford's GB need to be banned from development and Cherwell Local Plan should unilaterally state this.  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth                   | Powles    | Kirtlington Parish Council   | 12           |                         |               | Not 'promoters/developers/landowners'   |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben                    | Simpson   | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd  | 12           |                         |               | The rep includes a very comprehensive New Alchester Vision Document prepared by Canaway Fleming, and supporting Transport Feasibility Study by WYG.   |
| PR-B-1032 | David                  | Burson    | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford              | 12           |                         |               | Significant information has been provided with regard to the Begbroke Science Park at previous stages of the plan making process including a draft masterplan. A copy of the masterplan is also attached to this representation. It has been informed by technical surveys, further assessments are also under preparation including with regard to environmental impacts and can be supplied upon request. |
| PR-B-1033 | Matthew                | Symons    | Hollins Strategic Land   | 12           |                         |               | It has demonstrated that land off Old Arcott Road, Ambrosden can be identified as a site for housing. Have provided more detailed information in their submitted representation   |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert                 | Davies    | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace     | 12           |                         |               | Have submitted a plan illustrating the potential path of A40/A44 link road showing potential access points into parcels of land east and west of the road. Whilst proposals for the land uses site are at an early stage of their evolution it is clear that the site could provide development for a range of uses, including housing and would be attractive to developers and occupiers alike.           |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                              | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| PR-B-1037 | Alice      | Suttie      | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 12           |                         |  | Not applicable, however, see response to Q13 below.   |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim        | Spencer     |   | 12           |                         |  | No comment  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine  | Arakelian   |   | 12           |                         |  | Do the affected residents of Cherwell or North Oxford feel that they have been or are being consulted? In the CCD Statement of Community Involvement, on page 12, there is a photo of Kidlington people being consulted on the Kidlington Masterplan. This was ratified in December 2016. Now worthless.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi       | Stokes      | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 12           |                         |  | No comments   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol      | Matheson    |   | 12           |                         |  | Not asked anyone.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council  | 12           |                         |  | Has no knowledge of any site promoters, developers, landowners who wish to support or provide information about the sites.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard    |   | 12           |                         |  | Don't know.   |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling    |   | 12           |                         |  | Don't know  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry       | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                         | 12           |                         |  | A review of the capacity of existing Strategic sites should form part of the supply to address the unmet housing need. Attention is drawn to Banbury 3 and have provided a detailed statement in the representation. Banbury 3 has potential to deliver more housing on site without increasing the site area.  |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden       | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                        | 12           |                         |  | Reference is made to a Vision Document which includes details and technical work on highways and transportation, ecology, hydrology and drainage, archaeology and also includes a tree survey. (see rep for detail)   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                                     | 12           |                         |  | CDC has the onerous task of protecting a very rural region which sadly is being overrun by urban sprawl. It is not appropriate to build mini housing estates in small rural villages. House building should be restricted to infill and for a known local need e.g. rural exception sites.  |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat        | Clissold    |   | 13           | E                       | PR141, PR142                               | This rep provides a lengthy and detailed response to sites PR141 and PR142. These sites have been identified already in local plan part 2 but not yet in the LP1 partial review to meet Oxford's unmet needs. Wish to re-identify them together as done in LPA-A-055 and allow PR142 to be developed as a small retail outlet and leave PR141 as a wildlife site.   |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon      | Joyce       | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire                 | 13           |                         | Land at Launton                            | The land at Launton extends to 16.4ha and could accommodate approx. 300 new homes and supporting infrastructure. A detailed description of the site, its constraints, and perceived benefits is provided. A site location plan is also provided.  |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam       | Ryder       | Gladman Developments Ltd  | 13           |                         | Land west of South Newington Road, Bloxham | Gladman are promoting this site. It is deliverable, being available now, offers a suitable location for development and is achievable. The site is located within walking and cycling distance of a range of shops and community facilities in Bloxham. The site has limited constraints and is not covered by any restrictive policy designations. Can also reduce the pressure on the Council to release land from the GB.                              |
| PR-B-0930 | Philip     | Marsh       | Knights on behalf of Philip King Homes and Oxford City Charity  | 13           |                         | PR178                                      | PR178 can be extended northwards to include an adjoining parcel of land. This site has the potential to increase the potential for open space on the southern portion of PR178 to ensure a green buffer between the existing built up area of Kidlington and the A34. This site also has the potential to increase the residential capacity of the proposed site in a location which is very close to existing community facilities and public transport. |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris      | Robbins     |   | 13           |                         | PR22                                       | Site PR22 together with land north west of Upper Campsfield Road and lying between the A44 and A4260 could be used to create a garden village outside the GB, that would be a sufficient size to generate its own public transport links. This possibility should also be considered before developing any sites within the GB.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler      | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                                     | 13           |                         |  | No  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday      |   | 13           |                         |  | No  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall        |   | 13           |                         |  | Brownfields site should be included.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname             | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew           | Taylor              | Aitchison Rafferty   | 13           |                         |               | WG019 has the potential to deliver over 100 residential units despite being defined as a 50 dwelling site in the SHLAA.   |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue               | Mackrell            | Bicester Town Council  | 13           |                         |               | 'Not that Bicester Town Council can see'.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A               | McCall              |  | 13           |                         |               | Not that I am aware of.   |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter             | Worth               |  | 13           |                         |               | Mostly agreeable however there are other land opportunities that could be considered in Yarnton which provide less than 100 houses. If other pieces of land were said to be suitable, some would become available due to the increase in land value.  |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia | Jennings            |  | 13           |                         |               | Do not know what sites are being considered elsewhere around Oxford but this should be presented as an integrated Oxford plan, with all sites presented rather than just Cherwell. Do believe that sites that directly support the technology parks, factories in Cowley and the hospitals in Headington, make much better sense.             |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole            | Pack                |  | 13           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG    | Oldfield            |  | 13           |                         |               | Oxford city has brownfield sites which should be used, and respect given to the GB.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                 | Allen               |  | 13           |                         |               | Yes, detention centre and land immediately surrounding the ambulance station, Langford Lane. The land adjacent to the Langford lane motor village that has been labelled as a technology park for some time but not developed. Risinghurst to Old Road Headington, Oxford Greyhound, speedway stadium and land around Eynsham Trading Estate. |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter             | Webber              |  | 13           |                         |               | There are lots of sites within the city not included in this consultation. The relocation of the airport should be considered.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary    | Shirley             |  | 13           |                         |               | The whole of our village has been outlined, the airport could be considered.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                 | Kershaw             | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 13           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick              | Small               | Stagecoach   | 13           |                         |               | Not aware of any additional potential sites .   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn            | Phillips            |  | 13           |                         |               | Bunkers Hill - Shipton Quarry. Islip could be turned into an essential homes village as it has a new railway station.   |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony           | Matthews            | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 13           |                         |               | None that we are aware of   |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                | Humphreys           | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 13           |                         |               | Consider that Yarnton is not a suitable location for development sites capable of accommodating 100 homes. There is universal objection to housing in Yarnton.  |
| PR-B-0743 | John              | Tremlett            |  | 13           |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian            | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories   | 13           |                         |               | There are no potential strategic sites in Steeple Aston.  |
| PR-B-0769 | Debbie            | Jones               | Bidwells on behalf of City of Oxford Charity                         | 13           |                         |               | Wishes to put its site in Kidlington forward for allocation for residential development. Detailed further information and site location plan is provided.   |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve             | Pickles             | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 13           |                         |               | Not that we are aware of.   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian               | Sheppard            |  | 13           |                         |               | None.   |
| PR-B-0809 | Karen             | Selway              |  | 13           |                         |               | Yes. Land where Peartree Park and Ride is presently located could be turned into housing, once the other Park and Rides have been built at Begbroke, etc.   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne  | Mclvor              |  | 13           |                         |               | Oxford City Council should be expected to allocate land for more housing to enable it to meet more of its own housing requirements.   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan              | Dobson              |  | 13           |                         |               | Wonder if the potential of Option F on p.14 in the Summary Booklet has been fully explored: there was a small town there in effect when the RAF/USAF was there and an airfield is not virgin land.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard           | Hills               |  | 13           |                         |               | Certain there are, but don't have specific information. Proposed sites that are suggested after the consultation period has closed should be accepted.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike              | Gilbert             | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 13           |                         |               | No  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP  | 13           |                         |               | The LUC work should have separated out PR14 and PR27 as they are fundamentally different propositions. Request that KR12 is split in to KR12A and KR12B and the analysis re-run. This will show that PR14 has a low impact on the purposes of the GB. Diagrammatic information is provided.  |
| PR-B-0856 | David                  | Smith         |  | 13           |                         |               | Not seen   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins       | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC             | 13           |                         |               | No comments  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds          | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 13           |                         |               | Unable to respond - Insufficient time to consider the issues in detail   |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia                  | Trowles       |  | 13           |                         |               | Sites outside the GB along the rail corridor from Oxford to Banbury.   |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter                  | Trowles       |  | 13           |                         |               | Sites outside the GB along the rail corridor from Oxford to Banbury.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks         |  | 13           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street        |  | 13           |                         |               | Pear Tree Park and Ride.   |
| PR-B-0908 | Mark                   | Limbrick      | Defence Infrastructure Organisation                                  | 13           |                         |               | In November 2016 the government published 'A Better Defence Estate' One of the sites announced as surplus to requirements was St David's Barracks, Cherwell. The estimated date of disposal is 2028. The site could accommodate approx. 725 dwellings. The site is within the adopted Bicester 2 Craven Hill policy. However, this allocation does not take in to account these additional dwellings as the barracks site was not available for redevelopment at the time of drafting the Bicester 2 policy. As such DIO would like this brownfield site to be considered as a Strategic Development site for circa 725 dwellings. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux      | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 13           |                         |               | Shipton Quarry is one of the best and most suitable sites to meet Oxford's unmet need within the northern area.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David                  | Stone         |  | 13           |                         |               | The balance appears to be dis-proportionately overloaded towards the border of Oxford which is NOT sustainable for affordable housing needs, and impractical due to existing traffic congestion. Other areas in Cherwell District merit more detailed consideration, possibly Shipton-on-Cherwell, Banbury and areas to the north east of Cherwell to leverage advantage from the Cambridge-Oxford Express Way and the potential to create an enterprising Silicon Valley.   |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan               | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd  | 13           |                         |               | Additional sites not previously considered should come forward through criteria based policy. Such policy would allow sustainable sites to be delivered whilst preventing any proposals which would cause harm to heritage and ecological assets.  |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane                   | Burrett       |  | 13           |                         |               | No comment.  |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon                  | Turner        | Launton Parish Council   | 13           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth                   | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council   | 13           |                         |               | There are no sites in this Parish that fit the criteria for meeting Oxford's unmet housing need  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver                 | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   | 13           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan               | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd  | 13           |                         |               | Additional sites not previously considered could come forward through criteria based policy. Such policy would allow sustainable sites to be delivered whilst preventing any proposals which would cause harm to heritage and ecological assets.   |
| PR-B-1032 | David                  | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford        | 13           |                         |               | The extensive list of sites is sufficient to provide reasonable alternatives for comparative assessment.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1037 | Alice            | Suttie    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 13           |                         |               | The rep provides details of an additional strategic site. It adjoins land allocated for employment and housing development under policy Bicester 12, for which an outline application is currently under consideration. The potential to extend existing allocations that are consistent with the LPP1 strategy and vision must be an important starting point for the identification and analysis of options. The site comprises a total of approx. 30has of agricultural land. It is anticipated that the site could accommodate around 750 - 1000 homes to include 30% affordable housing. Further details in support of this potential allocation are give in the rep. |
| PR-B-1069 | JP               | Lyes      |   | 13           |                         |               | Not aware of any.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson   |   | 13           |                         |               | As a resident of the City Of Oxford am not able to suggest sites within Cherwell district councils area of responsibility  |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie            | Lewis     | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate           | 13           |                         |               | Site references DE008, DE010 and DE036 as identified in the 2014 SHLAA are all adjacent to the current built up area of Deddington and are promoted by the landowners as suitable and available locations for development. They do not impact on the Conservation Area or have significant landscape impacts when compared to other options.   |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard          | Bennett   |   | 13           |                         |               | Ambrosden and Blackthorn areas – this land is not currently productive and has potentially good railway links.   |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |   | 13           |                         |               | Almost certainly   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council   | 13           |                         |               | Suggest development from Risinghurst to Old Road Headington - near to major employment sites and access to A40(M40) Oxford Ring Road and the City. Develop the Greyhound/Speedway stadium for housing. Extend Greater Leys.  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |   | 13           |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 13           |                         |               | Yes, Finmere airfield  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |   | 13           |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson   |   | 13           |                         |               | No view  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 13           |                         |               | No comments  |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi            | Lancaster |   | 13           |                         |               | It is possible there are some brownfield sites not yet identified.   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol            | Matheson  |   | 13           |                         |               | Not that am aware.   |
| PR-B-1192 | Robert           | Selway    |   | 13           |                         |               | Yes. Land where Pear Tree Park and Ride is presently located could be turned into housing, once the other Park and Rides have been built.  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa          | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council  | 13           |                         |               | Does not believe that there are any potential unidentified sites   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew           | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm             | 13           |                         |               | The rep includes an additional parcel of land within the revised assessed area. A site location plan is provided.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry            | Brougham  |   | 13           |                         |               | Cannot identify any  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M            | Green     |   | 13           |                         |               | Oxford City should be expected to allocate land for housing before employment to enable it to meet its own housing needs.  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon            | Gamage    | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt            | 13           |                         |               | Do not wish to suggest any additional sites at this time.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard          | Boother   | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies           | 13           |                         |               | No. The processes leading up to the identification of the sites in Table 6 to 14 has been very comprehensive.  |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera        | Kantor    |   | 13           |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia            | Sheppard  |   | 13           |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G              | Wakeling  |   | 13           |                         |               | Don't know   |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific            | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|--|
| PR-B-1283 | Julian         | Philcox     | JP Planning Ltd on behalf of Mr N Wingfield           | 13           |                         |                          | The land at 12 Heath Close, Milcombe extends to 2.15ha. It is in single ownership, flat and has frontage to 3 no. roads. It is part previously developed as it contains the existing dwelling in addition to stabling and paddock areas. Plans identifying the site and existing land uses are provided. Also attached is additional information in respect of the site and significant consultation work already undertaken on drainage, landscape impact, trees, ecology and access/highways.  |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley         | Soanes      |   | 13           |                         |                          | Brownfield sites for mixed used, why does commercial come first then housing. Langford Lane should be considered for mixed use. Already there are empty units that could be converted to houses. Consider building above office and shops, making it a mixed community.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James          | Jocelyn     |   | 13           |                         |                          | No comment.  |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel          | McGurk      | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust      | 13           |                         |                          | Disagree. There is sufficient land within the A44 corridor to meet Oxford's needs.   |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan       | Harbottle   | Land and Partners Ltd                                 | 13           |                         |                          | Additional sites could come forward through a criteria based policy. Such policy would allow sustainable sites to be delivered whilst preventing any proposals which would cause harm to heritage and ecological assets.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian            | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                           | 13           |                         |                          | CDC has the onerous task of protecting a very rural region which sadly is being overrun by urban sprawl. It is not appropriate to build mini housing estates in small rural villages. House building should be restricted to infill and for a known local need e.g. rural exception sites.   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa        | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                                | 14           |                         | 160                      | Concerned about the adverse impact on the crossroads (A361), increase congestion onto Bloxham Grove with planned expansion for the Warriner School.  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa        | Goss        | Adderbury Parish Council                              | 14           |                         |                          | Has provided comments on these sites (PR18, PR87, PR88, PR114, PR116, PR117, PR134, PR162, PR184) in response to question 11.  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa        | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                                | 14           |                         | PR110                    | Objection on inadequate access grounds and its impact on the A361 mini roundabout.   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat            | Clissold    |   | 14           |                         | PR141, PR142             | Sites PR141 and PR142 were both entered under LP2-A-055 so have not been re-entered for the partial review of local plan part 1..  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa        | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                                | 14           |                         | PR159                    | Concerned that this would add to the congestion on the Tadmerton Road, major loss of green space surrounding the school and impact on air quality.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob            | Lawrence    |   | 14           |                         | PR164                    | Site PR164 is not a sustainable development location and not contribute to the principles of the Local Plan or meet the criteria for site allocation set out in "Policy Villages 2". Concerns to public transport in South Newington. No direct access to public highway, Sands Lane is a single carriageway road which should not be obstructed. Concerned with safety, access, turning areas, sustainable drainage, NPPF compliance. Conflict with existing plans and guidelines CDC Local Plan and national planning guidelines and the stated aims of the South Newington Conservation Area (2014). Impact to countryside and all wildlife. 50% increase to the houses and adds stress to the already stretched infrastructure. The rep. has stated that there are seven inaccuracies in the submission form which have been listed. |
| PR-B-0156 | Val            | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                | 14           |                         | PR18, PR87, PR162, PR134 | Sites PR18 and PR87 are unsuitable and if developed would serve to extend the built form of Adderbury in to the open countryside. Site PR87 would encroach into the gap between Adderbury/Twyford and Bodicote. Site PR18 relies upon site PR87 for access to the Oxford Road. Sites PR162 and PR134 are remote from the village and insufficiently connected to it to be considered sustainable sites suitable for allocation.  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth           | Powles      | Kirtlington Parish Council                            | 14           |                         | PR183                    | The Parish strongly disagrees with PR183   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa        | Goss        | Bloxham Parish Council                                | 14           |                         | PR35                     | Objection due to additional traffic, congestion, and overall impact on the A361  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG | Oldfield    |   | 14           |                         | PR51 previous PRA-061    | Your website is almost opaque. For example, for the Spring Hill PR51 I cannot find anything on PRA-061 by Gerald Eve LLP. If we can't easily find it, we cannot comment.   |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul           | Butt        | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd | 14           |                         | PR62, PR149              | Noting that Q14 seeks views on 'identified' sites, the reps or submissions received so far, including in relation to sites ref PR62 and PR149 are not available to view at this time.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname | Organisation            | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-----------------|---|
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey                | Wright  | Begbroke Parish Council | 14           |                         | PR74            | Objects to the promotion of this site. The Begbroke Masterplan is only proposing 14% residential use when the basis of the consultation is Oxford's unmet needs. This appears to be an attempt to get on the "development bandwagon" including a Park and Ride and a Rail Station. The local infrastructure will not cope with such a large scale development.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                      | Allen   |                         | 14           |                         | PR-A-009, PR23  | PR-A-009 Blenheim Estates site 23 is in GB and closes the gap between Begbroke and the existing developments in Langford Lane. If combined with sites 24 and 74 has a major impact on open space between these areas. The site has been listed as residential but the rep states it is a mix of residential, industrial and storage. There is no acknowledgement of effects on wildlife, loss of good agricultural land and traffic implications. It is likely to add to the unsafe condition at Begbroke for residents crossing the A44 for bus stops and village amenities, where there is no pedestrian crossing.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                      | Allen   |                         | 14           |                         | PR-A-009, PR24  | PR-A-009 Blenheim Estates site 24 is in GB and closes the gap between Begbroke and the existing developments in Langford Lane. If combined with sites 23 and 74 has a major impact on open space between these areas and the wildlife corridor. The statement that it serves no purpose to the GB is not true, there is currently a gap between Begbroke and Langford Lane developments, this will fit in. There is no acknowledgement of effects on wildlife, loss of agricultural land and traffic implications.  |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street  |                         | 14           |                         | PR-A-017        | Agree whole heartedly with the points raised by the Oxford GB Network PR-A 017  |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan                   | Lodwick |                         | 14           |                         | PR-A-019 (PR14) | Disagree strongly with PR-A-019 Bloombridge Developments. The site proposed is unsuitable for reasons I have given in my response to Question 11 including groundwater flooding on a portion of the site. Their submission (taken with previous submissions) suggests a remarkable lack of familiarity with the site, for example in proposing small business units next to the historic St Mary's church and conservation area and in a field which is frequently subject to groundwater flooding.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                      | Allen   |                         | 14           |                         | PR-A-051, PR48  | Site PR-A_051 M Gilbert/VSL site no 48 is in GB. The area has been grazed and therefore not redundant, it is a valuable area for wildlife. The SSL site is quite well concealed so not an urbanising influence for further development. Access is challenging and it will add to the unsafe condition at Begbroke for residents crossing the A44. There is no pedestrian crossing for residents to reach the bus stop and village amenities.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                      | Allen   |                         | 14           |                         | PR-A-061, PR51  | Site PR-A-061 Gerald Eve site no 51 the rep has errors. The submission states that the development will be close to facilities in Begbroke and Yarnton, there are very limited facilities here and they would be inadequate for this size development. It is not acceptable to use GB and lose wildlife habitats and country walks. The site is on a hill and will be visually imposing. it will make a island of Begbroke thus impacting on the sustainability of wildlife and woodland growth. The proposal is to large and has the potential to cause major traffic disruption on the A40 and A44. It will add to the unsafe conditions at Begbroke where residents have to cross the A44 dual carriageway without a pedestrian crossing to access village amenities and the bus stop. There is no detail on employment or leisure to be provided. |
| PR-B-0643 | L                      | Allen   |                         | 14           |                         | PR-A-074, PR20  | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR-A-074 Tripartite site 20 with specific concerns regarding categorisation and document error. It appears to be in the interest of Tripartite alone and is on GB land. Development on this scale will result in major loss of wildlife habitat which supports thriving populations of different species, including Water voles seen at Rowell Brook. There seems to be no consideration for an ageing population. Traffic will increase and proposals for rail link and Park and Ride are unlikely to be financially viable due to the size of infrastructure investment and journey times. Current operations at the science park have a shuttle bus service to Oxford.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname             | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|----------------|--|
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen               |  | 14           |                         | PR-A-111, PR74 | PR-A-111 JPPS site 74 there appears to be an error in the submission as there is reference to Begbroke Close, should this be Crescent? The survey by Mode Transport doesn't take into consideration the sharp bends and on road parking at the site entry from Begbroke Crescent. It appears to be part brownfield site with the rest in GB and a recent planning application for this site was rejected on the grounds of GB. Part of the site provides a habitat for wildlife so a corridor should be left to allow access to sites PR23 and PR24. A gap needs to be maintained between Begbroke and development in Langford Lane. |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen               |  | 14           |                         | PR-A-140, PR34 | Site PR-A-140 Kemp and Kemp site 34 the submission lacks detail. There is no indications of wildlife access and it is on GB. It should not be additional to the Tripartite proposals for site 20 in order to prevent development sprawl.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward              | Dowler              | Middle Aston Parish Meeting  | 14           |                         |                | No   |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford            | Jones               |  | 14           |                         |                | The link supplied went to a generic page, it should have been a direct link or provided instructions to access the documents.  |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue                 | Mackrell            | Bicester Town Council  | 14           |                         |                | Agrees with the areas of search  |
| PR-B-0119 | C A                 | McCall              |  | 14           |                         |                | Have not seen any representations, or had time to read all documents.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth               |  | 14           |                         |                | NIMBY'ism of providing little or no housing in Yarnton will solve the problem. The Yarnton site scores so low on page 71 that it will not result in new housing. Therefore Yarnton is not helping solve the housing shortage. This is not the way the community should operate with its proximity to Oxford, jobs and local economic hub. The options review is in danger of delivering nothing to address the housing shortage. A few fields, near to community services and good bus routes will have to be sacrificed. This is about peoples lives, jobs and communities.   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright          |  | 14           |                         |                | Submissions from private individuals and champions of the environment and local communities, are vastly outnumbered by submissions from Oxford City and the development sector. Motivated by commercial self-interest there is a wish to take advantage of the rise in local property prices. Hope that consideration will be given to those voicing local and environmental concerns.   |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber              |  | 14           |                         |                | In earlier consultations there was suggestion that Oxford City Council should encourage some large organisations to move out of the city. This would free up land and provide significant worthwhile employment elsewhere.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley             |  | 14           |                         |                | Communication has been poor, as there was no information until late December. People will not have had sufficient time to comment when close to the Christmas period.  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley             |  | 14           |                         |                | Unable to comment as not seen or heard about this.   |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw             | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 14           |                         |                | Have no further comments on the representations and submissions.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick                | Small               | Stagecoach   | 14           |                         |                | Not in a position to comment.  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                  | Humphreys           | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 14           |                         |                | Object to all new development in Yarnton, This is not simply a 'Nimby' attempt to resist any and all development, but a balanced and proportionate response that takes account of the intrinsic character of the village and its potential to accommodate new development without fundamentally harming its environmental character, quality and amenities.  |
| PR-B-0743 | John                | Tremlett            |  | 14           |                         |                | Disagree with the approach taken by my neighbours in the Harbord Road residents' association.  |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian              | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories   | 14           |                         |                | Have commented on the representation for Sandpits, Fenway North and South. Note that these representations comment that Steeple Aston is a 'highly sustainable village' because it has certain facilities. The reps refer to two business parks, which is unclear. Don't agree that the sites have limited environmental value, in addition to that, no ecological assessment have been made, Hedge is of considerable value, etc. are all included in their representation.   |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve               | Pickles             | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 14           |                         |                | There are a number of objections relating to a broad range of issues. The points are made in our responses to other questions.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|---------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0787 | Corinne          | Hill    | Shenington with Alkerton Parish Council                                    | 14           |                         |               | <p>LP2-A-136</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* The site does not have good access highway. The A422 goes through the village of Shenington and Alkerton. The road is narrow, winding and has no footway. Extra traffic would represent a significant hazard and increase the concerns of pedestrians, horse riders and cyclists.</li> <li>* Part of the site is within Flood Zone 2</li> <li>CDC Maps show areas of contamination within the site</li> <li>* The submission suggests a site for a village shop. The last village shop closed in mid 1980s because it was unsustainable</li> <li>* The submission includes a map which indicates the route of a possible footpath link to Stocking Lane - school and health centre. The route goes over the land of another landowner who has previously indicated that he did not wish to allow public access.</li> <li>* NPPF 109 states that the planning system should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by protecting and enhancing valued landscapes. The landscape sensitivity of the proposed site is high. A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment would be required before this is considered.</li> </ul> |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip           | Morley  | North Oxford Golf Club   | 14           |                         |               | Notes that the NOGC golf course land is contained in two sites (38, 50) with two different promoters. As stated in response to Q11, even if these sites are considered, the Unmet Need can be fully or significantly met by including only the land to the east of the Banbury Road in both sites.   |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris            | Robbins |  | 14           |                         |               | Have not seen these so am unable to comment.   |
| PR-B-0819 | Tim              | Green   | The Harbord Road Area Resident Association                                 | 14           |                         |               | Consider that there is a vast amount of documentation for this consultation. This means that the views of developers, land agents and land owners are more likely to be heard as they have the resources to respond fully. CDC's timing and poor organisation have made it difficult for "the man in the street" to respond. There is a conflict of interest in allowing those who stand to benefit financially from development (land owners, land agents and developers) to comment alongside those who have no such conflict. No housing development should be able to cope with the influx of new people and traffic movements. The existing infrastructure cannot cope at the moment.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder   | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 14           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor  |  | 14           |                         |               | Submissions in favour of development have been made by developers, land owners and agents. They clearly have a vested interest. Because of this their views should be taken for what they are i.e. as lacking independence. They should be set aside or as a minimum viewed as biased.   |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon            | Joyce   | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbshire                             | 14           |                         |               | No observations in relation to other comments made.  |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson  |  | 14           |                         |               | No, not seen any   |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard          | Hills   |  | 14           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0837 | David            | Jackson | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 14           |                         |               | Support the representations made by Oxford City Council, in so far as they express the view that 'an urban extension to the immediate north of Oxford would offer a highly sustainable location for housing-led development to help meet Oxford's unmet housing needs'.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike             | Gilbert | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 14           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard          | Cutler  | Bloombridge LLP  | 14           |                         |               | No comment.  |
| PR-B-0856 | David            | Smith   |  | 14           |                         |               | Couldn't find these  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim              | Perkins | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC                   | 14           |                         |               | See comments on Q11  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0877 | David      | Flavin        | Oxfordshire County Council   | 14           |                         |               | Transport strategy have expressed concerns about the need for transport infrastructure to support this growth. Clarity on how the sites come forward and providing sustainable links to housing location to minimise the impact is crucial. Public transport need is supported, as the need to focus growth on transport corridors, especially where additional funding could provide demonstrable advantages.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds          | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 14           |                         |               | Unable to respond - Insufficient time to consider the issues in detail   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris      | Dicks         |  | 14           |                         |               | It is not possible to review all of these in the time given for responses. Those submitted by landowners of potential development sites and their agents should be discounted due to conflict of interest.   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa    | Goss          | Bloxham Parish Council   | 14           |                         |               | Disagrees with further sites being put forward around Bloxham and surrounding areas for Oxford's needs due to lack of public transport links and inadequate infrastructure.  |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton        |  | 14           |                         |               | There hasn't been time to read these and many have not yet been submitted. I would like to endorse the CPRE submission.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall      | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 14           |                         |               | It is impossible for them to properly answer this question due to the short timescale to respond. Their principle objection is the impact of developments on the GB and thus the countryside around Oxford and on the City of Oxford itself which has been protected from adverse development for the last 70 years by the planning process and has a result thrived. At the moment it is possible to walk from the High Street into the countryside, but for how much longer?   |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux      | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 14           |                         |               | Disagree with the conclusions of the OGB with regard to the assessment of Shipton Quarry and the summary of the constraints to development put forward within the 'traffic light' assessment. Reasons are given in the rep.  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds          | Fringford Parish Council   | 14           |                         |               | The three sites in Fringford previously submitted and subsequently shown as rejected by CDC should remain rejected on the grounds of sustainability, distance from Oxford, inadequate transport links and lack of services.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone         |  | 14           |                         |               | Could not find this information to respond, so how do I evaluate and give a response to this question? Agree with respondents advising that the removal of the GB around Kidlington and Oxford is unacceptable and against national planning policy. Also concur from experience of living here that traffic congestion and pollution is already at an unacceptable illegal level and no development is the only solution to ensure community health, and well being.  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk          | Banbury Civic Society  | 14           |                         |               | Draw attention to the advantages of the London Oxford Airport site. The airport is not a base for public service flights , is a developed area within the 'green belt' , is 200+ hectares (say 5,500 - 6,000) dwellings which is adjacent to (a) existing employment (which could be extended), (b) to an existing railway line, (c) existing bus services direct to the city centre and the site is bounded by good quality main roads providing access to other parts This site could also accommodate a good site for a 'further out-of-town' Park and Ride terminal. They suggest that the rotary wing flying operations can be undertaken at Upper Heyford. Present policies for this area would also have to be reviewed, but restoring operations at this airfield need not be incompatible with the historic interest of the area - indeed flying operations could well enhance such interest. Upper Heyford has the potential for access to the M 40 and also has reasonable access to a regular rail services. Freight movements by nearby forwarding companies and the occasional large air movements on behalf of charities flying out disaster relief consignments would be facilitated by the long runway available at the location. |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council   | 14           |                         |               | Does not wish specifically to comment on the sites, but wishes to reiterate that Banbury through lack of connectivity with Oxford does not make the town an appropriate location to meet Oxford's unmet housing need.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   | 14           |                         |               | No   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1032 | David            | Burson    | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 14           |                         |               | It is noted that the Oxford Green Belt Network responded to the previous consultation. The importance of the GB is acknowledged but it is believed that development can be successfully accommodated without substantial harm. The scale of the unmet housing need and the social and economic problems which would arise by not making provision close to the City would constitute exceptional circumstances as required by the NPPF. The GB boundaries have endured for many years without significant change and we believe that there is broad support for such a review to be undertaken. Reference is also made to the LUC Green Belt Study commissioned by the Growth Board.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice            | Suttie    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 14           |                         |               | No comment at this stage. Do however, reserve the right to comment on this topic in future rounds of consultation.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP               | Lyes      |   | 14           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val              | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council   | 14           |                         |               | Objects to the promotion of this site for housing due to its impact on Bodicote. They have already lost a large portion of the Parish to the Longford Park development and currently there are 2 developments approved on the south part of the Parish at Blossom Fields. Both these sites are not acceptable for the following reasons:<br>PR 186 - There is a risk of flooding with this site and it is not the most accessible. It would increase traffic through the village and Water Lane, which is a bridleway and not a street. It could be a precursor to more development. The Parish is already experiencing major traffic problems. Where will the infrastructure funding come from to deliver LTP4 and Masterplan?<br>PR199 - This site is a major problem. Vehicles will use Wykham Lane, which is a narrow, winding, country lane, already in a poor condition and subject to near misses. It is not appropriate to build here and use Wykham Lane to enter and exit the site. |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson   |   | 14           |                         |               | It is very difficult to find these documents on your website and the public meeting was poorly advertised. Having now read these, the details are good but the constraints are the key. The principle of removing GB and damaging special areas of conservation are main objections.  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |   | 14           |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |   | 14           |                         |               | Not known   |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |   | 14           |                         |               | Support the objections to Areas A and B submitted by the parish councils of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington and the objections raised by Kidlington Development Watch.   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson   |   | 14           |                         |               | Disagree with any proposal to build houses in the Oxford GB.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 14           |                         |               | No comments   |
| PR-B-1180 | RA               | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd    | 14           |                         |               | There is universal local opposition to the provision of significant new housing in Yarnton. This is a balanced and proportionate response that takes account of the intrinsic character of the village and its potential to accommodate new development without fundamentally harming its environmental character, quality and amenities.   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol            | Matheson  |   | 14           |                         |               | The sites are within GB and are inappropriate development, there is no mention of brownfield sites. . Kidlington and Gosford will merge with Oxford and recreation land at North Oxford Golf course will be lost. Flooding is an issue and many sites are within the Flood Zone. There are listed buildings at Water Eaton and evidence of a medieval village and Roman road. The Oxford canal, an important leisure corridor is protected by Cherwell Local plan. Agricultural land that could be used for food production is being removed.   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew           | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm             | 14           |                         |               | N/A   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry            | Brougham  |   | 14           |                         |               | In agreement with those representations which question the basis of the requirement for 4,400 dwellings over the period to 2031, and seek to have it reviewed. Any sites released from the GB should be those which have the least impact on the purposes of Green Belts.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green           |  | 14           |                         |               | Submissions in favour of development have been made by landowners, agents and developers, that clearly have a vested interest. There should be some recognition that these are not independent.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                       | 14           |                         |               | RPS has not reviewed any emerging reps so far, but will review and comment on these as appropriate once they become available.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                    | 14           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                      | 14           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |  | 14           |                         |               | Cannot comment in the short time available.   |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |  | 14           |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-1262 | Andrew     | Gant            | Oxford City Council Lib Dem Group  | 14           |                         |               | The concerns from residents in North Oxford about the consultation are justified as it did not reach many. Although this area is outside CDC, it is significantly affected by these proposals. If there is evidence that the lack of publicity has led to a low level of response, further consultation should be undertaken  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council    | 14           |                         |               | There has been insufficient time to look at this question in detail.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling        |  | 14           |                         |               | Am not able to comment at such short notice.  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry           | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                    | 14           |                         |               | Have no comments at this stage, but do however reserve the right to comment on this topic in the future.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn         |  | 14           |                         |               | Disagree with any and all submissions that seek to justify the construction of unsustainable additional housing throughout the OHMA, and especially disagree with submissions that seek to justify the release of GB for the purpose of additional housing to 'meet Oxford's unmet need'.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk          | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                           | 14           |                         |               | Disagree. There is sufficient land within the A44 corridor to meet Oxford's needs.  |
| PR-B-1305 | Cllr Polly | Foster          | Fritwell Parish Council  | 14           |                         |               | Strongly agrees with the Key Strategic Constraints in Table 16 for Options G and I and agrees with 7.28 that scores these areas least positively overall and identifies them as not benefitting from existing or planned sustainable transport infrastructure.  |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley           | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                                  | 14           |                         |               | Sustainable options are likely to be at those locations immediately adjacent to Oxford (subject to constraints) and at those locations with sustainable transport connections or in southern Cherwell. All take account of the origin of the unmet needs and are generally supported to varying extents. A more detailed response is provide in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott     | Upper Heyford Village Group  | 14           |                         |               | CDC has the onerous task of protecting a very rural region which sadly is being overrun by urban sprawl. It is not appropriate to build mini housing estates in small rural villages. House building should be restricted to infill and for a known local need e.g. rural exception sites.  |
| PR-B-0837 | David      | Jackson         | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 15           | A                       |               | The assessment findings for Area A are supported.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |  | 15           | A                       |               | The areas of search assessed against 8 transport criteria is noted. Discusses the assessment for sites in area A against different criteria, and is very concerned about whether sufficient infrastructure can be put in place with new development; the impact on the Green Belt and local communities. Whilst Rapid Transport System is proposed, questions its funding and whether it will be delivered in time. |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname             | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific    | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright          |  | 15           | A, B                    |                  | Cannot understand how Areas A and B around Kidlington have been assessed as most promising locations for development. Their proximity to Oxford make them least suitable as employment is centred around Headington and Cowley in the South and East of the city. Kidlington would lose its village character and become an Oxford suburb with traffic chaos. Most significant would be the use of GB which according to the present government's manifesto should be sacrosanct.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris               | Robbins             |  | 15           | A, B                    |                  | Areas A and B together with Bletchington and Kirtlington should be the main areas of search.   |
| PR-B-0944 | David               | Stone               |  | 15           | A, B                    |                  | See response to Question 8. This assessment deliberately and misleadingly under plays the real issues about existing traffic congestion, pollution and log-jam on the present roads around Oxford. There no evidence any new roads, such as a northern relief road to connect with A40 will remove road congestion. No timescale is offered by the County to deliver realistic traffic improvements. This cannot be considered as a suitable reason to advocate development on sites A and B around Oxford and Kidlington. It is not deliverable, not sustainable and not realistic.   |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher         | Hardman             | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum                       | 15           | A, B                    |                  | The 'green scores' for areas A and B depend simply upon the proximity of the sites to existing roads, services and public transport. These transport services are already inadequate, the roads are congested and there are serious problems with air quality. Additional traffic growth from other imminent developments is certain to exacerbate the problems. Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane                | Olds                | Fringford Parish Council                             | 15           | C, I                    |                  | Agrees with the ratings of these sites as listed and the scoring of Options C and I.   |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil                | Tiley               | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group            | 15           | F                       |                  | Search Area F provides an opportunity to contribute to the unmet needs of Oxford City but also provides a sustainable opportunity to meet the housing needs of Cherwell once the necessary SHMA review is undertaken as the economic effects of development in Area of Search A would largely occur within Oxford City (rather than Cherwell).   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon               | Gamage              | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt | 15           | H                       |                  | Notes the conclusions regarding Area H and generally agrees with the findings. Contend however that the number of jobs within Oxford which are accessible within 45 minutes is unexpectedly low in comparison to other Areas of Search. Would welcome further discussion on the assumptions behind this conclusion. Suggest that further consideration of sites in areas of search other than Areas A and B would be beneficial particularly if it is concluded not all the required new homes can be accommodated in Areas A and B. Welcomes the comments in para 8.3 that other factors in addition to transport may lead to sites being concluded to be more or less sustainable overall. |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian              | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories                         | 15           | I                       |                  | The Options Consultation document confirms that Option I (including Steeple Aston) does not benefit from existing or planned sustainable transport infrastructure. Submit that this rules it out of serious consideration.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa             | Goss                | Adderbury Parish Council                             | 15           |                         |                  | Agrees with the assessment and its findings.   |
| PR-B-1281 | G M J               | Taylor              |  | 15           |                         | PR27, PR14, PR32 | Am absolutely against building on these sites. The whole area between The Moors and the River Cherwell must be protected. This area is greatly valued by all the residents of Kidlington. One of the few beauties of Kidlington is once you walk down to St Mary's Church into the conversation area, your out into the open Oxfordshire countryside. Where deer roam and in the summer the water meadows are full of swallows. The area is not overlooked by houses and the peace and quiet of the area needs protecting.   |
| PR-B-0801 | Janet               | Stott               |  | 15           |                         | PR38, PR50       | This refers to the transport assessment. Sites PR38 and PR50 chosen entirely for maximum profit since the development of Oxford Parkway Station. Although close to the city of Oxford, concerned vast majority of people working in Oxford will not be able to afford these homes, instead go to London commuters. Ultimately confounding the aims of increasing housing for Oxford workers.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0812 | Tim        | Stott       |   | 15           |                         | PR38, PR50    | This refers to the transport assessment. Sites PR38 and PR50 chosen entirely for maximum profit since the development of Oxford Parkway Station. Although close to the city of Oxford, concerned vast majority of people working in Oxford will not be able to afford these homes, instead go to London commuters. Ultimately confounding the aims of increasing housing for Oxford workers.  |
| PR-B-1097 | Caroline   | Hayes       |   | 15           |                         | PR38, PR50    | At sites PR38 and PR50 there is already an enormous amount of traffic congestion in the area. The new houses are more likely to become commuter belt for London rather than solving housing needs for key workers in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard    | Silvester   |   | 15           |                         | PR38, PR50    | New houses at sites PR38 and PR50 are likely to be bought by London commuters using the Parkway station, not people working in Oxford. The transport network is already at full capacity with regular congestion.   |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan      | Silvester   |   | 15           |                         | PR38, PR50    | New houses at sites PR38 and PR50 are likely to be bought by London commuters using the Parkway station, not people working in Oxford. The transport network is already at full capacity with regular congestion.   |
| PR-B-1263 | Katie      | Silvester   |   | 15           |                         | PR38, PR50    | New houses in sites PR38 and PR50 are likely to be brought by London commuters who would take advantage of the Parkway Station. The transport network is already at full capacity which results in congestion in the area.  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway    | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm | 15           |                         | PR39          | The rep provides detailed information on transport issues relating to this site. The assumed modal split for the site is based on flawed assumptions, given it is based on census data collected prior to the construction of the high speed rail route in to central Oxford and Bicester. Oxford Parkway station is near to the site and will provide convenient, frequent and fast commuter links reducing reliance on the private car.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler      | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                         | 15           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday      |   | 15           |                         |               | 7.25 Areas A and B are in GB, do not build outside of built area, south of Northing 14. Railway station north of Kidlington, west of PR14 with Park and Ride. 7.23 Kidlington already had traffic congestion.   |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford   | Jones       |   | 15           |                         |               | No link available to either documents?  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall        |   | 15           |                         |               | Sceptical about the governments projections. Oxford does not need new industry, and the "robust figures" are really guesses.  |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor      | Aitchison Rafferty                                  | 15           |                         |               | The report found that future travel patterns associated with Cherwell's share of Oxford's unmet housing need, in particular those for commuter travel, are likely to replicate existing flows.  |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony    | Hall        |   | 15           |                         |               | More should be done to improve links between Bicester and Oxford. Development outside Oxford will be more beneficial.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A        | McCall      |   | 15           |                         |               | Only found out about exhibition a few days ago, and have not had time to read all the documents.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul       | Goulding QC |   | 15           |                         |               | The lack of public transport to Noke militates against the site being selected.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val        | Colby       | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK              | 15           |                         |               | Agree that whilst the Transport Assessment was an important input to the SA process it was not in itself a reason to determine that any Areas of Search were unreasonable to consider. However, the conclusion that areas A and B should be the focus for development is over simplistic taking the Cherwell OAHN and the Oxford OAHN together. The site search should be cast wider through Cherwell District in recognition that there is already an interdependence between the two local authorities and the existing Local Plan allocations. Oxford's unmet housing allocation does not all have to be sited in close proximity to Oxford city borders. Sustainable rural villages such as Category A villages can play a greater role in meeting housing needs generally. |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter      | Worth       |   | 15           |                         |               | The bus service in Yarnton is excellent, if improved would take more cars off the roads.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0186 | Paul              | Walker     | Oxford Bus Company   | 15           |                         |               | Agree with the approach of utilising the areas of search and prioritising locations that can facilitate sustainable transport access to the employment market of Oxford. Agree with the need to promote and prioritise alternative modes of transport. The sustainable transport facilities that serve Oxford form part of the assessment for these areas. It is essential that these potential improvements are locked into new sites by way of both physical measures and developer contributions that enable improved public transport services.         |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG    | Oldfield   |  | 15           |                         |               | It is a faulty assessment because it's based on incorrect assumptions.  |
| PR-B-0641 | J                 | Willoughby |  | 15           |                         |               | As the assessment stands it is difficult for the layman to envisage all the implications. Roads are already full and the proposal doesn't deal with the future increase in traffic.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                 | Allen      |  | 15           |                         |               | The existing transport systems do not support current loadings let alone potential increases without causing Oxford gridlock. Lack of local knowledge has resulted in wrong assumptions with regards to bus routes. People are unlikely to use the train as it's expensive, less frequent and getting to a train station takes time. An independent system similar to the Docklands Light railway starting at a 10 mile radius from Oxford should be considered. Retention of the Witney branch railway line would have taken a lot of traffic off the A40. |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter             | Webber     |  | 15           |                         |               | In order to fulfil the aspirations of the SA Addendum significant transport infrastructure will be necessary.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary    | Shirley    |  | 15           |                         |               | There needs to be careful consideration for future generations with regards to losing village identities and creating gridlock.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G            | Shirley    |  | 15           |                         |               | Believe that all roads into Oxford will be gridlocked, it's not environmentally friendly.   |
| PR-B-0704 | J                 | Kershaw    | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 15           |                         |               | Council needs to acknowledge that Areas A and B will need a substantial investment in infrastructure in order to be able to come near to making the transport system acceptable. Except for key workers, the Council should place less emphasis on proximity to Oxford and work with businesses and other authorities to look at alternative employment opportunities in the rest of Oxfordshire.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick              | Small      | Stagecoach   | 15           |                         |               | Broadly agree that the methodology used is appropriate. Concerned that Options E and H score higher than is warranted by the prospects that sustainable modes can meet the majority of trip demands in to the City, given the distance involved and the dispersal of trip destinations.   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn            | Phillips   |  | 15           |                         |               | What is the potential loss of farming land and to our local food supply. Oxfordshire has a rural setting which will negatively effect its character.  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                | Humphreys  | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 15           |                         |               | Note that Yarnton is within Area A having been identified as the most sustainable broad location for identifying sites. Whilst acknowledging the need for an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, are concerned that no such proposals are in place in advance of the site selection process.  |
| PR-B-0740 | Richard and Linda | Jurd       |  | 15           |                         |               | No. To develop on GB is based upon guesswork about the growth of jobs in Oxford. Oxford City need to look at development inside the City and the new proposed Eco Towns to fulfil its housing shortfall.  |
| PR-B-0743 | John              | Tremlett   |  | 15           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin            | Palmer     |  | 15           |                         |               | Do not agree that access/ road infrastructure should not be part of this planning as it is often gridlock now.  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve             | Pickles    | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 15           |                         |               | Figs 6.2 and 6.3 strongly reinforce the argument that the Kidlington Option A is the most sustainable location in transport terms for accommodating the housing needed to meet Oxford's unmet need.   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane              | Olds       | Caversfield Parish Council   | 15           |                         |               | No  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation                                       | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0793 | Philip           | Morley    | North Oxford Golf Club                             | 15           |                         |               | ITA is just one aspect of the overall assessment. Consider that it is likely that there would be substantial change in the nature of transport by 2031 note that the NOGC golf course land is contained in two sites (38, 50) with two different promoters. As stated in response to Q11, even if these sites are considered, the Unmet Need can be fully or significantly met by including only the land to the east of the Banbury Road in both sites. Ask that CDC takes more explicit account of the vision of "rapid transport links". If they are indeed to be rapid, then there is less importance to have them close to the City – as has been already recognised in the proposed siting of new Park and Rides. Furthermore, it seems to us counter-intuitive to be considering sites that would be inside the Park and Ride perimeter, as traffic flow to/from these sites would be against the main flows being assumed by the Transport Plan.   |
| PR-B-0796 | David            | Tighe     |  | 15           |                         |               | Transport over capacity and huge amount of congestion in the area. Transport strategy is unrealistic and insufficient. The A34 and A40 improvements only deal with existing capacity issues, not with increased demand. New houses bought by commuters wishing to commute to London.   |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive            | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                | 15           |                         |               | The ITP does not adequately identify potential opportunities for transport infrastructure provision, especially rail based solutions, and new station facilities on existing lines.  |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard  |  | 15           |                         |               | There seems to be NO assessment of the transport impact in the areas, the congestion it will create, the A34 issues, the new Parkway   |
| PR-B-0805 | Tamara           | Frishberg |  | 15           |                         |               | Areas around Kidlington preferred because of "proximity to sustainable transport services and public transport accessibility." A34 and A40 through Oxford already overburdened. Improvements to Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts still have not eliminated tailbacks and planned construction of the Northern Gateway will increase the traffic problems along the A40.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder     | Gladman Developments Ltd                           | 15           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor    |  | 15           |                         |               | Please note that the A4144 and A4165 are already very heavily congested despite statements to the contrary.  |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson    |  | 15           |                         |               | There is already massive congestion in this area. The pressure on the A40 and A34 as major routes without alternatives will only increase: adding to this pressure with local GB development is folly  |
| PR-B-0831 | Natasha          | Eliot     | Oxford Preservation Trust                          | 15           |                         |               | Has particular concerns with preferred 'Area of Search A'. Remind CDC of Govt. guidance for Green Belts in paragraph 80 of the NPPF, which sets out the five purposes of the Green Belt. Table 16 of the consultation document identifies under 'constraints' that these sites are in the Green Belt. Both the SA and the ITA make reference to the risk of potential coalescence of settlements (the second purpose of the Green Belt) within Area A. Under Objective 8 in the SA, the table identifies five sub-objectives about preventing coalescence between settlements. As the partial review of Cherwell District Council's Local Plan develops, OPT wishes to see the Council make clear that as it considers options to help meet Oxford's unmet housing need, it will not allow the coalescence of Oxford with any other settlement, as this is key purpose of the Green Belt and it is vital that the globally significant character of Oxford is preserved during this unprecedented time of growth in Oxfordshire. |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard          | Hills     |  | 15           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike             | Gilbert   | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd                          | 15           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex             | Wilson    | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd | 15           |                         |               | No comments on the ITA at this stage.  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard          | Cutler    | Bloombridge LLP                                    | 15           |                         |               | Note that the principal public transportation route is planned to run through the centre of Kidlington. There are many benefits to this (these are set out in the rep). Disagree with the 'amber flag' afforded to The Moors for walkability to jobs. An alternative detailed analysis is included in the rep. Pleased the ICP Transport review presents no problem for development at The Moors.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | 15           |                         |               | Detailed comments on transport criteria made. PC very concerned as to whether sufficient infrastructure can be put in place to cope with such large scale developments. In addition, any infrastructure will have impacts on the GB and local communities. Concern regarding the Rapid Transport system which appears to be a wish rather than a fully funded proposal and therefore doubt whether it will be delivered in time to benefit residents in any new development.   |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt                   | Todd       |  | 15           |                         |               | Transport is a massive issue. Infrastructure already poor considering the new Oxford Parkway and A40 improvements. Mill site in Wolvercote and Northern Gateway will only add to the existing problems. A40 acts as through road for London and Cotswold traffic, it has been an issue since the M40.  |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer               | McFadden   |  | 15           |                         |               | Sites PR38 and PR50 are near the train station and have good bus links but the area is notoriously congested despite the recent work on the Wolvercote and Banbury Road roundabouts. The transport net work in the whole area is already at capacity. Will there be any new schools, as this will add to traffic in the area. Attraction for London commuters rather than the target employment opportunities in Oxford and Kidlington. Improvements to the A34 and A40 deal with current issues and not take into the account development of sites PR38 and PR50.   |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter                  | Hainsworth |  | 15           |                         |               | Transport provision hasn't been thought through and is almost certainly impossible to think through adequately anyway. The network is already overstretched, especially regarding access to and from Oxford at peak periods. The envisaged improvements to the A34 and A40 will make minimal difference.   |
| PR-B-0873 | Jenyth                 | Worsley    |  | 15           |                         |               | The Consultation Document states: "Kidlington and the surrounding area including the North and East of Kidlington stand out as areas of search with the most "green scores", particularly in respect of existing proximity to sustainable transport services and public transport accessibility". I disagree with the consultation document. Transport network already over its capacity with huge congestion in the area. Who will buy and live here, Oxford workers or London commuters. Insufficient number of schools in the area.   |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council                               | 15           |                         |               | Supports the conclusions from the ITP and welcomes the opportunity to be involved with the transport assessment work.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council                                | 15           |                         |               | Unable to respond - Insufficient time to consider the issues in detail   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks      |  | 15           |                         |               | Disagree with the statement that Kidlington, Yarnton and surrounding areas score best in terms of the number of "green" scores on the assessment. The sites are near infrastructure, but roads towards Oxford are at capacity. Local roads are constrained by the canal and rail line crossings. Journey times to Pear Tree by car or bus are long and routes from the west to Oxford Parkway are constrained by an increase in traffic. Have very little confidence that meaningful improvements would be made, there are simply too many constraints. The assessment needs to account for the much improved rail link between Oxford and Bicester, and consider this as a good asset. There would even be the option to create a new parkway station on the railway directly by M40 junction 9. Challenge the green score for local employment opportunities. While there are businesses located near Langford Locks, and the University facilities at Begbroke, most new residents in any developments around Kidlington and Yarnton would commute into Oxford. Indeed, since the object of the exercise is to provide housing for Oxford, by definition it must be expected that the developments are for those working there. |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street     |  | 15           |                         |               | It is clear that the assessment is comprehensive. Have no comments.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard | Miles      |  | 15           |                         |               | Acknowledge that Option A and Option B may score well in relation to proximity to sustainable transport and public transport accessibility but how does this relate to any proposed new Park and Ride schemes? The existing Park and Ride schemes already struggle due to their location within a busy road network and therefore at times are inaccessible. If there is to be a new Park and Ride at Oxford Airport – would people travel away from their houses in Option A and B and further out of Oxford to a new Park and Ride to take them into Oxford? Is this logical?  |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob              | Lawrence   |  | 15           |                         |               | It is not fit for purpose from the perspective of Cherwell residents. Radical changes are needed by Oxford with public transport to and within the city. Road access to Banbury railway station car park is convoluted and need streamlining to prevent traffic congestion at peak times. Banbury to Oxford train is overcrowded at peak times. Park and Ride requires a direct metro link to Oxford and not rely on buses. Quicker to get to Marylebone from South Newington than to Oxford with less hassle.   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa          | Goss       | Bloxham Parish Council   | 15           |                         |               | The Interim Transport Assessment predicted considerable traffic issues around Banbury due to the 32% increase in traffic trips from Cherwell Local Plan. Connecting Oxfordshire LTP also places emphasis on increase in road capacity and improvements in public transport for Oxford to ensure improvements in Air Quality. These factors endorse the search areas proposed by CDC.   |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison           | Forfar     |  | 15           |                         |               | Increased traffic and housing has made the roads unsafe for cyclists. The state of these roads needs to be addressed by the council to improve road safety and to prevent fatalities. Public transport needs to be in place from every development site, so as to reduce residents using their own cars. Where are the plans for public transport, footpaths and cycle routes. This is crucial to reduce the pressure on the roads, the plans as they only increase the pressure on local roads.   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken              | Pelton     |  | 15           |                         |               | The assessment is fundamentally flawed.  |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew           | Smith      | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                 | 15           |                         |               | Does not have confidence that the Oxfordshire County Council LTP will deliver sustainable transport to deliver improvements to the current situation as well as handling the additional burden of those needing access to Oxford from the new housing developments.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen            | Marshall   | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 15           |                         |               | There is very little information available in the assessment on the sorts of journeys that those living in the proposed homes will undertake. The assumption that all those living in these homes will work in central Oxford is seriously flawed as most employment areas in Oxford are in areas such as Hospitals sites and Cowley Business Parks and are a long way from the sites identified in the area of search. The fact that some of the sites are near a Number 2 bus route does not begin to address the question of how someone working on the South and East side of Oxford (where most employment is located) can get to work by public transport. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan              | Molyneux   | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 15           |                         |               | The development at Shipton Quarry (within Area B) has the potential to provide frequent and reliable public transport which will also support nearby rural settlements along with the site shifting travel patterns in the entire area towards more sustainable options. Whilst the area is not directly adjacent to the currently proposed future transport improvement, larger sites have the capacity to provide additional transport investment, which can be connected to the proposed transport schemes and benefit from such schemes.   |
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric          | Sidebottom |  | 15           |                         |               | Attempts to deal with current transport problems by Cherwell and the City have been pathetic. Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts have been a waste of time and money. A34 should be a motorway through Oxfordshire and the A40 needs to be a dual carriageway through the county not cross other A roads at roundabouts. A roads should be crossed via bridges or tunnels.  |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter            | Bateman    | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                             | 15           |                         |               | No direct comment however transportation should be considered with the evidence of a complete county wide IDP to be robust.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0935 | David      | Lock      | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates | 15           |                         |               | The Interim TA appears to have the same methodology as the SA, with only sites within Areas A and B being interrogated individually. This approach is flawed. The assessment is too high level and cannot appropriately assess alternatives. The rep provides a detailed critique of this approach. It concludes by stating that CDC needs to conduct further transport and sustainability assessments at a more refined scale, to ensure sites are properly assessed.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle     | Greenlight Developments                              | 15           |                         |               | Detailed comments made centred around the RAG transport assessment findings.  |
| PR-B-0939 | Lynne      | Tighe     |  | 15           |                         |               | The transport network is over its capacity. Huge amount of congestion in the area. The County Council Oxford Transport Strategy is unrealistic and insufficient. A34 and A40 improvements only deal with existing capacity problems, not deal with increased demand. Homes to be brought by London commuters. Improvements at the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts have made no difference. Has consideration been given to where will children go to school and how they will get there.  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk      | Banbury Civic Society                                | 15           |                         |               | Sites suggested east of the M40 by Junction 11 would be affected by the link road proposed in the Local Plan and Banbury Vision.  |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia   | Banbury Town Council                                 | 15           |                         |               | Does not believe that Banbury is an area of search or spatial option for travel to Oxford using public transport. This would lead to increased car traffic or drive to the train station in Banbury further increasing congestion in town as the mode of transport to the train station is by the car.  |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin    | Noke Parish Meeting                                  | 15           |                         |               | The Transport Assessment is vague with no concrete proposals. The 'Rapid Transport Lines' has no explanation of what a 'Tram-equivalent level of service' is and how it is going to be achieved. Detail comments on impact on the overall transport infrastructure around Oxford area and the need to address the current problem are future plans (tram system) including funding are included in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0983 | Suzanne    | Morris    |  | 15           |                         |               | The transport network is over its capacity. Commuter trains to London from Oxford and into Oxford are already full. Huge amount of congestion in the area despite improvements to Woodstock Road and Banbury Road roundabouts. The County Council Oxford Transport Strategy is unrealistic and insufficient. A34 and A40 improvements only deal with existing capacity problems, not deal with increased demand. Homes to be brought by London commuters. Has consideration been given to where will children go to school and how they will get there? |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett   |  | 15           |                         |               | Have commented above concerning the essential needs for housing for Oxford to be near to Oxford in terms of travel time to work and cost. Only if appropriate for employment in Headington, Cowley and the city itself. and if the journey times are reasonable which they are not at peak times from Bicester to Oxford. If transport possibility and costs are affordable with the salaries and wages paid. Any unmet housing needs to be as near to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter      | Collins   | Islip Parish Council                                 | 15           |                         |               | The recently improved train station at Islip with connections to London and Oxford is not included in the transport assessment  |
| PR-B-1005 | SP and SA  | McQuillan |  | 15           |                         |               | The transport assessment is vague, unrealistic and simply won't happen. The diagram of the rapid transport lines is considered not to be worthy. A well planned and funded infrastructure should be the first priority or in parallel with housing. Without this it will not happen. Section 106 and community infrastructure money must be spent 100% in the areas where housing is constructed not going into some ill-defined central pool of money  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles    | Kirtlington Parish Council                           | 15           |                         |               | Transport connectivity from sites as near Oxford as possible is important, avoiding any increase in more distant commuting into Oxford.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1012 | Calum        | Miller        |   | 15           |                         |               | A wide range of sites have been consulted in Kidlington. Have no comment on the merits of these sites. Islip experiences traffic issues at peak times, the likelihood of a large development in Kidlington would exacerbate this. Therefore thought and analysis needs to be given to the impact on other traffic routes if development's approved. Strongly argue that Islip should benefit from some of the section 106 monies allocated to the highways in light of this development. |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel       | Hatcher       | Rosconn Group   | 15           |                         |               | An additional option associated with sites close to train stations not included within any of the other options (other than Option I) should be undertaken. It is expected that against the RAG analysis criteria for the Interim Transport Assessment and Sustainability Appraisal, such an option would perform well.  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben          | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                               | 15           |                         |               | The interim assessment does not take proper account of the stated potential of New Alchester to provide new rail station and new services to locations south of Oxford in the Science Vale. The Assessment needs to be revised following dialogue with promoters of the largest sites ( including New Alchester) so that it can take account of all constraints and opportunities, rather than focusing on the existing situation which is only part of the equation.                    |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver       | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 15           |                         |               | No, other than to say it has not considered the potential for Site 41.   |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew       | Hornsby-Smith |   | 15           |                         |               | The assessment was based on inaccurate baseline traffic data in the local area, and in purely transport terms, sites closer to Oxford were preferred. Has conducted traffic counts himself as part of his MSc in Transport Planning . Has provided very detailed data and analysis of traffic on the roads surrounding Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-1032 | David        | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 15           |                         |               | The evidence based approach is supported. The general findings support the University's statements that the Begbroke Science Park is a suitable place for development in terms of accessibility and connectivity to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 15           |                         |               | A detailed and comprehensive response which concludes by stating that the appraisal of Area E has the potential to offer a highly sustainable location for the delivery of further housing growth and would be consistent with both Cherwell's spatial strategy and the aims of the LTP4 which emphasises the need to promote links along the Knowledge Spine, including between Oxford and Bicester.  |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret | Sidebottom    |   | 15           |                         |               | Attempts to deal with current transport problems by Cherwell and the City have been pathetic. Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts have been a waste of time and money. A34 should be a motorway through Oxfordshire and the A40 needs to be a dual carriageway through the county not cross other A roads at roundabouts. A roads should be crossed via bridges or tunnels.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson         |   | 15           |                         |               | Using low or zero emission transport is good. Sustainable transport always respects the integrity of the existing natural environment and heritage with the inclusion of GB. Encourage communication technology to minimise commuting and enabling dispersed employment.   |
| PR-B-1046 | William      | Hodgson       |   | 15           |                         |               | The transport network is over capacity. Already increased traffic has damaged the roads. The capacity improvements at the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts have not made a difference. The visual character and green landscape has been changed significantly. Which secondary school has to accommodate the increase of children and what thought has been put in place to het them there.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP           | Lyes          |   | 15           |                         |               | Not found on website. However additional housing and subsequent commuting into Oxford could well create significant additional air pollution. Whilst Kidlington may on paper appear to be well served transport-wise, the realities of daily commuting are not without their difficulties, without adding to that.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F     | Hickman       | Middleton Stoney Parish Council                                 | 15           |                         |               | Takes comfort that the ITA underscores their views that sites within Options C, F, and G are least suitable for development and Options A and B are most suitable.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1095 | Val              | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council   | 15           |                         |               | Concerned that The Banbury Masterplan has not yet been implemented. With Brexit and Local Plan Part 2 still in preparation, the housing numbers are yet to be realised. New development and any required infrastructure will impact on many of the search areas identified in the Options Paper. The provision of adequate infrastructure must play an important part when deciding on sites for new housing.   |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg             | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 15           |                         |               | The ITA is wholly flawed and cannot be considered a robust evidence base against which to take forward significant decisions on future growth scenarios. The metrics adopted have been inconsistently applied, do not make reasonable assumptions about future conditions, and fail to identify likely opportunities or constraints. The report is particularly biased towards development immediately adjacent to the Oxford built up area.  |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan             | Storah    | Oxford City Council   | 15           |                         |               | The key findings of the ITP endorse that sites in closest proximity to Oxford are the most appropriate and sustainable sites for meeting Oxford's needs.  |
| PR-B-1101 | Catherine        | Dobson    |   | 15           |                         |               | Although Kidlington has close proximity to the transport network it is already heavily congested and the transport strategy has not made improvements. Further development will create the same problems on the A34 that exist on the A40.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson   |   | 15           |                         |               | Disagree with 7.3. GB should not be considered because exceptional circumstances are debatable in this case.  |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat              | Clissold  |   | 15           |                         |               | Kidlington is fast becoming a suburb of Oxford city.  |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward      | Kidlington Development Watch  | 15           |                         |               | The assessment identifies the need for major investment to address significant congestion and lack of capacity on major roads. See no evidence that investment on the scale required will be forthcoming, for example to meet the LEP's funding bids. Furthermore consider that the schemes required would in themselves be damaging to the environment and to the assets which the Green Belt is intended to protect.  |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French    | Deddington Development Watch  | 15           |                         |               | Have no specific comments on the RAG assessment of the 9 Areas of Search in Appendix 1a to the Interim Transport Assessment, October 2016, Part 2.  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |   | 15           |                         |               | Public transport is key to any development and access to reliable and regular public transport from day one is required.  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council   | 15           |                         |               | The traffic volumes and infrastructure cannot accommodate such large scale development and the A44 in particular. Also concerned that the development at Woodstock will exacerbate the problem. Residents of Begbroke have difficulty crossing the A44 now.   |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |   | 15           |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 15           |                         |               | To rule out a transport assessment from determining whether an Area of Search was reasonable or not is wrong. It is no use building houses where transport is already massively congested or the road and rail links are not able to cope with heavy usage. It would be the rural equivalent of creating a 'sink estate' where those with money and ambition leave for better areas and only those unwilling or unable to move would remain   |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |   | 15           |                         |               | Traffic flow down the A34, A44 and A4126, have not been properly assessed and additional traffic coming through Kidlington from villages and towns to the north would be a disaster. Both the County Local Transport Plan and the Oxford Transport Strategy to mitigate these extra flows appear to be chronically underfunded, over-ambitious and so unachievable in the current climate. A sustainable plan 2011 – 2031 would have to be aimed at reducing flows around Kidlington and district not merely within the city boundaries. It is likely that infrastructure needed to support an increase in housing and jobs would not be built before the houses. |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson   |   | 15           |                         |               | The growth proposed would put unsustainable pressure on the already strained transport infrastructure. Oxford barely copes with the existing transport movements at peak times, substantial growth could not be absorbed. Growth in bus services although preferable to car movements would still be difficult to absorb.   |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 15           |                         |               | Agree that with the ITA findings that Areas A and B would be the most sustainable broad locations for identifying sites due to their transport connectivity and proximity to Oxford.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis           | Davies   |   | 15           |                         |               | Am not sure how the new developments will help with the overcrowded roads and other infrastructures.  |
| PR-B-1182 | Alison          | Noel     |   | 15           |                         |               | The consultation document states that Kidlington and the surrounding area has the most 'green scores' in respect of proximity and public transport accessibility. However the transport network is over capacity and improvements at Wolvercote and Cutteslowe have not eased congestion. The transport strategy is unrealistic and insufficient and will not deal with increased demand. Schools places are an issue and new houses are likely to be bought by London commuters. |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol           | Matheson |   | 15           |                         |               | The traffic congestion around Kidlington and Gosford has not been taken into account. The proposed traffic improvements need a firm plan and costing details.   |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul            | Butt     | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd   | 15           |                         |               | Detailed comments are made in relation to the bus and rail service for Arncott.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry           | Brougham |   | 15           |                         |               | No comments.  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M           | Green    |   | 15           |                         |               | The A4144 and A4165 are already very heavily congested despite statements to the contrary.  |
| PR-B-1231 | Prof J M        | Baker    |   | 15           |                         |               | There would be significantly increased pressure on existing transport infrastructure, which recent and proposed improvements would not address. Given the proximity to the A40 and new rail link to Oxford Parkway, there is a high likelihood that new homes here would be occupied by commuters to London, thereby significantly diminishing any economic benefits to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed              | Barrett  | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd | 15           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard         | Boother  | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies   | 15           |                         |               | The findings of the Interim Transport Assessment are supported.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera       | Kantor   |   | 15           |                         |               | No time to do the task properly   |
| PR-B-1245 | Jason and Petra | Tyrell   |   | 15           |                         |               | The improvements to the North Oxford roundabouts have made no real improvements to congestion. The new railway station is already at capacity with more carriages being proposed to accommodate existing demands. The A34 is regularly congested and in 2016 had numerous serious accidents including fatalities. Any improvements will only meet the existing inefficiencies and not additional development  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia           | Sheppard |   | 15           |                         |               | Trains are already busy, which has been added to with the extension from Oxford Parkway to Oxford. The houses will attract London commuters therefore putting added pressure onto the train services and not help to achieve Oxford's objective.  |
| PR-B-1257 | Charles         | Fletcher |   | 15           |                         |               | Transport network is already over capacity. Despite vast improvements to Woodstock Road and Banbury Road roundabouts, there is still congestion. The County Council Oxford Transport Strategy is unrealistic and insufficient. A34 and A40 only deal with the current problems and not with the increased demand. London commuters will by these houses. Where will the children go to school and how will they get there.  |
| PR-B-1258 | Hilary          | Fletcher |   | 15           |                         |               | Transport network is already over capacity. Despite vast improvements to Woodstock Road and Banbury Road roundabouts, there is still congestion. The County Council Oxford Transport Strategy is unrealistic and insufficient. A34 and A40 only deal with the current problems and not with the increased demand. London commuters will by these houses. Where will the children go to school and how will they get there.  |
| PR-B-1259 | Mircea          | Popa     |   | 15           |                         |               | Transport network is already over capacity. Despite vast improvements to Woodstock Road and Banbury Road roundabouts, there is still congestion. The County Council Oxford Transport Strategy is unrealistic and insufficient. A34 and A40 only deal with the current problems and not with the increased demand. London commuters will by these houses. Where will the children go to school and how will they get there.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard |   | 15           |                         |               | Transport network is already over capacity, particularly with the opening up of the Chiltern line through to Oxford. Despite recent improvements there is still a huge amount of traffic congestion. The County Council Transport Strategy is unrealistic and will not address current or future issues due to the proposed development. The A34 is long overdue for development and can only deal with the current capacity. A40 is insufficient to manage existing traffic and proposed development is certainly beyond its capacity. The proposed sites are close to the railway links, the risk is therefore high that this will attract London commuters.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells    | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 15           |                         |               | Agrees with the assessment and its findings of the ITP report and that without significant improvements, new development of the scale envisaged cannot be accommodated in Areas A and B in particular. Press reports indicate that Oxfordshire is likely to be awarded less than 10% of the Transport Infrastructure bid submitted by LEP. There is no certainty that the Rapid Transport system will be deliverable. This is a deal breaker for new housing and increased strain on already overloaded routes, worsening conditions for existing residents and failing to sustainably meet the needs of newcomers. The capacity of the existing infrastructure is minimal or exceeded in and around Kidlington. Developers can only be asked to address the needs of their own scheme before the delivery of Affordable Housing becomes unviable. The funding gap has to have realistic prospects of resolution before any land is allocated for development in the future. |
| PR-B-1271 | Rebecca    | Hodgson  |   | 15           |                         |               | Local roads are all ready full to capacity and result in heavy congestion. They will not cope with more people. The Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts are still congested. What consideration has been given to where the children will go to school and what transport links have been considered or put in place to get them there.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling |   | 15           |                         |               | Comments given in responses to questions 1 and 3 are relevant here.  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 15           |                         |               | Have no comments at this stage, but do however reserve the right to comment on this topic in the future.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes   | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 15           |                         |               | Transport is an important aspect that will need to be given significant weight in the final decision as to which sites to promote.   |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn  |   | 15           |                         |               | The SHMA suggests that only a minor proportion of the 4,400 homes that are 'affordable' would be relevant in terms of transportation into Oxford to support employment; the rest would promote unsustainable commuting patterns as residents find work further afield. Additional pressure would be placed on the transport network in the area through this unsustainable demographic expansion, increasing congestion and pollution and further undermining the Cherwell Local Plan's compliance with the NPPF's sustainability requirements   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk   | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 15           |                         |               | Sites PR23 and PR24 relate well to the requirements of the Assessment. However, the scoring do not appear to properly reflect this and should be updated in the light of the sustainable location of the Sites, with particular regard to proximity to Oxford and location within the A44 corridor.  |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede   |   | 15           |                         |               | The finding that any sites north of Kidlington score 'green' for existing proximity to sustainable transport services and public transport accessibility into Oxford is ludicrous. Access by public transport to the majority of jobs in Oxford, being in the east and south, is currently non-existent. Roads passing through North Oxford only have bus lanes in one direction and journey time are long   |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                          | 15           |                         |               | Agree with the findings of the Assessment. But notes that the highest rankings within the Kidlington area need further testing and consideration before progressing to a final proposed allocation. The Assessment and its findings are too dismissive on rural options within Option I.   |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick       | Alston   | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd                 | 15           |                         |               | Support the principle that Area of Search A as the most sustainable location in transport terms to accommodate growth.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1352 | Liz              | Boden     | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                                   | 15           |                         |               | Detailed comments are made on the RAG scorings for the Areas of Search.  |
| PR-B-0731 | Ioana            | Davies    |  | 16           | A                       |               | No. Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Option A closest to Oxford. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1158 | Elizabeth        | Leckie    |  | 16           | A                       |               | Area A is not a reasonable area of search. It is in GB which absorbs harmful pollution, supports a wide range of wildlife and provides a space for healthy leisure activities. The GB in area A ensures that Gosford and Kidlington retain a clear identity from Oxford allowing a sense of community and social cohesion. Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a legitimate reason to build on GB and CDC's policy to protect it must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin           | Leckie    |  | 16           | A                       |               | Area A is not a reasonable area of search. It is in GB which absorbs harmful pollution, supports a wide range of wildlife and provides a space for healthy leisure activities. The GB in Area A ensures that Gosford and Kidlington retain a clear identity from Oxford allowing a sense of community and social cohesion. Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a legitimate reason to build on GB and CDC's policy to protect it must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip           | Towler    |  | 16           | A, B                    | PR14, PR27    | Too much focus has been placed on areas A and B, areas outside the GB should be investigated more. If the bulk of the 4,400 homes were to be sited in areas A and B the character of Kidlington village would change beyond recognition. They need to be dispersed among different areas to reduce the impact. Object to sites PR14 and PR27 which would ruin a beautiful and tranquil area valued by many for recreation. Proximity to the river Cherwell could increase the flood risk. The land is in the GB and local infrastructure could not support the development.  |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor    |  | 16           | A, B                    | PR38, PR50    | No. Options A and B involve the loss of GB areas which I object strongly to. do not believe that the criteria for exceptional need has been demonstrated. The detrimental effect of building up to the boundary of Cutteslowe Park has not been evaluated. This park is an important recreational resource for a wide geographical area and it should be protected. (The rep provides a detailed objection to site PR38 and PR50.)   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG   | Oldfield  |  | 16           | A, B                    |               | Disagree vehemently with the inclusion of Options A and B in the areas of Search as they are in the GB which should be sacrosanct.   |
| PR-B-0837 | David            | Jackson   | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 16           | A, B                    |               | Areas of Search A and B are strongly supported.  |
| PR-B-0966 | E                | Nicholson |  | 16           | A, B                    |               | No, this number of homes added to 22,840 CDC intends to build will see Cherwell's housing stock increase by 50% in a very short space of time. If most of the building occurs within search areas A and B it would have an adverse impact on all areas of life for residents. Lack of adequate health care, school provision, traffic congestion, light, noise and air pollution and increased risk of flooding. It will also compromise the functions of GB and is debatable that exceptional measures to justify its use have been demonstrated.   |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert           | Davies    | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford                         | 16           | A, B                    |               | Agree that Area of Search A should be taken forward into site specific assessments, and consider that focussing the 'area of search' upon areas well related to the City of Oxford is of critical importance if Cherwell is to effectively meet the unmet housing need of the City from where it arises. Do not consider that Area B are suitable for development given the disconnected nature of the locations and open nature of the countryside in many cases.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman   | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum  | 16           | A, B                    |               | The 'green scores' for areas A and B depend simply upon the proximity of the sites to existing roads, services and public transport. These transport services are already inadequate, the roads are congested and there are serious problems with air quality. Additional traffic growth from other imminent developments is certain to exacerbate the problems. They have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline    | Johnson   |   | 16           | A, B                    |               | Disagree with the proposals to develop GB. Exceptional circumstances do not exist for this to proceed. The growth levels proposed are unrealistic and the housing needs projected are unlikely to be realised. Options A and B are not reasonable  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M       | Green     |   | 16           | A, B                    |               | No do not agree with this as Options A and B would involve loss of GB. These areas of GB are largely pleasant and unspoilt countryside used and enjoyed by many people for recreation. It prevents urban sprawl and protects the character, setting and heritage of the historic City of Oxford. Do not believe that exceptional circumstances exist to justify building on the GB. A public survey has shown that the majority of people think that the GB should be protected and not built on. I believe that the detrimental effect of building up to the boundary of Cutteslowe Park has not been evaluated. This park is an important recreational resource for a wide geographical area and it should be protected. |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry       | Brougham  |   | 16           | A, B, D, E              |               | Agree with the focus on areas A and B as being those most suitable for meeting Oxford's housing needs. Areas D and E could make a contribution if there was provision of adequate public transport to Headington and Cowley. Area E has the advantage of a large amount of brownfield land.  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine   | Arakelian |   | 16           | A,B                     |               | Areas of Search A and B are not reasonable as they are in the GB. They are in the Cherwell Valley and subject to waterlogging and flooding. Some parts are on Otmoor; there are water meadows along the Ray and Cherwell in the floodplain which sustain considerable biodiversity, including water voles. "Native and locally common but vulnerable to extinction in the UK. They are a priority species in the UK Biodiversity Action Plan and fully protected under section 9 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981(as amended). Schedule 5 of this Act makes it an offence to intentionally damage or obstruct access to water vole burrows."   |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben         | Simpson   | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                                       | 16           | A-I                     |               | Area I is unhelpful as it is too general to be useful and the Banbury area is too remote from Oxford to be relevant. The Areas of Search should be restricted to areas A-G. New Alchester is within Area C together with proposals at Weston on the Green. New Alchester is close to the built up area of Bicester and falls within the Garden Town Masterplan area. It does not relate well to Weston on the Green. It should therefore be considered as part of the area around Bicester. (Area E).  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg        | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 16           | B                       |               | Whilst parts of Option B are within GB, it is significant to note that the promoted sites are not. They are also the first locations to be arrived at from Oxford outside of the designation. Land NW of Oxford airport would have the potential to form a new garden neighbourhood community served by its own local facilities to meet the needs of the community, with the Land East of Marlborough School extending the existing Woodstock settlement.   |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley      | Soanes    |   | 16           | C, D, E, F, G, H, I     |               | Only if it is proven that all areas are equally robustly analysed, the view is that C to I has been less well worked through. Where is the evidence for the review of C to I?  |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon       | Joyce     | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire                         | 16           | E                       |               | The Areas of Search are reasonable for the purpose of making a full assessment of all the development options. But of the opinion that Area of Search E is the most appropriate to accommodate Oxford's unmet need.  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex        | Wilson    | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                      | 16           | E                       |               | A2D considers Option E as an appropriate location to meet housing needs. The need to be well related to Oxford City does not necessarily mean sites in close proximity. It is a question of capacity and contribution to strategic priorities and spatial strategy.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice       | Suttie    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments         | 16           | E                       |               | See responses above to Q9, Q11 and Q13. There are no further comments at this however reserve the right to comment on this topic in future rounds of consultation.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname             | Organisation                           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett             |  | 16           | F                       |               | Area F - Upper Heyford and surrounding area does have a bus service into Oxford but the last bus is at 19:20 . You could drive to Heyford railway station and take the train.  |
| PR-B-1124 | Chris      | Thornton            | Ardley with Fewcott Parish Council     | 16           | G                       |               | Do not agree with Option G being reasonable  |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett             |  | 16           | G, C                    |               | Areas G and C both implies travelling on the M40. Air pollution in the existing rural villages would increase effecting all residents in the area. In 2013 will all vehicles be electric by then.  |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel      | Buttler             |  | 16           | H                       |               | Option H Banbury and Surrounding Area, should be omitted from consideration to provide Oxford's housing needs. There is no reason for Banbury and its surrounding area being asked to meet Oxford's unmet quota when there are areas closer to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia             | Banbury Town Council                   | 16           | H                       |               | Option H and surrounding areas are not appropriate areas for Oxford's unmet need.  |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett             |  | 16           | H                       |               | Shift workers in Oxford City would spend too long and too much from Banbury area H.  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val        | Russell             | Bodicote Parish Council                | 16           | H                       |               | Option H should be deleted as there has already been a considerable amount of new build in this area, more is planned and even more will be needed. It is unfair to ask Banbury and surroundings to meet Oxford's unmet need. It would encourage more traffic on the road system which is already inadequate and struggling with the amount of traffic.  |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom        | Hockaday            |  | 16           | H                       |               | Area H is not a reasonable area for addressing Oxford's housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank      | Vreede              |  | 16           | H                       |               | No. It is unreasonable to consider option H or any northerly areas for meeting the unmet housing need of Oxford; Oxfordshire does not have a county-wide housing market area, as evidenced by the huge variation in house prices across the county. It is also unreasonable to consider any options in the GB for unmet housing need which is an unsubstantiated estimate. Oxford should take a more balanced, measured and sustainable approach to growth and development |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner              | Launton Parish Council                 | 16           | H, E                    |               | The Parish Council find it hard to believe that anyone moving to Banbury would wish to work in Oxford - Options H is unreasonable. Option E is likely to be appropriated by commuters to London, thereby reducing the effectiveness of this option in meeting Oxford's unmet housing need.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val        | Colby               | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK | 16           | I                       |               | Area of Search I has a role to play in delivering housing. Category A villages can provide a proportion of housing in scale with the settlement to ensure housing is delivered across the plan period and distributed more equitably across the district. This is currently not accounted for in the Partial Review which is looking to accommodate the additional housing as close to Oxford City as possible.  |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian     | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories           | 16           | I                       |               | For reasons given elsewhere in this submission do not agree with all areas of search being considered reasonable. Area I should not be included.   |
| PR-B-0839 | Mark       | Rose                | Define on behalf of William Davies Ltd | 16           | I                       |               | Concerned about the wide definition of Option I which ignores the potentially important role of Cat A villages. They could and should make a contribution as part of the required portfolio of development sites in accordance with the extant sustainable development strategy. The rep goes on to explain why Bloxham is suitable for further growth.  |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher             | Rosconn Group                          | 16           | I                       |               | Option I is not a reasonable option in that it includes potential locations close to train stations as detailed, which have not been fairly assessed due to being included within a 'catch-all' option for the remaining rural areas of the District. A fairer assessment which identifies these potential locations under a separate option would therefore address their concerns.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname    | Organisation                 | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|------------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-1146 | DJ                 | French     | Deddington Development Watch | 16           | I                       |   | The Areas of Search around urban areas and other 'focal points' must be considered to be reasonable. On the other hand, it is not reasonable to designate the whole of the rest of north Oxfordshire as an Area of Search (Option I (Remainder of District/Rural Dispersal)). This represents a 'scatter gun' approach for the sake of appearing to be inclusive, and is unsupported by the Interim Transport Assessment and the Initial Sustainability Appraisal. Self-evidently, development on the scale contemplated to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs in the rural areas would not be sustainable for a variety of reasons. Do not agree that development within the Green Belt surrounding Oxford should now be considered reasonable. Development would also be contrary to the fifth core planning principle and Part 9 of the NPPF.   |
| PR-B-0200 | John and Elizabeth | Gittings   |                              | 16           |                         | PR123   | PR123 is not reasonable as it would kill the golf course, which has barely enough space as it is.   |
| PR-B-0260 | Chris              | Pack       |                              | 16           |                         | PR14, PR27, PR37, PR125, PR178, PR50, PR122, PR38, PR167, PR123 | No, these sites should never have been chosen because of the potential impact on the valuable countryside and residents quality of life.  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison             | Forfar     |                              | 16           |                         | PR157   | Why has site PR157 been included if this site has been categorised as unsustainable in two previous local plans. Nothing has changed to the village. Development would constitute village extension which has been previously refused. Your proposal would suggest that 200 homes could be added to a village that currently has 55 homes with no local infrastructure or transport links would be in any way sustainable. It would not. Village locations are not suitable for the of the large scale 100+. The essential character of the village and its area will be destroy.   |
| PR-B-1076 | Jana               | Gnappova   |                              | 16           |                         | PR20, PR24  | No, the GB should be protected. See general comments  |
| PR-B-1281 | G M J              | Taylor     |                              | 16           |                         | PR27, PR14, PR32  | Am absolutely against building on these sites. The whole area between The Moors and the River Cherwell must be protected. This area is greatly valued by all the residents of Kidlington. One of the few beauties of Kidlington is once you walk down to St Mary's Church into the conversation area, your out into the open Oxfordshire countryside. Where deer roam and in the summer the water meadows are full of swallows. The area is not overlooked by houses and the peace and quiet of the area needs protecting.  |
| PR-B-0801 | Janet              | Stott      |                              | 16           |                         | PR38, PR50  | No. Strongly object to development in the GB. Proposal to develop in the GB is based on unsupported assumptions about the growth of jobs in Oxford. Alternatives to building in the GB, such as those proposed as employment. The effect on Cutteslowe Park, the wider footpaths in the GB areas of sites PR38 and PR50 in the City of Oxford has not been considered. This park is a very important green space and should be protected as such.   |
| PR-B-0812 | Tim                | Stott      |                              | 16           |                         | PR38, PR50  | No.Strongly object to development in the GB. Proposal to develop in the GB is based on unsupported assumptions about the growth of jobs in Oxford. Alternatives to building in the GB, such as those proposed as employment. The effect on Cutteslowe Park, the wider footpaths in the GB areas of sites PR38 and PR50 in the City of Oxford has not been considered. This park is a very important green space and should be protected as such.  |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter              | Hainsworth |                              | 16           |                         | PR38, PR50  | Strongly in favour of maintaining the GB, unless there are greater benefits to be gained from development for the inhabitants of Oxford and Kidlington. GB is a valued and well used amenity for all. Development will have a negative impact on the day to day lives of many, these new homes will likely serve London commuters via Oxford Parkway. Sites PR38 and PR50 either together or separately will have a terrible impact on traffic. Oxford and Kidlington will become one with no benefits for either. Countryside views would be lost and wildlife would be damaged. People will lose the benefits of the open rural spaces which contributes to well-being. Cutteslowe Park will be affected a resource that is enjoyed by many locals and those from further afield. No reason to think that employment in Oxford will grown on the suggested scale unless encouraged or allowed to do so. |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation                | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0939 | Lynne             | Tighe     |                             | 16           |                         | PR38, PR50    | Strongly object to building in the GB. Do not accept that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the need. GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford is an unspoilt green lung with footpaths that is appreciated by local residents. It's there to protect historic Oxford. Public survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, 76% of Oxfordshire residents are in favour to protect GB. Assumptions about Oxford's job growth, there are alternatives such as sites that are proposed for employment being used for housing. The effect on Cutteslowe Park has not been taken into consideration, important space it needs protecting. |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward            | Dowler    | Middle Aston Parish Meeting | 16           |                         |               | No, it was not reasonable to include Rural Dispersal sites and areas to the north of the District due to the limitations of the transport infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-0029 | Sonia             | Morgan    |                             | 16           |                         |               | Object to development on GB. The projected job growth in Oxford needs substantiating, and alternative sites within Oxford considered. The proposal of a rail link between Oxford and Cambridge could impact on the location of new homes and jobs. Sites close to the A34 are unreasonable on health grounds.   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry             | Munday    |                             | 16           |                         |               | Not in Kidlington   |
| PR-B-0036 | David             | Blowers   |                             | 16           |                         |               | Objects to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Questions the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford          | Jones     |                             | 16           |                         |               | Strongly objects to development on GB. Previously developed sites within Oxford and sites proposed for employment should be considered.   |
| PR-B-0046 | Caroline          | Thompson  |                             | 16           |                         |               | Strongly objects to development on GB and believe it's based on incorrect assumptions about growth in jobs. Previously developed sites within Oxford and sites proposed for employment should be considered.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia           | Hall      |                             | 16           |                         |               | No, there should be no building on GB or on the flood plains.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew           | Taylor    | Aitchison Rafferty          | 16           |                         |               | No. Given that the SHLAA identifies site WG019 as having potential to develop 50 dwellings it is reasonable to increase the figure to over 100. This increase would represent a more efficient use of land and allow the council to raise its land supply figures. The development of this site would be more in keeping with the settlement pattern of the village than sites PR82 and PR83.   |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony           | Hall      |                             | 16           |                         |               | Certainly not – you've said it yourself. "The strategic release of green belt land was therefore considered not to be a reasonable alternative" Nothing has happened to change this obviously correct conclusion – you are simply trying to ignore it.  |
| PR-B-0078 | Anthony           | Churchill |                             | 16           |                         |               | Objects to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0081 | Linda             | Beattie   |                             | 16           |                         |               | Object to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0082 | Felicity          | Emptage   |                             | 16           |                         |               | Object to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. I question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0119 | C A               | McCall    |                             | 16           |                         |               | No, some are on flood plains and GB.  |
| PR-B-0120 | E                 | Tonkin    |                             | 16           |                         |               | No, CDC needs to develop less economically successful locations and spread areas of expansion rather than the size proposed for Kidlington which will increase congestion.  |
| PR-B-0150 | Patrick and Julia | Marcks    |                             | 16           |                         |               | Object to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Questions the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0150 | Patrick and Julia | Marcks    |                             | 16           |                         |               | Object to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Questions the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname          | Organisation       | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0151 | Prof John         | Batchelor        |                    | 16           |                         |               | Object to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Questions the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0152 | Henrietta         | Batchelor        |                    | 16           |                         |               | Object to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0154 | Hannah            | Hale             |                    | 16           |                         |               | Object to GB being considered for development, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. I question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter             | Worth            |                    | 16           |                         |               | Mostly yes with the caveats as provided in earlier responses  |
| PR-B-0175 | Mr D and Mrs S    | Rudd             |                    | 16           |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Questions the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0181 | Diane and Darryl  | Bates-Brownsword |                    | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Questions the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0184 | Roger             | Prince           |                    | 16           |                         |               | No. have strong objections to any development in the Green Belt. There is no need for it as the projected figures for jobs growth are incorrect and there is plenty of scope to provide housing outside of the Green Belt. Oxford City has missed opportunities to provide additional housing on sites where it is allowing development for employment such as the Northern Gateway, which will add to the demand for homes.  |
| PR-B-0185 | Terrence          | Yeatman          |                    | 16           |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Questions the assumptions on job growth in Oxford and feel that Oxford city have brought their housing shortage upon themselves, allowing the building of the Brooks University site in Headington, and now having a multimillion pound expansion that will lead to more houses being bought for letting. Does not see why the villages north of Oxford should have to suffer the consequences. If the Green Belt is to be sacrificed there are plenty of other sites around Oxford that could be used away from the surrounding villages. |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul              | Walker           | Oxford Bus Company | 16           |                         |               | Disagree with the inclusion of Option C (Junction 9, M40), Option F (Upper Heyford), Option D (Arncott) and Option I (Remainder and Rural) as these score least positively in the transport infrastructure score and accordingly do not meet the sustainability criteria or the objectives of the Oxfordshire LTP4 which is a main consideration of sites to come forward through the Plan.   |
| PR-B-0201 | Dr Catherine      | Grebenik         |                    | 16           |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia | Jennings         |                    | 16           |                         |               | Area A and B are in Oxford's GB which prevents urban sprawl and ensures access to the countryside and nature for all. It's there for a reason and should be respected. There is no demonstration of the exceptional circumstances required to build on GB.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0213 | Linda               | Browning   |              | 16           |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington as it's based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. GB is pleasant, unspoilt, well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered.                           |
| PR-B-0222 | Malcolm             | Axtell     |              | 16           |                         |               | Objects strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. The proposal is based on speculation and discredited analysis, and as such, previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered before GB.                        |
| PR-B-0234 | Prof Roger          | Davies     |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the GB, it's a permanent designation and unmet housing needs do not justify building on it. Some of the areas to the north and east of Kidlington contain precious natural habitats and well used footpaths. GB's purpose is to prevent urban sprawl and the present governments manifesto promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Oxford City should consider using the Northern Gateway area. |
| PR-B-0238 | D A                 | Burt       |              | 16           |                         |               | The proposed development would merge Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington creating a vast urban sprawl. This goes against the GB principles in the NPPF, CDC's policy and the governments manifesto promise. In a public survey commissioned by the CPRE, 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB.  |
| PR-B-0240 | Mrs Carole          | Walton     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is mainly unspoilt countryside, well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. I question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.                              |
| PR-B-0241 | Richard             | Walton     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is mainly unspoilt countryside, well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.                                |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole              | Pack       |              | 16           |                         |               | No they are sites identified by developers who's interest is profit.   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | 16           |                         |               | The summary leaflet mislead us by incorrectly repeating Q15 for Q16. In Question 15 we explain why we find areas A and B unreasonable.   |
| PR-B-0641 | J                   | Willoughby |              | 16           |                         |               | No, cannot agree that the proposals are reasonable as they all invade valuable open space.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen      |              | 16           |                         |               | GB must not be touched, it is there for a good reason. Smaller sites must be considered and if there are empty houses within Oxford, as reported by the press, they need to be used. Constant expansion in any form is not sustainable and development in other centres within Oxfordshire and surrounding counties must be considered. As some data is unsubstantiated there needs to be good data in order to make good decisions.               |
| PR-B-0648 | Patricia            | Perisi     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to the proposed development of 4,400 houses on GB, which should be protected. Have lived in Kidlington 80 years and do not want to see my village joined to Oxford and lose its character. The development will destroy the countryside and wildlife and bring chaos to the area. Traffic is already heavy and the doctors surgery at capacity   |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber     |              | 16           |                         |               | It is essential to consider all of the options, but not to accept them all.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley    |              | 16           |                         |               | No, our countryside is what sets England apart form other countries. We need to retain a home for wildlife.  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley    |              | 16           |                         |               | No, far too large.   |
| PR-B-0670 | Mary                | Phipps     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Questions the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0671 | David      | Phipps     |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0673 | Joyce M    | Morris     |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB which will result in north Oxford becoming one large urban sprawl. The historic nature of Oxford as a city will be destroyed. The government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0682 | Felicity   | Peacock    |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0695 | Mark       | Bale       |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Question the assumptions on job growth in Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J          | Kershaw    | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 16           |                         |               | No. See response to Q2. There should be a county wide approach to meeting Oxford's needs without the need to build on the green belt.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick       | Small      | Stagecoach   | 16           |                         |               | The Council has been generous and very conservative in its acceptance of the fullest range of promotions within the District as representing reasonable alternatives.   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn     | Phillips   |  | 16           |                         |               | Do you not mean "areas of interest". This is not a problem as none of them have been selected yet.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony    | Matthews   | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 16           |                         |               | Agreed  |
| PR-B-0712 | Sonya      | Willoughby |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA         | Humphreys  | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 16           |                         |               | Note that Yarnton is within Area A having been identified as the most sustainable broad location for identifying sites. Whilst acknowledging the need for an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, are concerned that no such proposals are in place in advance of the site selection process.  |
| PR-B-0728 | Verity     | Westgate   |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. Concerns with healthcare as existing GP surgeries are already stretched in Kidlington. |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation              | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0729 | Tamara           | Lucas     |                           | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the green belt for reasons given in response to Q9. It is based on incorrect assumptions about jobs growth. Alternatives would include making better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead.  |
| PR-B-0736 | Kieran           | Ward      |                           | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-0739 | G                | Gelder    |                           | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-0742 | Keith and Hilary | Prince    |                           | 16           |                         |               | No. Too many are in GB. GB is a permanent designation. Government guidelines state that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The governments manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect GB must be observed. Unable to sustain large number of new houses. Local councils should refuse permission for new businesses, making incentives in other areas of the county where there is a need. Oxford area at full capacity, increased population into the area would be a disaster for Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John             | Tremlett  |                           | 16           |                         |               | No opinion   |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian           | Scargill  | Oxford Green Belt Network | 16           |                         |               | Oxford Green Belt Network object to development in areas A and B as it would involve development in the GB. GB is intended to be a permanent destination only to be changed in exceptional circumstances. They do not think the overall levels of growth are unnecessarily high and alternatives to development in the GB are available; therefore consider that exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify development in the GB and that Options A and B are not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-0749 | Dr and Mrs M     | Wallace   |                           | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the GB. Proposal to develop in the GB is based on incorrect assumptions about the growth of jobs in Oxford. Alternatives to building in the GB, such as previously developed land in Oxford and those proposed as employment sites in the city. Not reasonable to develop with the GB.   |
| PR-B-0750 | Niels            | van Kuijk |                           | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |



| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname     | Organisation                                    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0752 | Keeley        | Middleditch |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld. Proposal based incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.                      |
| PR-B-0754 | Philippa Jane | Nelson      |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB for reasons outlined in question 1. Proposal based on questionable assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-0755 | Martin        | Palmer      |   | 16           |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-0757 | Martin        | Palmer      |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-0759 | R L           | Davies      |   | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development of GB. There are alternatives a least a few hundred metres away from some of the sites under consideration. If Oxford needs new housing why don't they build houses in the 'northern gateway area', rather than rely on the surrounding communities.  |
| PR-B-0764 | Steven        | Daggitt     |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve         | Pickles     | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd | 16           |                         |               | Yes. Given the housing is needed to meet Oxford's unmet need, it is considered that options in the GB close to Oxford must be considered reasonable.   |
| PR-B-0776 | Anthony       | East        |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname  | Organisation                             | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0779 | David C         | Hinde    | Hinde Law Ltd                            | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Yarnton has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. More rigorous evidence is required by Oxford City.  |
| PR-B-0782 | Andrew and Emma | Mundy    |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane            | Olds     | Caversfield Parish Council               | 16           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip          | Morley   | North Oxford Golf Club                   | 16           |                         |               | Consideration of Green Belt and recreational areas is appropriate, and the unique position of the NOGC site between Kidlington and Oxford means that the importance given to preservation of the Green Belt and of recreational facilities on this site should be paramount. Note that the land of Oxford Golf Club (previously Southfield GC) was, to quote from Section 4.4 of the 2010 Inspector's Report, "rightly excluded" by Oxford City from its Core Strategy because of its "importance in recreational terms". Believe that NOGC's location and role provides even stronger arguments for its continued role as Green Belt and as a recreational facility. Have highlighted the importance of NOGC as an important leisure facility in North Oxford and in the Green Belt, promoting active life after retirement, prominent feature of Cherwell's green infrastructure network, publicity in BBC, endorsement by Barrack Obama, etc. in their representation. |
| PR-B-0796 | David           | Tighe    |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development of the GB. Development on GB based on assumptions of the growth of jobs in Oxford. Alternatives should be sites proposed as areas of employment. Cutteslowe Park has not been considered. This park is a very important green space.   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian             | Sheppard |  | 16           |                         |               | Areas of search completely unreasonable   |
| PR-B-0807 | Justin          | Scroggie |  | 16           |                         |               | No. Some justification for new homes around transport links north of Cutteslowe, no justification for building on GB, when Oxford has land available. Kidlington is a result of massive ribbon development, far better to create new ribbon developments around small villages.   |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris           | Robbins  |  | 16           |                         |               | No further comments   |
| PR-B-0809 | Karen           | Selway   |  | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB, this conflicts with the GB policy. The figures area based on the incorrect assumptions of the growth of jobs in Oxford. Recalculation of these figures is required.  |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam            | Ryder    | Gladman Developments Ltd                 | 16           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan            | Dobson   |  | 16           |                         |               | No. See the points above about the GB and particularly Cutteslowe Park  |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus          | Campbell | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group | 16           |                         |               | Note that the more remote or rural areas pose additional challenges due to distance from existing surgeries, and lack of sustainable options for new local surgeries. Have provided a detailed response in a separate statement as part of their representation.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard         | Hills    |  | 16           |                         |               | Yes   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0833 | Cas        | Lester        |  | 16           |                         |               | Do not. Building homes near the new Oxford Parkway station is likely to attract a significant influx of commuters to London. This will do nothing to help meet the needs of Oxford City's unmet housing need. Additionally, this influx will inevitably increase house prices in the area and make them unaffordable to local people. Placing 4,400 homes in the Kidlington area would almost double the size of the village. Clearly the schools won't be able to absorb the additional children – so it's likely new schools will also have to be built. Existing local health services will also be overstretched and again, either new health practises will need to be built, or existing ones extended.   |
| PR-B-0834 | Eleanor    | Williamson    |  | 16           |                         |               | No. Virtually all areas of search in Cherwell are within GB. There are no circumstances under which housing development in GB can be considered 'reasonable'. Consideration should be given to brownfield sites and the redevelopment of developed sites. Not on the GB. Oxford City is creating false pressure on the GB by reserving its own sites for commercial development. These should be used for residential development, like Northern Gateway, in Oxford's own boundary.   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike       | Gilbert       | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd                                | 16           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard    | Cutler        | Bloombridge LLP  | 16           |                         |               | Yes, they are reasonable. Area A is preferable by a significant margin. The Kidlington Gap and Begbroke Gap must be added to Table 16 as constraints as these are fundamental to the integrity of the GB. Also political constraints.   |
| PR-B-0857 | Mark       | Christodoulou |  | 16           |                         |               | No. If Kidlington is to absorb the new houses, it should be restricted to existing brown belt areas. Will the local residents be able to afford these new houses. Makes sense to build closer to business areas before sacrificing GB. Protect our much loved open countryside, it makes Oxfordshire a beautiful place to work and live. Cherwell need to prevent and resist the pressure of Oxford City turning the area into unsightly urban sprawl. CDC should go back to Oxford Growth Board and demand a re-assessment of the numbers after Oxford City have agreed to build more houses instead of white elephant business estates.   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim        | Perkins       | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | 16           |                         |               | No comment at this stage.   |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter      | Nicholson     |  | 16           |                         |               | Strongly objects to CDC proposing to build houses in its area to meet City's 'unmet housing need' and on the GB for many reasons that have been discussed in the response to previous questions. Reiterates that the areas of search A and B are unviable and unreasonable for development for reasons discussed in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt       | Todd          |  | 16           |                         |               | No. Absolutely not GB should not be considered. Favourable inclination to areas A and B which are in the GB. Imperative that GB is preserved. These are not exceptional circumstance when many options available.   |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer   | McFadden      |  | 16           |                         |               | Totally opposed to the development of the GB which is unreasonable. Encroachment of this area already with the Northern Gateway development. GB's aim is to protect undeveloped areas from becoming urban sprawl. GB provides open spaces and footpaths that many residents use and it's important for mental well-being. Sites PR38 and PR50 would join Kidlington to Oxford becoming one large urban area. Circumstance do not justify the use of GB. Health concerns linked with busy roads and dementia. A public survey by CPRE Oxfordshire finds 76% of Oxfordshire residents want GB to be protected. Site PR50 has a footpath and bridleway that would disappear. Views at Cutteslowe Park would be affected, with decreased air quality due to more cars in the area. The figure is based on assumptions, why aren't Oxford addressing their own issues. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0873 | Jenyth     | Worsley |                            | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to the development in the GB. Object very strongly to the development in the Oxford GB. GB was set up to prevent urban sprawl, which is now threatened. The green lung between Oxford and Kidlington has been there since after the war. Oxford is a historic city and should not be allowed to sprawl towards the north. Do not accept that exceptional circumstances exist to justify housing on GB close to Oxford. Over 76% of Oxfordshire residents want to protect the GB from housing. Assumptions to the job growth in Oxford. Alternatives to GB like employment sites. The effect on Cutteslowe Park has not be considered, its an important green space that needs protecting.                              |
| PR-B-0877 | David      | Flavin  | Oxfordshire County Council | 16           |                         |               | Agrees that Areas of Search within Greenbelt would be reasonable if they are related to transport corridors.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds    | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 16           |                         |               | Unable to respond - Insufficient time to consider the issues in detail   |
| PR-B-0880 | Rhiannon   | Davies  |                            | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.                   |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia      | Trowles |                            | 16           |                         |               | No. Do not agree that the release of GB land is reasonable to provide for Oxford's housing needs. Purpose of GB is there to constrain the expansion of a town or city so that it retains the distinctive character and setting of surrounding communities. Highly value the open countryside, wildlife, recreational activities and quality of live that the GB provides. Do not want to experience increased air, light and noise pollution.  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter      | Trowles |                            | 16           |                         |               | No. Do not agree that the release of GB land is reasonable to provide for Oxford's housing needs. Purpose of GB is there to constrain the expansion of a town or city so that it retains the distinctive character and setting of surrounding communities. Highly value the open countryside, wildlife, recreational activities and quality of live that the GB provides. Do not want to experience increased air, light and noise pollution.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul       | Buckley |                            | 16           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris      | Dicks   |                            | 16           |                         |               | No, the impact on the GB will be severe and highly detrimental to Kidlington and Yarnton with very little local benefit. Oxford must try harder to accommodate housing within its boundaries. The concept of sustainability should be incompatible with building on GB which provides benefits for health, well-being, recreation and tourism. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to build on GB which seems to be contradicted in the consultation paper.   |
| PR-B-0891 | Katherine  | Simpson |                            | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0892 | Richard                | Simpson  |                        | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |                        | 16           |                         |               | Yes, with the exceptions specified above.  |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |                        | 16           |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-0902 | Vanessa                | Pinder   |                        | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-0904 | Jill                   | Grain    |                        | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, to build here would destroy the villages identity along with Yarnton and Begbroke if site PR20 were developed. Footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Building on GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. CDC adopted the Local Plan to protect GB. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council | 16           |                         |               | Options A and B appear to be the most sustainable and suitable   |
| PR-B-0906 | Steve and Anne         | Handsley |                        | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Kidlington has grown from a small village to one of the largest in the county. It has contributed significantly to the housing growth in the CDC area. Further growth will allow it to lose its character. The green corridor between Kidlington and Oxford needs to be maintained. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton   |                        | 16           |                         |               | Those in the green belt are not reasonable save where very limited housing numbers can support local communities.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall   | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 16           |                         |               | Strongly objects to development in the GB, which exists to protect the historic city and equally acts as a 'green lung' providing opportunities for recreation for the local communities. Set out the purpose of the GB around Oxford which they support. They discuss in more detail the benefits of the GB and believe that alternatives to development in the GB exist to justify development in the GB. Options A and B are therefore specifically not reasonable, although given the high growth levels already committed by Cherwell they do not consider any further land allocation necessary in the GB for reasons of serious harm to it. Object to area of land in A and B and consider it excessive to the housing requirement, and would co-join Oxford, Kidlington and Woodstock making a mockery of the GB and adversely affecting the environment of thousands of local inhabitants. How can this be reasonable? |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux   | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 16           |                         |               | Development that is intended to meet the Duty to Cooperate, areas of search too far from Oxford will not meet these needs and will only contribute to the District's general housing requirement. Development of previously used land within the GB can be considered to be capable of meeting the City's needs without adverse impact on the character and openness of the Oxford GB. Areas outside the GB within Cherwell would be significantly further from the City and thus not ideally placed to meet Oxford's unmet needs.  |
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric    | Sidebottom |  | 16           |                         |               | No. Object strongly to development on GB. Do not accept that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the need. GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford is an unspoilt green lung with footpaths that is appreciated by local residents. It's there to protect historic Oxford. Public survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, 76% of Oxfordshire residents are in favour to protect GB. Assumptions about Oxford's job growth, there are alternatives such as sites that are proposed for employment being used for housing. The effect's to Cutteslowe Park has not been taken into consideration, important space it needs protecting.  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds       | Fringford Parish Council   | 16           |                         |               | Transport is a key issue and should exclude some of the potential sites listed above (restricted to Options A and B)  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle      | Greenlight Developments  | 16           |                         |               | Lengthy response provided. Other opportunities outside the GB should be assessed in the first instance and if appropriate explored further or discounted, before the release of land from the GB is considered. The release of GB should only be considered where all other opportunities for delivering sustainable growth have been exhausted.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone      |  | 16           |                         |               | No, do not fully agree with the weighting and assessment of areas of search considered. The observations for areas A and B are unreasonable as they are deliberately selective and unbalanced in their conclusions. There is no justification for selection of sites in Kidlington and North Oxford where GB will be destroyed and journey times to Oxford exacerbated through extra development. Indeed there is no tangible gain for potential 'low cost' housing occupants.  |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo   |  | 16           |                         |               | No do not. Believe that the GB must be protected.   |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk       | Banbury Civic Society  | 16           |                         |               | Given the extent of the requirement, the Search Area goes above and beyond the need of the requirement.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small      | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 16           |                         |               | Note that the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report concludes that all of the Areas of Search would have significant negative effects in relation to SA Objective 9: "To protect, enhance and make accessible for enjoyment, the historic environment." This is most unfortunate and must beg the question whether further development in any of the Areas would be truly sustainable. Disagree with the general proposition that GB options should be considered Have provided a more detailed statement in response to this question in their representation.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M          | O'Mahoney  |  | 16           |                         |               | Strongly objects to development in the GB. He considers that the growth figures are based on inaccurate assumptions and considers that there are alternatives to housing development in the GB including making better use of previously developed land and using proper employment sites in the city for housing instead.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0963 | Mr and Mrs | Shepherd |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington. has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB more consideration needs to be given to brownfield sites. |
| PR-B-0967 | Eileen     | Bloomer  |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-0983 | Suzanne    | Morris   |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to building in the GB. GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford is an unspoilt green lung with footpaths that is appreciated by local residents. It's there to protect historic Oxford. Do not accept that exceptional circumstances exist to justify the need. Public survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, 76% of Oxfordshire residents are in favour to protect GB and housing is seen as it's greatest threat. Assumptions about Oxford's job growth, there are alternatives such as sites that are proposed for employment being used for housing. The effect on Cutteslowe Park has not been taken into consideration, an important space which needs protecting.  |
| PR-B-0996 | Lucy       | Smith    |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-0997 | George     | Thomas   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0998 | Lisa         | Coulling      |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. GB is there to protect against unrestricted urban sprawl of large built up areas. If built upon between Kidlington and Oxford we become consumed and lose our village identity. Building between Kidlington, Yarnton, Thrupp and Begbroke four villages become one town. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth         | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council   | 16           |                         |               | Supports selection of sites that are south west, south and south east of Kidlington, as close as possible to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver       | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   | 16           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1032 | David        | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford          | 16           |                         |               | The SA should include all reasonable alternatives, on a precautionary basis it can therefore include all areas of search. It is considered however that locations closest to Oxford are clearly best placed to provide a sustainable strategy therefore initial assessment correctly eliminates those locations remote from the City.   |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert       | Davies        | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace | 16           |                         |               | Increased supply of housing to meet Oxford's need is critical to drive economic growth in Oxford and the wider County. If housing is to meet the needs of Oxford, then it must be well related to the City with good access to markets and hubs in the City. It is important that travel times to areas of employment are also considered as part of the 'area of search' so as to ensure that housing development does not materially increase the time taken to travel to work, impacting upon creating economic efficiency and quality of life. Area of Search A is most closely related and better connected to Oxford than any other areas. Therefore, they consider that housing option in Area A should be thoroughly explored and either taken forward or discounted before housing options in the other area of search is considered.  |
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret | Sidebottom    |  | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB., this is not accepted as exceptional circumstances. Aim of GB is to prevent urban sprawl with land permanently open. GB between Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. A public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. Assumptions about Oxford's job growth, there are alternatives such as sites that are proposed for employment being used for housing. The effect's to Cutteslowe Park has not been taken into consideration, important space it needs protecting.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson         |  | 16           |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land like at the former air base at RAF Upper Heyford, be affordable and house the current population first.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1040 | Robert     | Dyson     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1046 | William    | Hodgson   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB policy is to specifically prevent urban sprawl, land kept open and not covered with concrete and tarmac which kills the soil. GB between Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt farmed countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Do not accept the justification to build on the GB close to Oxford. A public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. Cutteslowe Park has not been considered, it's an important green space that needs protecting. |
| PR-B-1049 | Maria      | Page      |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1052 | Andrew     | Mundy     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1053 | David      | Hemingway |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1054 | Bharat and Jankee | Badiani   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1055 | Philippa          | Mullineux |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford Green Belt as stated in response to question 9. The proposal to develop in the Green Belt is based on incorrect assumptions about the growth in jobs in Oxford. There are alternatives to housing development in the Green Belt including making better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. For example, the use of the Pear Tree Park and Ride site, which is likely to shortly be decommissioned. This would provide better transport links with Oxford, and would avoid the congestion of the Oxford Ring Road.   |
| PR-B-1056 | Simon             | Parker    |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of overdevelopment. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1057 | Julie             | Walters   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1058 | Kim               | Bennell   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of overdevelopment. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1065 | J                 | Bevis     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1069 | JP              | Lyes      |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Assumptions on job growth in Oxford questioned.  |
| PR-B-1073 | Susan           | Simms     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1073 | Susan           | Simms     |              | 16           |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-1079 | JW              | Fresen    |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1080 | Mr and Mrs      | Horne     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxfordshire are questioned.   |
| PR-B-1081 | Lynn            | Pilgrim   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1082 | Nicholas Edward | Mullineux |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The Pear Tree Park and Ride site which is likely to be decommissioned could be used. Assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned. |
| PR-B-1085 | Susan M         | Rugg      |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1088 | Bryan           | Rugg      |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1089 | Dave            | Bevis     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname | Organisation                    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|---------|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F         | Hickman | Middleton Stoney Parish Council | 16           |                         |               | Transport issues are fundamental to sustainability. Agree that options in the Green Belt and close to Oxford must be considered to be reasonable given that the unmet housing need identified is surely an 'exceptional circumstance'.  |
| PR-B-1097 | Caroline         | Hayes   |                                 | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the GB which provides a green lung to the city and helps protect our historical city from excessive development. There are alternative sites where the quality of life would be better for new home owners and would have better access to areas of employment.   |
| PR-B-1098 | Michael          | Bott    |                                 | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposals based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan             | Storah  | Oxford City Council             | 16           |                         |               | Agrees that the sites in search areas A and B would appear to be by far and away the most 'reasonable' areas of search.   |
| PR-B-1100 | Katherine        | Andrews |                                 | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to any development on GB which is an area enjoyed by local residents and important to wildlife. It protects Oxford from overdevelopment and serves as a flood plain which must be taken into account. The GB is a permanent designation and the government's manifesto promise and CDC's policy to protect it must be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on jobs growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1101 | Catherine        | Dobson  |                                 | 16           |                         |               | No, disagree. Object strongly to development on GB which is there to limit urban development and keep open spaces. GB is well used and a vital breathing space, in a survey commissioned by CPRE 76% of Oxfordshire residents wish to keep the GB. It should only be encroached upon in exceptional circumstance which don't exist at present. The proposal is based on questionable assumptions about development of employment in Oxford. Areas proposed for employment should be re-designated to housing.   |
| PR-B-1105 | Norman and Janet | Bates   |                                 | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson |                                 | 16           |                         |               | How will several hundred houses on the edge of Oxford reduce air pollution (7.35 and 7.39)?   |
| PR-B-1123 | Paul             | Mayhook |                                 | 16           |                         |               | Although Oxford's unmet housing demands need to be met, GB should only be used as a last resort.  |
| PR-B-1127 | David            | Betts   |                                 | 16           |                         |               | Object in principle to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. The proposal to develop in the GB is based on incorrect assumptions about the growth in jobs and there are alternative to using GB. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered as should the Northern Gateway. Banbury and Bicester could meet Oxford's unmet needs with strengthened rail links.  |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward    | Kidlington Development Watch    | 16           |                         |               | Strongly objects to development in the GB for its role in providing green space for Kidlington and its function as Oxfordshire Green Belt.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname    | Organisation             | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------------|------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1134 | Neil               | McKendrick |                          | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.   |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan               | Lodwick    |                          | 16           |                         |               | Search Areas A and B are almost entirely within the GB. CDC's Local Plan Part 1 includes Policy ESD 14 to maintain the GB. It was designated to restrain development which could damage the character of Oxford City and its heritage through increased activity, traffic and the outward sprawl of the urban area. GB provides a well used and appreciated space for people from a wide area. The rep refers to Q1 and questions the need for development and its justification.  |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard            | Bennett    |                          | 16           |                         |               | Ambrosden and Blackthorn areas – this land is not currently productive and has potentially good railway links.   |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim                | Spencer    |                          | 16           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey            | Wright     | Begbroke Parish Council  | 16           |                         |               | Strongly objects to the Areas of Search and development in the Green Belt. Do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances' for making alterations to the Green Belt boundaries.  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles   | Lewis      |                          | 16           |                         |               | No, for the reason outlined in other questions. Any areas of search within the Green Belt are not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger              | Bellamy    | Hornton Parish Council   | 16           |                         |               | 3 SA objectives (3, 6, and 10) would not be met by removing Oxford's housing needs to other districts. Pollution and road congestion would increase, few sites would have sufficient access to all services and facilities and supporting current high housing prices in Oxford by reduced building plans would not reduce overall poverty or social exclusion.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi               | Stokes     | Persimmon Homes Midlands | 16           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis              | Davies     |                          | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Assumptions on job growth in Oxford questioned.   |
| PR-B-1175 | Clare              | Cooper     |                          | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned. |
| PR-B-1176 | Laura              | Pritchard  |                          | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned. |
| PR-B-1177 | Sandra and Richard | Tyrrell    |                          | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford is questioned.         |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1182 | Alison             | Noel     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object to development on the Oxford GB which aims to prevent urban sprawl and keep land permanently open. The GB around Kidlington is well used and enjoyed by many, a survey commissioned by the CPRE showed 76% of Oxfordshire wished to protect it. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment and exceptional circumstances to justify building on it don't exist. Cutteslowe Park is an important green space and should be protected. The proposal is based on questionable assumptions about jobs growth. Sites allocated for employment within the city should be used.   |
| PR-B-1186 | Christina          | Miskin   |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1187 | Nigel              | Homent   |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol              | Matheson |              | 16           |                         |               | No, they are not reasonable as they are based on flawed unverified assumptions. Brownfield sites need including.  |
| PR-B-1192 | Robert             | Selway   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The proposal is based on incorrect assumptions about the growth in jobs and figures need recalculating taking into account Brexit. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. It is not reasonable to develop in the GB as it will be in conflict with GB policy which checks unrestricted sprawl and prevents towns merging together.  |
| PR-B-1207 | Douglas and Louise | Lloyd    |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. Assumptions about predicted job growth in Oxford are questioned.   |
| PR-B-1213 | Fleur              | Hodgson  |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions about predicted job growth in Oxford are questioned.   |
| PR-B-1216 | Christine          | Lodge    |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions about predicted job growth in Oxford are questioned. When plans to extend St Mary's church were considered a few years ago it was found to be a risk to flooding, any development would be the same. |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1221 | Martin          | Perisi    |   | 16           |                         |               | No, the GB should be protected. See general comments  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa         | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council                                | 16           |                         |               | Does not agree that all the areas of search being considered is reasonable  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul            | Butt      | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd   | 16           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew          | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm     | 16           |                         |               | Given the partial review is to address Oxford's unmet need, it is not logical to assign growth to the northern parts of the District. Growth should be concentrated around Oxford in locations with good transport links.   |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard         | Silvester |   | 16           |                         |               | No. Exceptional circumstances to allow development on GB do not exist. The levels of predicted growth are unnecessarily high and there are alternatives within the city rather than use GB. In particular the impact on Cutteslowe Park as an important green space has not been considered.  |
| PR-B-1231 | Prof J M        | Baker     |   | 16           |                         |               | No. Strongly object to development in the GB. The proposed development is based on questionable assumptions about the growth of jobs in Oxford, and in practice would be likely to be occupied by commuters working elsewhere. Alternatives, especially the use of non-greenfield land, and the use of proposed employment sites for housing, should be exploited instead.  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon           | Gamage    | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt    | 16           |                         |               | Generally agrees that Areas of Search are reasonable. Concerned at the focus on Areas A and B at this early stage. Questions whether all the unmet need can be accommodated in those areas and would support a dispersed distribution arrangement in that event. Notes that the focus of the SA is on Areas A and B only. Considers Area H to have potential to meet a proportion of Oxford's unmet needs.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed              | Barrett   | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd | 16           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard         | Boother   | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies   | 16           |                         |               | Yes, although as noted in response to Q9 would question whether realistically sites within some of the more remote rural areas to the north of the District will be a sustainable way of meeting Oxford's unmet housing need.   |
| PR-B-1241 | Beverley        | Kwan      |   | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions about predicted job growth in Oxford are questioned. |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera       | Kantor    |   | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to the irreversible destruction of the GB, which covers the whole of the area under consideration on the basis of untested and unsubstantiated "needs" of Oxford City. The City should exhaust its own brownfield sites before looking further afield.  |
| PR-B-1245 | Jason and Petra | Tyrell    |   | 16           |                         |               | No, strongly disagree with large scale development within the GB which was set up to protect the city and the surrounding villages.   |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan           | Silvester |   | 16           |                         |               | No. Exceptional circumstances to allow development on GB do not exist. The levels of predicted growth are unnecessarily high and there are alternatives within the city rather than use GB. In particular the impact on Cutteslowe Park as an important green space has not been considered.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation                  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard |                               | 16           |                         |               | No. Absolutely do not agree with this. Isn't the point of GB policy to protect open areas to prevent the spread of Urban areas ? This proposal is totally contrary to this principle. The area between Oxford and Kidlington is beautiful countryside which is good for our health. There aren't enough areas like this, so to develop on this area will impact on many people's lives. Cannot think of any exceptional circumstances to build on the GB. What would the impact be on this historic area, GB helps to protect against development pressure and needs to be maintained. A public survey shows that 76% of the public are in favour of protecting GB, public views need to be considered. There are incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There has been a failure to consider alternative sites such as brownfield areas. The impacts to GB and Cutteslowe Park hasn't been considered. Added pressure with local infrastructure, schools, hospitals etc.   |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola     | Mallows  | Gresswell Environmental Trust | 16           |                         |               | All sites earmarked for development within the GB are inappropriate unless brownfield. Development is contrary to the NPPF – there are no exceptional circumstances to justify either A or B. Islip has a brownfield site. The density of housing should neither swamp nor overshadow the existing village . and infrastructure (used by villages along the B4027 –doctors, school) should be supplemented before any new housing is to be considered. The narrow bridge at Islip is crucial to keeping the traffic level on B4027 to cars only, and will help keep surrounding villages rural and quiet.  |
| PR-B-1257 | Charles    | Fletcher |                               | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The fundamental aim of GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. I do not accept that this is exceptional circumstance to justify building on GB close to Oxford. A survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, shows 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. Proposal based on questionable assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. The effects to Cutteslowe Park which is a important green space used by residents and beyond which needs protecting has not been taken into consideration. |
| PR-B-1258 | Hilary     | Fletcher |                               | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The fundamental aim of GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Do not accept that this is exceptional circumstance to justify building on GB close to Oxford. A survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, shows 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. Proposal based on questionable assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. The effects to Cutteslowe Park which is a important green space used by residents and beyond which needs protecting has not been taken into consideration.   |
| PR-B-1259 | Mircea     | Popa     |                               | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The fundamental aim of GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. Do not accept that this is exceptional circumstance to justify building on GB close to Oxford. A survey by CPRE Oxfordshire, shows 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. Proposal based on questionable assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. The effects to Cutteslowe Park which is a important green space used by residents and beyond which needs protecting has not been taken into consideration.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname             | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard            |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB which is contrary to the fundamental aim of GB policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. Oxford is an area of great historic interest and has a wealth of extraordinary buildings. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. I do not accept that this is exceptional circumstance to justify building on GB close to Oxford. The CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. Consideration has not been given to the impact to these developments on the City of Oxford or to Cutteslowe Park. Cutteslowe Park is a important green space used by residents and beyond which needs protecting. |
| PR-B-1263 | Katie      | Silvester           |   | 16           |                         |               | No. Do not consider exceptional circumstance exist enough to develop on GB. The level of predicted growth is high and there are alternatives within the city that need to be explored, rather than using GB. The effect to Cutteslowe Park as an important green space has not been considered.   |
| PR-B-1264 | Drs        | Slater and Harrison |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Green spaces are essential to people's wellbeing. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1266 | Linda      | Ward                |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. GB can only be developed if it has been demonstrated that a valid exceptional need exist. , Oxford's unmet target is not a real, immediate or proven need. GB should be excluded from the search area. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells               | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 16           |                         |               | Agrees with areas A and B as 'reasonable alternative site options'. It does not consider that adequate assessment of other alternatives has been undertaken before discarding them, or that due regard has been had to the importance of protecting the Green Belt.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation                            | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1271 | Rebecca    | Hodgson  |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. The aim of GB is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. GB around Kidlington and Oxford has unspoilt countryside, acts as a green lung, with footpaths and green spaces enjoyed by many. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over-development. Do not accept exceptional circumstances exist to justify this. A public survey commissioned by the CPRE Oxfordshire 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the GB with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat. Cutteslowe Park will be effected with housing right at the edges of the park, changing its character for residents and visitors. Proposal is based on questionable assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives such as using employment sites instead. The effect to Cutteslowe Park has not been considered, this is an important green space that needs to be protected. |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling |   | 16           |                         |               | No. Most are too remote and would need a new enlarged workable transport system to support these. Residents daily commute to work would be effected and gridlock would be aggravated on the Oxford Road in Kidlington, which is experienced already during rush hours.   |
| PR-B-1275 | Dagmar     | Carr     |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1276 | John       | Carr     |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1278 | Helena     | Boyce    |   | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes | 16           |                         |               | Have no comments at this stage, but do however reserve the right to comment on this topic in the future.   |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes   | West Oxfordshire District Council       | 16           |                         |               | No objection to the approach adopted which appears to be exhaustive. The Local Plans of local planning authorities in Oxfordshire are at different stages in their processes. It is for each Council to set out what the reasonable alternatives are.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname               | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha    | Blackmore             | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family | 16           |                         |               | There are a number of Service villages (category A) which have been included within Area I remainder of district/ rural dispersal which have the capacity to accommodate more housing than originally proposed in the Local Plan. As identified in the Areas of Search table Adderbury is within the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area, is connected to the established rural road network and wider infrastructure, and has a "cluster" relationship with existing villages and services.   |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy                 | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd    | 16           |                         |               | The areas of search are reasonable for the purposes of making a full assessment of all development options in the district, but as set out above are of the opinion that Area of Search A is the most sustainable to accommodate Oxford's unmet need.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn               |  | 16           |                         |               | No. The reasoning behind the categorization of GB areas as 'reasonable' to be specious. The SHMA demonstrates that additional building on GB land would be unnecessary in terms of addressing overall housing need, ineffective in fully addressing affordable housing need and unsustainable. Considering also the obvious damage to GB purposes, consideration of these areas is utterly unreasonable.   |
| PR-B-1300 | Julia      | Hammett               |  | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to building on the GB around Kidlington which is unspoilt and open countryside. A terrible legacy will be left if you proceed to develop. The proposals have been based on assumptions of job growth in Oxford. Oxford have failed to find ways to provide for their needs. They need to look at the refurbishment of empty houses, efficient use of developed land with multi storey accommodation. The building of Westgate shopping centre seemed to take precedence over the needs of the residents, this should have been used for housing. Cherwell should say no and stand up to protect the GB.  |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk                | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust     | 16           |                         |               | Disagree, but consider that sites PR23 and PR24 relate well to the requirements of the Assessment. However, the scoring does not appear to properly reflect this and should be updated in the light of the sustainable location of the Sites, with particular regard to proximity to Oxford and location within the A44 corridor.  |
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria   | Campbell              |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1309 | Kate       | Miklaszewska-Gorczyca |  | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname            | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1310 | Tara              | Prayag             |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington and Gosford has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces which is equivalent to Oxford City's many parks. which are enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Extra housing isn't a good reason to build on GB. If Kidlington and Gosford GB and park area and the golf course is classed as exceptional and under consideration why has this not been applied to Oxford City's parks and golf course. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives which have not been fully explored. Better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. Criticism about the lack of consultation with residents. |
| PR-B-1311 | Keith E           | Stratford          |              | 16           |                         |               | No do not. Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1312 | Carl              | Parker             |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. Cherwell have already identified there's no requirement to remove land from the Oxford GB for Cherwell's own needs, it is therefore its a contradiction to the original plans for Kidlington and its improvements. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1313 | Helen             | Broxap             |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1314 | Nicole and Eugene | Brooks and Griffin |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to this level of development in the Oxford GB. Do not consider the areas of search as being reasonable. Understand the need for development and this could be achieved on a much smaller scale and divided up over many smaller sites that would be in keeping with the character, natural landscape and preserving a way of life for local communities in Oxfordshire.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1315 | Joel       | Phipps        |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1316 | Christian  | Gilliam       |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1317 | Rachel     | Walton        |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in search areas A and B around Kidlington which are in GB which is a permanent designation. The GB around Kidlington is mainly pleasant, unspoilt countryside which is well used and enjoyed by many. The Government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered. The assumptions on predicted job growth in Oxford are questioned.  |
| PR-B-1318 | Laura      | Walton        |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to the developments in the Oxford GB. GB should not be built upon, it should be protected and not lost for ever. Wildlife habitats will be destroyed. Some of the areas are prone to flooding, development will make it worse and move it into other areas if there are no green run off areas. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. If there is an increase the road infrastructure isn't there. The housing will not be affordable for the local people, buy to let or London commuters will buy them and the prices will increase and be out of the reach of local residents who work in the area. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1319 | Mr and Mrs | Unwin         |              | 16           |                         |               | Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB and if the 'Kidlington Gap' between Oxford and Kidlington were to be developed it would merge the two communities which GB is designed to prevent. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered or areas beyond the GB such as Bicester and Upper Heyford. The GB should not be sacrificed in light of questionable housing forecasts and exceptional circumstances to use GB do not exist.   |
| PR-B-1320 | Vassilis   | Athanassoglou |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1321 | Catherine R | Mundell   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Why has no consideration been given to the unused brownfield site of the former fuel depot in Islip, it has good access to the A34 and trains to Oxford and Marylebone. This is far more sensible than the areas suggested. The emphasis in the plan is on greenfield development rather than brownfield sites. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1322 | Judy        | East      |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington should be sacrosanct it is enjoyed by a large number of local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Oxford City needs to be held accountable and manage their own housing needs and not expect the surrounding villages to take their over spill resulting in the destruction of the countryside which would result in a vast amount of wildlife lost. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1323 | Karen       | Suter     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.   |
| PR-B-1324 | Katie L     | Stratford |              | 16           |                         |               | No do not. Strongly object to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1325 | Richard     | Lodge     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents and visiting friends as a great fitness resource. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname         | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1326 | Jan and Chris | Lacey and Plant |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents and ramblers from near and far. Local walks feature in major publications recognising their access to the open countryside. GB protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. |
| PR-B-1327 | John          | Pilgrim         |              | 16           |                         |               | Strong object to development in the Oxford GB which is mainly attractive, unspoilt countryside, well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Previously developed land in Oxford and proposed employment sites should be considered, such as the Northern Gateway and Pear Tree Park and Ride.  |
| PR-B-1330 | N M           | O'Mahoney       |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1333 | Zoe           | Christodoulou   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1334 | Jenny         | Betts           |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1337 | Marcus         | Lloyd     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1338 | Philip         | Camp      |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB. GB around Begbroke and between Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld, infilling between villages is not acceptable.<br>Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB or the sites listed round the villages in North Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1339 | Dr Christopher | Wedge     |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents and myself for running and walking. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |
| PR-B-1340 | Sophia         | Argyris   |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Building in the area would make Oxford another over built up city like areas similar in London, losing its unique character and ruins it for many residents in the area. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. Living in this area during and after the development would become unpleasant, terrible traffic, overcrowding a general lack of public services etc. The infrastructure would not be able to cope. Would consider leaving the area. |
| PR-B-1341 | Olga Lascano   | Choperena |              | 16           |                         |               | Object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington. GB has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun          | Richards      | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                          | 16           |                         |               | Agree that in these very specific circumstances that these options are reasonable. However, they must be subject to justification through a thorough assessment of the sites against the 5 functions of the Green Belt required by the NPPF.  |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz            | Boden         | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                                | 16           |                         |               | Areas E, F, and H are already identified in the Cherwell Local Plan as area of growth. Areas C and G represent transport nodes rather than sustainable locations for development. Areas A and B are closest to Oxford and therefore merit assessment. But large parts are within the Green Belt. Allocation on a limited range of sites could lead to over reliance on locations within these options and would not provide flexibility or choice in the range of sites to provide Oxford's unmet housing need. |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank          | Vreede        |   | 17           | A ,E                    | PR14          | Cannot envisage how areas A or E could record any positive effects in any of the 11 objectives considered. Examples of this are detailed in the rep for site PR14.  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris          | Dicks         |   | 17           | A, B                    | PR20, PR34    | This rep refers to the full LUC initial sustainability report and has criticism of sections of it. There is a need to recognise the value of the countryside, GB and agricultural land. The importance of the canal for tourism and the need to preserve low light levels between Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton. The increase in pollution and congestion have not been assessed correctly.  |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline       | Johnson       |   | 17           | A, B                    |               | The selection of Areas A and B is based on providing new balanced communities that are well connected to Oxford. There is no evidence that you will be able to deliver well balanced communities, you have no power to ensure the balance of housing provided. Area B has a regular bus service to the City Centre but there is no comment on increasing the service at peak times and there is no service to Headington or Cowley employment centres.  |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark           | Schmull       | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 17           | B                       |               | Welcome the key findings of the areas of search which have identified Area B as performing best against the SA criteria. Area B should be the starting point as an area of search for suitable locations to meet development needs.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris          | Dicks         |   | 17           | C, E                    |               | Criticism of the score for SA16 given the good railway connections.   |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane           | Olds          | Fringford Parish Council  | 17           | E                       |               | Option E Bicester should be excluded on the grounds of inadequate transport links/sustainability challenges.  |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane           | Burrett       |   | 17           | G,C                     |               | Do not think that housing in Area C in the quadrants of J9 on M40 or Area G is sustainable for health reasons for existing residents and any future ones.   |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter          | Bateman       | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                                | 17           | I                       |               | Area I is a very broad area covering the majority of the District. This causes the conclusions of the SA to be unduly broad and strategic. Should more focused areas be assessed it is considered that a more robust conclusion and scoring system would result   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew         | Garraway      | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 17           |                         | PR39          | Detailed comments are made in response to this question. It includes a revised sustainability appraisal summary of Site PR39  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver         | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 17           |                         | PR41          | Yes. Pleased to see that Site 41 was considered under Area of Search Option A but can find no explanation as to why Site 41 was ruled out and other land favoured within the areas of search.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey        | Wright        | Begbroke Parish Council   | 17           |                         | PR49          | PR49 is a good suggestion for development.  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG | Oldfield      |   | 17           |                         | PR51          | The sustainability Proposal for PR51 puts too much emphasis on the number of houses and not enough on the damage to the environment.<br>The GB must be saved.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward         | Dowler        | Middle Aston Parish Meeting   | 17           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry          | Munday        |   | 17           |                         |               | Believe houses are already affordable.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia        | Hall          |   | 17           |                         |               | Complete scepticism.  |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony        | Hall          |   | 17           |                         |               | The "sustainability" assessment is ludicrously mistitled, since many of the criteria are about its opposite, economic growth. So the apparently green scores for many areas on many criteria are utterly misleading, simply allowing you to appear to justify choosing unsustainable areas by appearing to balance the red scores with spurious green ones.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname             | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0119 | C A                 | McCall              |  | 17           |                         |               | Not had time to examine all of the material to make comment.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val                 | Colby               | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                               | 17           |                         |               | As above. The area of search should continue to include Category A villages in area of search I.   |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth               |  | 17           |                         |               | There is a lot of detail that cannot not fully be digested. In essence it's about providing homes for working people in a community with good infrastructure of schools, doctors, recreational space.  |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings            |  | 17           |                         |               | Disagree with the criteria used in the assessment - 'access to services' and 'creating employment opportunities'. It is not clear why houses built in one area will create job opportunities. Further the strategy is meant to be addressing the problem of insufficient housing for existing people in Oxford, not creating jobs to encourage migration to the Oxford area. Regarding services, would expect that any development would include new services to support the extra housing, not add further strain on the existing services. |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright          |  | 17           |                         |               | The protection of the GB is the most important issue as laid down in the NPPF and committed to by the present government in its 2015 manifesto. There are no exceptional circumstances here to justify using the GB and losing well used countryside and protected wildlife habitats. The Interim Transport Assessment is deficient in foreseeing the transport problems which would result from major development around Kidlington without adequate infrastructure in place.   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen               |  | 17           |                         |               | Very vague in its comments and not based on accurate knowledge of the area. Traffic chaos and overwhelmed health and school services are of concern.   |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber              |  | 17           |                         |               | There is a real risk of creating a "metroland" which would not assist with the SA's laudable objective.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley             |  | 17           |                         |               | It is environmentally unacceptable that we are destroying all we have inherited. We are a village. Tourism will decline.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley             |  | 17           |                         |               | Too much traffic will cause gridlock, the same as Bicester.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw             | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 17           |                         |               | In relation to the specific objectives set out in para 7.40 of the Consultation Objectives 7, 8, and 9 would be redundant in the event of the proposed developments around Begbroke going ahead.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick                | Small               | Stagecoach   | 17           |                         |               | Agrees with the range of Strategic Objectives. A little concerned that transport and accessibility related criteria might have been applied a little more generously for some options with the result that some options emerge more positively than in practice is likely to be justifiable. Strongly agree that Areas A and B are the most sustainable locations.   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn              | Phillips            |  | 17           |                         |               | By building Kidlington into a town it will push up house prices that the essential workers will not be able to afford.   |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                  | Humphreys           | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 17           |                         |               | Note that Yarnton is within Area A having been identified as the most sustainable broad location for identifying sites. Whilst acknowledging the need for an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, are concerned that no such proposals are in place in advance of the site selection process.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John                | Tremlett            |  | 17           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0746 | Adrian              | White and 79 others | Petition with 80 signatories   | 17           |                         |               | GB land should only be released as a last resort and then only in phases and after proper testing of the economic assumptions as mentioned in their response to Question 1.  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve               | Pickles             | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 17           |                         |               | The SA represents a broad brush assessment and it is important for it to be supplemented by detailed site assessments. Some of the SA assessments are also suspect. E.g. Sites 20, 32 and 91. A justification for this statement is given in the rep.  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane                | Olds                | Caversfield Parish Council   | 17           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian                 | Sheppard            |  | 17           |                         |               | No consideration taken on the sustainability and effect for the areas of search  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris               | Robbins             |  | 17           |                         |               | No further comments  |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam                | Ryder               | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 17           |                         |               | No   |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne       | Mclvor   |  | 17           |                         |               | The strategy should be addressing the lack of housing not creating jobs to encourage migration to this area.   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan                   | Dobson   |  | 17           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus                 | Campbell | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group                                   | 17           |                         |               | Note that the more remote or rural areas pose additional challenges due to distance from existing surgeries, and lack of sustainable options for new local surgeries. Have provided a detailed response in a separate statement as part of their representation.   |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel                  | Buttler  |  | 17           |                         |               | There are concerns regarding the future of the Horton Hospital, with many of its services being transferred to the Oxford hospitals. Access to open spaces is becoming limited due to extent of housing development in rural areas.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard                | Hills    |  | 17           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0837 | David                  | Jackson  | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 17           |                         |               | The findings of the ISA for Area A are considered acceptable and appropriate to inform the Council's decision that strategic development sites within Area of Search A should proceed to site assessment.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike                   | Gilbert  | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 17           |                         |               | Yes - support  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex                   | Wilson   | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                         | 17           |                         |               | Detailed comments relating to the findings for Area of Search E are made, particularly those in Tables 7.1 and 7.2.  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler   | Bloombridge LLP  | 17           |                         |               | The focus on Oxford is noted. But the role of Kidlington appears to be a missed opportunity, not least in relation to social inclusion. In accommodating Oxford's unmet need there should be a suite of benefits for Kidlington, including regeneration.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David                  | Smith    |  | 17           |                         |               | None   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins  | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC                   | 17           |                         |               | Detailed comments are made on the SA particularly objective 2 (health and wellbeing), objective 10 (air quality and congestion), objective 5 (creating and sustaining vibrant communities), and objective 8 (landscape)  |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer               | McFadden |  | 17           |                         |               | No comment.  |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin   | Oxfordshire County Council   | 17           |                         |               | Supports objective 6 and 10 of the SA. It considers that Objective 2 is not at all clear. The impact of development on health and wellbeing is not clearly recognised.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds     | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 17           |                         |               | The criteria chosen in figure 10n does not adequately reflect the lack of public transport options for key workers who have to work unsocial hours.  |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |  | 17           |                         |               | Have no comments.  |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |  | 17           |                         |               | There has been insufficient time allowed by CDC for people to review the Sustainability Appraisal as well as the extensive main options paper.   |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar   |  | 17           |                         |               | This appraisal has clearly failed as it has identified locations already categorised by you as unsustainable as potential options.   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton   |  | 17           |                         |               | The study should consider the harmful physical and mental health effects of spending time during the week in either stationary or slow moving traffic. The study should look at the benefits of cycling.   |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew                 | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                       | 17           |                         |               | Concerned about the impact on Kidlington if areas A and B were developed. It will sacrifice the 'Green Belts' of Kidlington area and risk it becoming an Oxford suburb; destroying key recreational and nature conservation area of the River Cherwell.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 17           |                         |               | The SA does not make any reference to air pollution caused by the additional car journeys which will be generated from providing these extra homes. Oxford, because it is a major transport hub and being in a bowl surrounded by hills, already has a major problem with particulates and nitrogen oxide emissions. The pollution in the area close to the A34 should be closely monitored before any sort of housing development should be considered. Development further away from the harmful effects of air borne pollution around the A34 and the Oxford bypass would be beneficial, rather than adding to the problem. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd       | 17           |                         |               | Development at Shipton Quarry is capable of meeting all the 15 objectives. Rep makes comments relating to Objectives 1, 3, 6, 10, 16 and 17.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle         | Greenlight Developments  | 17           |                         |               | Lengthy response provided concentrating on the consideration of the objectives in the SA. Of the opinion that the initial selection of site options for testing should be extended to include Option E, particularly given the fact that this Option does not require the release of land from the GB.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone         |  | 17           |                         |               | The search areas have been selected due to a dubious relationship to Oxford, not because this is a better or more sustainable option. Economic projections are questionable and the resulting destruction to natural habitat is not justified and there are no acceptable exceptions. Local needs have to be understood and respected. Communities need good means of access with reduction in vehicle use while having good services, medical and education provision. Existing roads and facilities in North Oxford are overstretched and cannot cope. Development proposals do nothing to make the situation sustainable.            |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo      |  | 17           |                         |               | What has been said is very technical and detailed wording and have little or no effect.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council   | 17           |                         |               | Agrees with the SA assessments and suggests that any attempt to provide housing in and around Banbury to meet Oxford's needs would seriously compromise any attempts to meet these objectives.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group        | 17           |                         |               | Note that the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report concludes that all of the Areas of Search would have significant negative effects in relation to SA Objective 9: "To protect, enhance and make accessible for enjoyment, the historic environment." This is most unfortunate and must beg the question whether further development in any of the Areas would be truly sustainable. They discuss in more detail Table 5.1 and the purpose of GB in their representation.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council   | 17           |                         |               | Supports selection of sites that are south west, south and south east of Kidlington, as close as possible to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher       | Rosconn Group  | 17           |                         |               | An assessment of a further Option relating to locations around existing train stations outside Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington should be undertaken.   |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                                      | 17           |                         |               | Concerned that the SA does not adequately assess or compare the proposed areas of search and sites with respect to items of infrastructure that they are able and committed to deliver. This is a fundamental omission from the SA and in the case of New Alchester, means no account is taken of the location of the site across the railway line from Bicester to Oxford and our stated intention to deliver a new railway station there. The rep includes a comparative matrix that compares New Alchester against the other sites within the Areas of Search. This indicates a high score in comparison with other candidate sites. |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |  | 17           |                         |               | Has undertaken a detailed SA assessment of the sites in Areas A and B in response to question 11. Has provided a detailed response to this question.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David      | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford          | 17           |                         |               | The shortlisted areas of search (A and B) are agreed.   |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert     | Davies        | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace | 17           |                         |               | Accept overall findings of the SA, however consider that the Initial SA is in part simplistic and subjective in its assessment of the Areas of Search. Detailed comments have been made.  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert     | Davies        | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford                     | 17           |                         |               | The Initial SA is too simplistic and highly subjective in its assessment. Although the majority of the objectives utilised in the assessment are generally appropriate, consider that the outcomes, in terms of findings for the Areas of Search, have not been appropriately assessed. Have provided detailed comments on the Sustainability Appraisal.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice      | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments        | 17           |                         |               | A detailed and comprehensive response. The broad approach is supported. In terms of the identification of specific areas of search and to ensure that all potential areas are subject to SA, it is recommended that search area E should be extended to the SE to assess the area up to the bridleway to the east of the site, broadly running along Blackthorn Hill.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri     | Dyson     |   | 17           |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land, be affordable and house the current population first.   |
| PR-B-1069 | JP               | Lyes      |   | 17           |                         |               | The purpose of GB and the role it plays in keeping an attractive separation between Oxford and Kidlington is lacking in the evaluation of sites. There also seems to be little assessment on the total impact of 4,400 homes on Kidlington specifically. Rather the report is full of references to Cherwell as a whole.  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val              | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council   | 17           |                         |               | There are a lot of issues brought up by the SA Report, which point to policies that the Local Plan Part 2 would supposedly address. Given that this document is still in preparation, with policies yet to come forward, this is strange. As it stands, they have no idea how many homes could be allocated throughout Cherwell. Detailed comments on the SA Report have been made.   |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg             | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 17           |                         |               | Whilst the SA demonstrates that the area subject to these representations is justified against the alternatives, contend that the SA underscores the positive benefits of the sites and lack of constraints. The ranking of these sites should be at least equal to, if not better than, Option B Area. The rep continues by giving a detailed critique of the SA in its analysis of the promoted sites.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson   |   | 17           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward      | Kidlington Development Watch  | 17           |                         |               | The Initial SA fails to address existing Green Belt policy and therefore ignores a key issue in its comparisons between search areas. Note that it is recognised that development in Area A would have adverse impacts on air quality.  |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip           | Towler    |   | 17           |                         |               | The Green Belt should not be included in Areas of Search. The reasons for the creation of the Green Belt are as valid now as when created.  |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French    | Deddington Development Watch  | 17           |                         |               | Have no specific comments on the RAG assessment of the 9 Areas of Search in Appendix 4 to the Initial Sustainability Appraisal, October 2016, Part 3. Regarding SA Objective 10 of the SA Framework "to reduce air pollution (including greenhouse gas emissions) and road congestion", large scale development will most likely have significant negative effects which can only be mitigated by not building new houses. As regards paragraphs 7.39 and 7.40, Objective 10 is as relevant to Cherwell as it is to Oxford. |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |   | 17           |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |   | 17           |                         |               | This seems very superficial.  |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher      | Hardman   | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum  | 17           |                         |               | The objectives in 7.40 relate not only to Cherwell, but to everyone. Of the objectives in 7.34, concern is the consequences of Objective 17 if there is uncontrolled and unsustainable growth.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 17           |                         |               | Yes, Areas A and B are currently remote from many services, development would constitute de facto erosion of the Green belt and many of the plots identified carry the risk presently of flooding, thereby disallowing a complete, full, large-scale development. Development would not be cohesive and run the risk of creating a conglomeration of separate mini-estates whilst contributing to a higher flood risk.  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |   | 17           |                         |               | No. The exercise does not feel transparent. The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal" has predetermined which sites will go forward to the next phase, regardless of objections. If it was a site near to Oxford, that appears to have been the deciding factor. The planning officers have so little resource and are being urged on by the July deadline to complete the Local Plan Review, seem obliged to seek evidence that fits the desired outcome of the Growth Board and the Local Enterprise Partnership.            |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 17           |                         |               | No comments   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1188 | Carol      | Matheson        |   | 17           |                         |               | Not impressed by the Sustainability Appraisal which is based on unverified assumptions. It hasn't considered the needs of local villages and their residents. Kidlington has been chosen as suitable because of its services, but these serve the current population and could not accommodate another 4,400 to 8,000 people. A large development would increase light, noise and air pollution and change the character of the village. Flooding is an issue and agricultural and recreational land will be lost.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss            | Adderbury Parish Council  | 17           |                         |               | Supports SA objectives and findings both those specific to Oxford and more general ones relating to CDC.   |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt            | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 17           |                         |               | It is noted in Appendix 1a of the ITA that in Search Area D (Arncott) the area performs relatively well in terms of commuter travel mode split compared to Areas A and B, and that Area D is the only area in which congestion is not an issue within the areas of search. Appendix 1a advises that there is no bus provision to Area D. This is not the case.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 17           |                         |               | No comments.   |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green           |   | 17           |                         |               | The proposal to build all these new houses is not sustainable without very serious attention to the local infrastructure. This must be improved before there is any attempt to build houses between Oxford and Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 17           |                         |               | Agrees with the conclusions with regards to the effect of Area of Search H on the delivery of the stated Sustainability Objectives with respect to Cherwell District. Do not agree with the effects of Area H on the delivery of the stated Sustainability Objectives with respect to Oxford. As set out in response to Q5 disagree with the conclusions with regards to the effect of Area H on the delivery of Sustainability Objective SO16, with respect to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 17           |                         |               | The SA is very broad brush particularly when assessing Area of Search I. It is very difficult to compare this large area to the other options which are more defined and location specific. Due to the size of Area I there may be large variances in how individual villages may score in the sustainability criteria.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 17           |                         |               | It is noted that Area of Search A scores very well in relation to other Areas of Search that are more remote from Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 17           |                         |               | The SA is a high level study, based on a number of assumptions and subjective judgements, and therefore can only have limited value in assessing suitability of locations for development. Discusses the assessment of area A against the different objectives in the SA, which has both positives and negatives and highlights that the existing services and facilities would not be able to accommodate new development.  |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 17           |                         |               | Cannot comment given the short timescale given to research this matter.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 17           |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 17           |                         |               | The SA has failed to have regard to the Green Belt Policy, and so ignores a key issue in its comparisons between Areas of Search. It unreasonably 'levels the playing field' as a result. Are concerned about AQMA levels in Kidlington and that this is likely to be further affected by additional growth. Many of the other findings are inconclusive until further detailed assessment has been undertaken. Understand that a revised SA is in the pipeline, but consider that the current version does not provide a strong direction of travel for the strategy. Too much is uncertain, and also consider that, in the absence of adequate information at this time, the 'traffic light ratings' given are unduly optimistic and overstate anticipated benefits. |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling        |   | 17           |                         |               | Am not able to comment at such short notice.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry           | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 17           |                         |               | Support the broad approach and make no further comments at this stage in terms of the role of the LPP1 Addendum (partial review). It is considered to be capable of being compatible with the existing spatial strategy of the already adopted LPP1.   |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley     | Soanes          |   | 17           |                         |               | GB is critical for sustainability, all need spaces, that is why it was created. So far no extraordinary need has been identified that would jeopardise it.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes   | West Oxfordshire District Council  | 17           |                         |               | Support the inclusion of the criteria that test the relative sustainability of the areas of search in terms of meeting Oxford's needs and in terms of the impact on Cherwell. However, it is not clear that the impacts on West Oxfordshire have been considered even though areas adjoin or are very close to West Oxfordshire.   |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn  |  | 17           |                         |               | The Sustainability Appraisal is compromised by its erroneous assumption that the 4,400 additional homes proposed are all relevant to employment growth in Oxford. As noted above, the Interim Sustainability Appraisal ignores the specificity of Oxford's housing need and pays too little heed to the wider context of commuter transport development between Oxford and London and Birmingham. See comments to Question 1.  |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk   | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                           | 17           |                         |               | Detailed comments have been made relating to Objectives 5, 7 and 8.  |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura      | Precious | Quod on behalf of Albion Land  | 17           |                         |               | The initial SA did not include any testing of impact on Green Belt purposes and the SA similarly does not consider such impacts. The SA process is flawed in this respect as it fails to consider all relevant planning considerations holistically, as required by the NPPF. Against CDC's SA metrics, the Site scores better than all but one site in Areas A and B in terms of its impacts on Cherwell and better than or equal to many of the sites in Areas A and B in terms of its impact on Oxford; Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                             | 17           |                         |               | Have no specific comments to make as the results are not unexpected. Site specific testing will be producing more conclusive results.  |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley    | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                                  | 17           |                         |               | The SA undertakes a single assessment of each Area of Search which does not recognise the individual impacts of the development of smaller parcels within each Area of Search. The SA has then been used to discount any strategic sites in all areas but A and B. The SA of Chippenham Site Allocations Plan has been found to be lacking for precisely this reason where the Inspector confirmed that there are fundamental concerns with the adequacy of the site selection process, which was to do with the approach, firstly, broad strategic areas and secondly specific locations within those areas to allocate for development. This resulted in some locations not being evaluated in the same detail as others before being rejected. Therefore, it is necessary to consider all reasonable alternatives across a range of scales in order to prevent future legal challenges to the Partial Review. Have provided a detailed explanation in the representation. |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden    | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                                   | 17           |                         |               | It is unclear how the rankings have been assessed or how they were determined. It is also noted that Objective 8 considers AONB but not Green belt designations. This means that Green belt is excluded from the SA Objectives assessment.   |
| PR-B-0837 | David      | Jackson  | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 18           | A                       |               | The selection of strategic development sites within Area A for further assessment is supported. Consistent with this finding the North Oxford Triangle should be allocated as a strategic development site to contribute to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone    |  | 18           | A                       |               | No, the sites selected are intended to appease Oxford, they are not the most suitable sites, given unrealistic expectations for affordable housing and chronic transport issues. I do not believe sites in area A are suitable, they are unsustainable and unsound. Sites north of the district can offer more convincing alternatives than indicated and the balance needs readjustment.  |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo |  | 18           | A                       |               | Object to any development within the GB. If you develop area A, Kidlington will become part of Oxford. GB and the green lung needs to be maintained between these two. Developing on the land close to Cutteslowe Park will have a significant and detrimental effect on this wonderful open space.  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green    |  | 18           | A, B                    | PR38, PR50    | Sites which are not GB should be selected before sites in areas A and B which are largely GB. Treating PR38 and PR50 as preferred and sustainable sites due to their proximity to the station is unsound. There will be nothing to stop people who work in London buying houses close to the station.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1035 | Robert              | Davies     | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace | 18           | A, B                    |               | Housing options in areas A should be thoroughly explored and taken forward or discounted before those in Areas of Search B are considered.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F            | Hickman    | Middleton Stoney Parish Council  | 18           | A, B                    |               | Agrees with the selection of Areas A and B   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat                 | Clissold   |  | 18           | A, B                    |               | Options A and B. Kidlington is becoming a dormer town for Oxford City and a suburb of Oxford. It has no separate identity now.   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline            | Johnson    |  | 18           | A, B                    |               | Do not agree, object to development on GB, other sites are available so there are no exceptional circumstances to justify using it. The metrics and measurements in Figure 10 show that these areas may give access to Oxford Centre by car. They do not test access to the major employment centres of Headington and Cowley. They show proximity to planned but not necessarily funded transport investments with no details of the improvements. All of the sites are shown as red for road safety incidents – is it reasonable for this issue to be ignored and additional transport movements to be added in these areas?   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol               | Matheson   |  | 18           | A, B                    |               | Cherwell has concluded that areas A and B around Kidlington would be best for this large scale development, based on the flawed argument put forward by the Oxford Growth Board. It was assumed that the GB could deliver all these houses. Do not agree with this assumption or with the merging of Oxford to Kidlington and Gosford. Object to destroying agricultural land; the landscape; the character of the rural villages; removing current recreational areas; and possibly harming the canal. The Environment has not been considered. It seems little weight has been given to how building on 'water catchment land' increases flooding and how congestion in Kidlington can be addressed. |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn              | Phillips   |  | 18           | B                       |               | Given Kidlington's proximity to Oxford it is an easy target along with Begbroke and Yarnton. Area B seems to offer more.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris               | Dicks      |  | 18           | C, E                    |               | No, areas C and E around Bicester should not have been dropped at this stage of the process.   |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon               | Joyce      | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbishire                        | 18           | E                       |               | No. Sites in Area E should have been considered by the SA as the exceptional circumstances to release GB in Areas A and B do not exist.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip              | Rawle      | Greenlight Developments  | 18           | E                       |               | No. GB land should only be considered for development when all other opportunities for delivering sustainable growth have been exhausted. The initial selection of sites should be extended to include Option E.   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank               | Vreede     |  | 18           | E                       |               | Given that all the Options performed equally poorly against the objectives that were considered where the effects only relate to Cherwell, only the Options that recorded positive effects on Oxford would be selected. Effectively, these were the options closest to Oxford, quite simply. In other words, including all the Areas was pointless, as indicated in answer to question 16. Option E should be considered too.  |
| PR-B-1124 | Chris               | Thornton   | Ardley with Fewcott Parish Council                                     | 18           | G                       |               | Do not agree with Option G   |
| PR-B-0200 | John and Elizabeth  | Gittings   |  | 18           |                         | PR123         | PR123 is not reasonable as it would kill the golf course, which has barely enough space as it is.  |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew              | Smith      | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                   | 18           |                         | PR125         | Object to extending Kidlington from Water Eaton Lane south west to the A34 and consider that it may close the 'green gap'.   |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew              | Smith      | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                                   | 18           |                         | PR14          | Object to the development of the site for the same reasons as PR9 and PR17   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |  | 18           |                         | PR14, PR27    | Don't agree with the sites around Kidlington and in particular sites PR14 and PR27. The lovely countryside from behind The Moors to the river Cherwell is much valued and enjoyed by residents and it would be a crime against the environment to damage it. There is also a flood risk on these sites.  |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie               | Lewis      | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate                  | 18           |                         | PR153         | The inclusion of Site PR153 is strongly supported by M and G Real Estate being located adjoining the Deddington satellite of Hempton. As set out in response to Q12 and Q13 above, there are further opportunities at Deddington which should be considered.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific           | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| PR-B-0907 | Alison           | Forfar   |   | 18           |                         | PR157                   | Why has site PR157 been included if this site has been categorised as unsustainable in two previous local plans. Nothing has changed to the village. Development would constitute village extension which has been previously refused. Your proposal would suggest that 200 homes could be added to a village that currently has 55 homes with no local infrastructure or transport links would be in any way sustainable. It would not. Village locations are not suitable for the of the large scale 100+. The essential character of the village and its area will be destroy. |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew           | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                            | 18           |                         | PR20                    | Object to the development of this site as it would compromise the separate identities of the two settlements.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin           | Small    | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 18           |                         | Pr22, PR32, PR50, PR181 | Sites PR22, PR32, PR50 and PR181, should be eliminated from further consideration at this stage due to their potential impact on designated heritage assets (and, in the case of Site PR181, because of the high contribution it makes to Green Belt Purpose 4) (in addition to another site in Area of Search B, Site 21, which we consider should also be eliminated from further consideration because of the high contribution it makes to Green Belt Purpose 4).   |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew           | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                            | 18           |                         | PR27                    | Object to the development of the site for the same reasons as PR9 and PR17  |
| PR-B-1281 | G M J            | Taylor   |   | 18           |                         | PR27, PR14, PR32        | Am absolutely against building on these sites. The whole area between The Moors and the River Cherwell must be protected. This area is greatly valued by all the residents of Kidlington. One of the few beauties of Kidlington is once you walk down to St Mary's Church into the conversation area, your out into the open Oxfordshire countryside. Where deer roam and in the summer the water meadows are full of swallows. The area is not overlooked by houses and the peace and quiet of the area needs protecting.  |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew           | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                            | 18           |                         | PR32                    | Object to the development of the site for the same reasons as PR9 and PR17  |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew           | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                            | 18           |                         | PR38                    | If the North Oxford site is to be developed only the southern half of these sites should be developed to maintain the 'green gap' to Kidlington. Failing that the A34 and the rail line should be considered as natural barriers to maintain the gap.   |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor   |   | 18           |                         | PR38, PR50              | No. Areas A and B "preferred sites" largely GB. Sites that are not GB should be selected initially. Treating PR38 and PR50 as preferred and "sustainable" sites due to their location near the station is unsound. There will be nothing to stop people who work in London becoming commuters and buying houses close to the station.   |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew           | Smith    | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting                            | 18           |                         | PR50                    | If the North Oxford site is to be developed only the southern half of these sites should be developed to maintain the 'green gap' to Kidlington. Failing that the A34 and the rail line should be considered as natural barriers to maintain the gap.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward           | Dowler   | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                                     | 18           |                         |                         | Yes   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry            | Munday   |   | 18           |                         |                         | 7.44 infrastructure and services already stretched, don't believe Kidlington should provide Oxford's houses, land prices will rise.   |
| PR-B-0039 | Susan            | Cooper   |   | 18           |                         |                         | Proximity to Oxford to minimise travel distance is important, as is a Park and Ride and good bus service, so areas A and B are reasonable. This could be further strengthened by extending bus lanes. Houses in the GB should be "green" in the carbon-footprint sense. Loss of GB could be compensated by creating a park there.   |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia          | Hall     |   | 18           |                         |                         | No.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew          | Taylor   | Aitchison Rafferty  | 18           |                         |                         | No. Client owns an 8.7ha site of which 1ha has approval for 20 dwellings. Part of the remaining 7.7ha is in the current SHLAA (ref: WG019) for an additional 50 houses. The site is also included in the draft Weston on the green Neighbourhood Plan. This site would provide continuity of the village as opposed to sites PR82 and PR83 which lie to the B430.   |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony          | Hall     |   | 18           |                         |                         | No, because they are all destroying green belt. Also the trick of showing each site separately so that it appears to be an insignificant encroachment won't wash: put all the sites together and you create almost complete infill between Kidlington and Oxford, destroying the environment of both.   |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue              | Mackrell | Bicester Town Council   | 18           |                         |                         | Agrees with the initial selection of site options for testing.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0119 | C A               | McCall    |  | 18           |                         |               | Sites A and B, have not had time to look at these documents.   |
| PR-B-0156 | Val               | Colby     | Berrys on behalf of Cancer Research UK                               | 18           |                         |               | As above for Question 17.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter             | Worth     |  | 18           |                         |               | No do not agree with the sites. Yarnton could do more and provide support to the District and County by providing some of the housing.   |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul              | Walker    | Oxford Bus Company   | 18           |                         |               | Pleased to note that the areas of search have been assessed utilising the commuter travel within each area noting proximity to current sustainable transport facilities that serve Oxford, access to jobs by public transport and proximity to proposed improvements as set out on table 6.2 of the interim Transport Assessment.  |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia | Jennings  |  | 18           |                         |               | No. Areas A and B are green belt sites, so it should be sites elsewhere that are initially selected  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG    | Oldfield  |  | 18           |                         |               | Disagree. Exceptional circumstances do not exist justifying the destruction of GB. Area A and B should be excluded.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                 | Allen     |  | 18           |                         |               | No, the GB must not be touched. Smaller sites must be considered and it is likely this will yield more brownfield sites. If there are empty houses within Oxford, as reported by the press, they need to be used. There needs to be acknowledgment of the daily traffic chaos that surrounds Oxford. Some sites e.g. site 20 is listed as residential yet it is mostly industrial?   |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter             | Webber    |  | 18           |                         |               | These sites should certainly be listed but be mindful of providing London overspill.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary    | Shirley   |  | 18           |                         |               | No, there will be no wildlife, no individuality just one large overcrowded housing estate.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G            | Shirley   |  | 18           |                         |               | No, what will happen to wildlife   |
| PR-B-0704 | J                 | Kershaw   | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 18           |                         |               | No for the reasons given in responses to Q2 and Q16 above.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick              | Small     | Stagecoach   | 18           |                         |               | Agree that only sites within Areas A and B warrant more detailed testing.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony           | Matthews  | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 18           |                         |               | See response to Q11  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 18           |                         |               | Note that Yarnton is within Area A having been identified as the most sustainable broad location for identifying sites. Whilst acknowledging the need for an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, are concerned that no such proposals are in place in advance of the site selection process.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John              | Tremlett  |  | 18           |                         |               | No opinion   |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian            | Scargill  | Oxford Green Belt Network  | 18           |                         |               | Object to all sites in Options A and B for testing as it involves development in the GB because GB which was designated to restrain development pressures which could damage the character of Oxford City and its heritage..." as stated in Policy ESD14 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan. Support the five purposes of the GB, and in particular protect the setting band character of the historic city of Oxford. The reference to the character of the City, as referred to in Cherwell's local plan is often overlooked but it is a crucial arm of the GB policy. The overall levels of growth are unnecessarily high and alternatives to development in the GB are available; therefore consider that exceptional circumstances do not exist to justify development in the GB and that Options A and B are not reasonable. |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve             | Pickles   | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 18           |                         |               | Strongly agree that areas within Option A and Option B are the most sustainable locations for development and therefore support the initial selection of these site options for testing.   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane              | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council   | 18           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip            | Morley    | North Oxford Golf Club   | 18           |                         |               | Suggest that the consideration of rapid transport links, plus the likelihood of dramatic reductions in vehicles on the road and the growing healthcare need should be included in the selection process for options for testing.   |
| PR-B-0796 | David             | Tighe     |  | 18           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian               | Sheppard  |  | 18           |                         |               | No.Do not seem to meet Cherwell's district needs, only to actively pacify City Council.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0808 | Chris                  | Robbins  |   | 18           |                         |               | No further comments  |
| PR-B-0809 | Karen                  | Selway   |   | 18           |                         |               | No. Development should be dispersed throughout CDC, not putting all 4,400 properties around Kidlington and neighbouring villages.  |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam                   | Ryder    | Gladman Developments Ltd  | 18           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan                   | Dobson   |   | 18           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0830 | Nigel                  | Buttler  |   | 18           |                         |               | Areas for testing should be confined to those areas close to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard                | Hills    |   | 18           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0838 | David                  | Jackson  | Savills on behalf of University of Oxford, Christ Church, Exeter, Magdalen, Merton and St John's Colleges | 18           |                         |               | The selection of strategic development sites within Area A for further assessment is supported and after that Area B. This approach reflects the 'proximity principle' and is also supported in general by the findings of the ITA and ISA. It also accords with the intention 'to provide new balanced communities that are well connected to Oxford.'  |
| PR-B-0839 | Mark                   | Rose     | Define on behalf of William Davies Ltd  | 18           |                         |               | The assessment only includes sites within the 2 preferred areas of search. It does not reflect the need to facilitate the delivery of a portfolio of sites to ensure a 5 year housing land supply, and that the identified need is met within the plan period. It ignores the potential contribution of sustainable sites elsewhere that reflect the Adopted Local Plan strategy.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike                   | Gilbert  | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd   | 18           |                         |               | Yes - support  |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren                 | Bell     | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd   | 18           |                         |               | Do not agree with the approach that has led to only Options A and B being assessed. The sustainability of all reasonable alternatives is not being met. Serious concerns about an emerging strategy that would be reliant on a small number of strategic sites. More appropriate to have a strategy that is realistic and balanced to allow market choice on different size sites in different locations as recommended by the NPPF. |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex                   | Wilson   | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd  | 18           |                         |               | A2D objects to CDC only taking forward Areas A and B. Areas of Search should have strong connections with Oxford City however this does not necessarily mean the areas geographically closest to Oxford should be chosen. Option E provides an opportunity to provide unmet need in a location with strong socio-economic connections to Oxford and having Garden City status.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler   | Bloombridge LLP   | 18           |                         |               | Yes. Pleased that PR14 (The Moors) is included in the 38 possible sites. Detailed comments in support of this site already made in answer to earlier questions again rehearsed here.   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins  | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC  | 18           |                         |               | Do not agree that narrowing down the Areas of Search, without taking account of the existence of GB, the key principles of preventing towns and villages merging, and protecting open countryside, is the right one. In some places, positive effects have been overstated and negative effects understated. The decision to focus on these Areas is derived from a flawed argument presented by the Oxford Growth Board.            |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt                   | Todd     |   | 18           |                         |               | No. Nothing in the GB should be considered. Favourable inclination to areas A and B which are in the GB. Imperative that GB is preserved. These are not exceptional circumstance when many options available.  |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin   | Oxfordshire County Council  | 18           |                         |               | Agrees with the initial site selection.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds     | Wendlebury Parish Council   | 18           |                         |               | Unable to respond - due to lack of time  |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia                  | Trowles  |   | 18           |                         |               | No. Not those within the GB.   |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter                  | Trowles  |   | 18           |                         |               | No. Not those within the GB.   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |   | 18           |                         |               | Support options for testing in site A. Kidlington could support some further development to the north, emphasising the amenities provided by the canal. Development to the west of the canal should not be supported exclusively by Yarnton Road hump backed bridge. Do not support development on the GB between Kidlington and Oxford. Also do not support any development on section B.   |
| PR-B-0896 | Lucy and Richard       | Miles    |   | 18           |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |   | 18           |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton   |   | 18           |                         |               | Object to development in the GB.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall      | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 18           |                         |               | Strongly objects to development in the Oxford GB. They have set out the purpose and function of the GB around Oxford and that they support this designation. They have provided a detailed statement in their representation. Note that the lack of any substantial selection process makes it impossible to review and comment meaningfully on all the potential sites, and meanwhile a large number of communities are being affected by planning blight. For example, at 50 houses per hectare, the 4,400 houses could occupy about 86 hectares of land, but Area of Search Option A alone covers 1,109 hectares! Whilst accepting that the Council has a duty to consider all sites submitted as part of the process, the fact that no basic screening has been undertaken rather leaves the impression of attempting to overwhelm the public with superfluous information. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux      | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 18           |                         |               | The proximity of sites within Cherwell to Oxford is important in assessing the suitability. Only land to the south of Cherwell is sufficiently close to Oxford to meet the Duty to Cooperate requirement. The most suitable sites are Option A and Option B.  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds          | Fringford Parish Council   | 18           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0935 | David      | Lock          | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates                 | 18           |                         |               | Strongly disagree with the approach undertaken that solely assesses the 38 sites within Areas A and B. CDC have a duty to make sure that the proposals are the most appropriate given the 'reasonable alternatives' and to demonstrate how the tests of soundness have been met. The Options Paper alludes to a preferred strategy which seeks to concentrate growth solely across a small number of strategic sites all closely geographically related. This rigid strategy could have severe implications for delivery of homes. It is considered that a range of sites will be required.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council   | 18           |                         |               | Following the criteria detailed in the Initial Sustainability Appraisal and more broadly within the partial review document as a whole, Banbury Town Council agrees with the initial selection of site options for testing.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin     | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 18           |                         |               | The 38 sites in Areas of Search A and B include 19 sites that include or are within the setting of designated heritage assets (see our response to Question 11). Development of these sites therefore has the potential to be harmful to these assets and, logically, would therefore prefer that these sites were eliminated from consideration. Have discussed in more detail some of the sites in their representation.  |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council   | 18           |                         |               | Supports selection of sites that are south west, south and south east of Kidlington, as close as possible to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher       | Rosconn Group  | 18           |                         |               | Do not agree that a reasonable assessment of all available alternative options has been undertaken. The decision to assess areas A and B have not been informed by a robust and credible evidence base; therefore do not agree to the initial site selection. Further discuss paragraph 7.29. Consider that other areas have been unreasonably discounted, which would not harm the GB and can be sustainable sites for development.  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                                    | 18           |                         |               | No, Areas of Search A and B are not the only or optimal locations to meet Oxford's unmet needs. Sites in Areas E (including New Alchester) and F should also be tested given their locations around direct rail links with Oxford and the Science Vale.   |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   | 18           |                         |               | No as there is no credible reasoning why Site 41 was not taken forward.   |
| PR-B-1032 | David      | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford        | 18           |                         |               | The progression of those sites within the selected areas of sites for testing is supported. A justification for this view is given in the rep.  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert     | Davies        | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford                   | 18           |                         |               | Sites in Search Area A should be thoroughly explored first as the most appropriate location for new homes to meet Oxford's unmet needs. Do not consider that Areas of Search B are the most appropriate location to accommodate Oxford's unmet housing need given its lack of immediate proximity to the City of Oxford, transport links and associated infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice      | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments      | 18           |                         |               | See response to Q13, Q15 and Q17 above.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation                   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|----------|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri     | Dyson    |                                | 18           |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land like at the former air base at RAF Upper Heyford, be affordable and house the current population first.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP               | Lyes     |                                | 18           |                         |               | Could not find this on website.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val              | Russell  | Bodicote Parish Council        | 18           |                         |               | Objects. Areas of search should be in or close to Oxford, to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan             | Storah   | Oxford City Council            | 18           |                         |               | Agrees with the initial selection of site options for testing as they serve to endorse its answers already given to previous questions.   |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom              | Hockaday |                                | 18           |                         |               | It is not clear to me what these are.   |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson  |                                | 18           |                         |               | Disagree. Good transport into Oxford from the area between Kidlington and Oxford is negated by serious traffic congestion. The train station may allow some people to commute into Oxford, on overcrowded trains due to lack of Chiltern railway capacity, as reported in the news. However the houses will provide easy access to London. While desirable for commuters, it will not help Oxford workers.  |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward     | Kidlington Development Watch   | 18           |                         |               | Strongly disagree with the initial testing of site options. These sites are almost all in the Oxford Green Belt the fundamental purpose of which is to protect the historic city of Oxford from the effects of over-development as is acknowledged in the approved Cherwell Plan. The City Council's apparent strategy of directing more and more growth towards and within Oxford is a damaging one to the City itself as well as to the areas surrounding it. The sites selected for testing (those in Areas A and B) have been chosen in order to support this strategy and will be equally damaging.                          |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan             | Lodwick  |                                | 18           |                         |               | No. Do not agree with the initial selection of site options. They are almost all in the GB. Alternative strategies to development on these sites exist as explained in answers to Questions 9 and 16.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French   | Deddington Development Watch   | 18           |                         |               | The selection of the 38 sites within Options A and B is consistent with the findings of the Interim Transport Assessment and the Initial Sustainability Appraisal.  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer  |                                | 18           |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright   | Begbroke Parish Council        | 18           |                         |               | Strongly objects to the Areas of Search and development in the Green Belt. Do not consider that there are exceptional circumstances' for making alterations to the Green Belt boundaries.   |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis    |                                | 18           |                         |               | Object strongly to any site within GB. CDC's adopted local plan 2015 which supported GB should be upheld. Alternatives development sites exist so there are no exceptional circumstances to overturn GB policy. Developers should be encouraged to activate available planning permissions rather than wait for more profitable GB sites. Refusal to cooperate with Oxford City's apparent unmet housing demand might encourage them to do so.  |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher      | Hardman  | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum | 18           |                         |               | The selection of all the sites within A and B is not appropriate. In 7.46 it states the importance of 'convenient affordable and sustainable travel opportunities'. The sustainability assessment is based on proximity to transport routes. Insufficient weighting is given to the current and future nature of these routes and the consequences of increasing the traffic. The problem is arising from the positive assessments of these site due to their location close to key transport infrastructure, no matter what the infrastructure is capable of delivering. Have provided a detailed comment in the representation. |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy  | Hornton Parish Council         | 18           |                         |               | No. Proximity to interchanges, whilst arguably suitable for distribution or industry, is by nature of its very proximity unfit for reasons of noise and pollution, for housing  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine  | Arakelian       |   | 18           |                         |               | No. The exercise does not feel transparent. The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal" has predetermined which sites will go forward to the next phase, regardless of objections. If it was a site near to Oxford, that appears to have been the deciding factor. The planning officers have so little resource and are being urged on by the July deadline to complete the Local Plan Review, they seem obliged to seek for evidence that fits the desired outcome of the Growth Board and the Local Enterprise Partnership.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi       | Stokes          | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 18           |                         |               | No comments  |
| PR-B-1192 | Robert     | Selway          |   | 18           |                         |               | No. 4,400 should be dispersed throughout the district not concentrated around Kidlington and neighbouring villages.  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss            | Adderbury Parish Council  | 18           |                         |               | Agrees with the initial selection of site options for testing.   |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt            | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 18           |                         |               | No. The comments made on the ISA and the ITA ought to be considered by the Council and all the Areas of Search, including Area D ought to proceed to site assessment.  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway        | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 18           |                         |               | The selection of site options appears broad, suggesting a reasonable scope of search.  |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard    | Silvester       |   | 18           |                         |               | No, see above comments.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 18           |                         |               | Agree.   |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark       | Schmull         | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 18           |                         |               | Consider that these exercises have been carried out prematurely, and should be repeated once all sites put forward as part of this current consultation have been considered as a whole. Additional sites/proposals (including strategic infrastructure proposals) may result in different findings for these assessments.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 18           |                         |               | Considers the selection of only sites within Areas A and B to be narrowly focused, and suggest that sites outside those areas could also provide potentially suitable locations for development that would contribute to meeting Oxford's unmet need. Encourage the Council to consider at this stage where their next most appropriate preference for additional housing would be if further land other than in Areas A and B is required.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 18           |                         |               | In accordance with the recently adopted Part 1 Plan, sites should be considered in Area of Search I including, for example in Cropredy, which is a Cat 1 village, i.e. a larger and more sustainable village to which growth is directed to in the Part 1 Plan.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 18           |                         |               | Yes. The general conclusions of the Initial Sustainability Appraisal and the ITA are supported.  |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 18           |                         |               | Notes that the SA and the ITA conclude that the sites in areas A and B perform best, without taking into account the existence of the Green Belt, the key principles to prevent towns and villages merging, and protecting open countryside, is the right one. Concerned about the way the scoring has been carried out in the assessment, and the decision to focus on these areas is from a flawed argument presented by the Growth Board. The Oxfordshire Growth Board determined apportionment for Cherwell based on the assumption that Green Belt sites could deliver development. |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 18           |                         |               | No. It seems that an easy option has been selected which would have serious consequences. I am also unclear how these areas would not become a big dormitory for London particularly as the building of the houses would be probably be completed prior to the "jobs" being created.   |
| PR-B-1251 | Susan      | Silvester       |   | 18           |                         |               | No, see above comments.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 18           |                         |               | Absolutely not.  |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola     | Mallows         | Gresswell Environmental Trust   | 18           |                         |               | It is inappropriate to test for sites within the GB – since under the recommendations of the NPPF they should in principle remain open. Since the SHMA figures are based on wild economic conjecture, since and no exceptional circumstances exist, there is no need to assess these areas for development. The land is GB and therefore unsuitable for development.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1263 | Katie      | Silvester |   | 18           |                         |               | No.Do not consider exceptional circumstance exist enough to develop on GB. The level of predicted growth is high and there are alternatives within the city that need to be explored, rather than using GB. The effect to Cutteslowe Park as an important consideration.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells     | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 18           |                         |               | Understands that many fundamental issues have yet to be considered. Flood risk is a particular concern around Kidlington, and that assessment may well eliminate the potential for large areas within Search Area A. Strongly recommend that the selection is reduced as early as possible once these factors are brought to bear. The overall capacity is not proven at this stage. Other options outside Areas A and B should not be discarded at this stage.   |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling  |   | 18           |                         |               | Only if responses to questions 1 to 4 about are taken into account.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 18           |                         |               | The Partial Review is an Addendum to the already adopted LPP1 if it is entirely consistent with the vision and spatial strategy of LPP1 and does not in any way depart from the fundamental principles it defines for the location of growth in Cherwell. However, a review of the capacity of existing Strategic Sites should also form part of the supply to address the unmet housing need.  |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes    | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 18           |                         |               | No objection to the approach adopted. A relatively large number of sites have been selected for testing in detail, and a significant number of these have major weaknesses as evidenced by the initial appraisal and transport assessment.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn   |   | 18           |                         |               | No. Please refer to answer to Question 11.  |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk    | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 18           |                         |               | See above, re A44 Corridor  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards  | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                          | 18           |                         |               | The approach is considered to be logical, pragmatic and sensible and agree with the initial findings. However Green Belt should not be released unless completely justified and tested against the requirements of the NPPF.  |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley     | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                               | 18           |                         |               | An early review of the Local Plan should be undertaken to meet the up-to-date housing needs across both Cherwell and any remaining unmet needs of Oxford City. This will necessitate an alternative initial selection of site options in the longer-term.   |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden     | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                                | 18           |                         |               | The Initial site selection of areas A and B is not a robust approach. Indeed, the E A of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 Part 3, 12 (2) states that "The report shall identify, describe and evaluate the likely significant effects on the environment of - (b) reasonable alternatives taking into account the objectives and the geographical scope of the plan or programme". Other Areas of Search are also reasonable alternatives and should have been assessed. The rep provides a detailed argument.   |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn   |   | 19           | A, B                    |               | See answer to Question 15. A lengthy study is not needed to conclude that Areas A and B are most convenient for transport. And for the purposes of the Partial Review, it seems that 'convenience' and 'sustainability' have become closely related concepts. Like the Sustainability Appraisal, the Transport Assessment smells of a document written to justify a preconceived set of conclusions.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David      | Burson    | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford           | 19           |                         | PR20          | The ITP provides a useful snapshot of the transport sustainability of Strategic Development Sites. However, the University has some specific concerns in relation to the methodology and scores allocated to Site PR20, Begbroke Science Park. Detailed comments are provided relating to Criteria 1 and 4, and the methodology. However it concurs with the conclusions that the site is a suitable place for development in terms of accessibility and connectivity to Oxford and wishes to reiterate the strong transport case for development at site 20. |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter      | Collins   | Islip Parish Council  | 19           |                         | PR30          | The scoring should be higher in acknowledgement of the benefit of its proximity to Islip Station.   |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd   | 19           |                         | PR46          | Development in rural areas gives the opportunity to provide significant benefits to smaller communities. Sites in villages benefit from a pre-existing network of infrastructure which could benefit from improvement as a consequence of development. Infrastructure is not necessarily a constraint. Site PR46 is in a sustainable location well related to the village. Growth in this village will help to sustain its existing services and facilities.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0840 | Mike       | Gilbert  | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd                             | 19           |                         | PR48          | Yes. Specific detailed comments are made on the metrics used in the ITA carried out on the potential strategic development sites within Areas A and B. These proposed changes to site 48 would mean that it would move up the table of potential development sites in Fig 10 .  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert     | Davies   | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford    | 19           |                         | PR51          | Have provided specific comments on the ITP assessment and key findings in relation to site PR51. Have provided a Site Transport Appraisal undertaken by Vectos which provides additional information in respect of the site. The thrust of the findings are: The scoring of Site PR51 in the ITP is negatively affected by the placing of the centroid point in the centre of site PR51 in its entirety which is not accurate given only the eastern portion of the site is proposed for housing. When the centroid point is placed in the centre of the area which is proposed to come forward for housing, concentrated to the east of Site PR51 at its border with Yarnton, the scoring in accordance with the ITP's criteria improves considerably. Propose correcting the centroid point the RAG's change (see rep) and suggest that scorings should also be weighted, with some given greater importance than others. Questions in relation to congestion and accidents should be given lower weightings as congestion and accidents tend to increase in areas more suitable for sustainable development (i.e. closer to urban areas). These changes should be reflected within the Sustainability Appraisal and RAG's for Site PR51. |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother  | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies | 19           |                         | PR74          | The further consideration given to the site options within Areas A and B are welcomed. However, the rep includes detailed comments and criticisms of the assumptions and metrics used particularly in how it relates to Site PR74.  |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler   | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                           | 19           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday   |   | 19           |                         |               | Roads are congested, it's good however to see the A40 Banbury Road roundabout has traffic lights.   |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall     |   | 19           |                         |               | Houses should be built in response to actual, not guessed use.  |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew    | Taylor   | Aitchison Rafferty                                    | 19           |                         |               | Co-ordinating between the City and County Council will encourage housing development, as the Cherwell-Oxford border provides the opportunity to release transport funding.  |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue        | Mackrell | Bicester Town Council                                 | 19           |                         |               | Concerned that robust solutions will not be in place to cope with additional traffic.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A        | McCall   |   | 19           |                         |               | Not had a chance to read documents.   |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter      | Worth    |   | 19           |                         |               | It is already good, more housing would require more buses and take some cars off the roads.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                | Walker     | Oxford Bus Company                                      | 19           |                         |               | <p>Consider that providing attractive public transport is extremely difficult. Have built a much improved network of frequent and regular bus service linking all the main centres of population. Discuss in more detail in their representation on managing peak and off-peak demand, opportunity cost, Oxfordshire County Council funding. Recommend that only by taking advantage of the main existing transport corridors can development be provided at the outset with relevant and credible use of private car as opposed to creating entirely new bus service, which may not be commercially sustainable. Public transport probably isn't given the prominence it deserves with developer requirements not being detailed or prescriptive enough at source and how they align with LEP objectives. This is something that needs to be considered, and are supportive of the view that development proposals should be accompanied by detailed statements on how the development aligns with the LEP strategic infrastructure document with supplementary planning guidance in specific areas to ensure that the delivery is right and joined up.</p> <p>Possible parts of a solution include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Strategic route planning – end-to-end, not just within developments;</li> <li>* Identify and protect routes joining places;</li> <li>* Be ready to exploit funding and development opportunities;</li> <li>* Good practice for all modes of transport: walking, cycling, bus, train, car and lorry;</li> <li>* Adopt Standards that deliver facilities that people will choose to use;</li> <li>* Don't accept developments that fall short or destroy opportunity;</li> <li>* Set transport mode targets for developers to give them a stake in the outcomes;</li> <li>* Link them to CIL/S106 payments;</li> <li>* Link them to penalty payments or requirements;</li> <li>* Link them to future development opportunities.</li> </ul> <p>It is critical that any new infrastructure introduced to facilitate housing and economic growth is mindful of the public transport network and any new infrastructure should be designed to enhance rather than impede this. Engagement with the bus operators is encouraged. They are more that will in to help shape developments, infrastructure requirements to facilitate commercial bus operation in the medium</p> |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings   |   | 19           |                         |               | The access to Public transport criteria appears to be guided by current bus routes. Any significant changes in the population should be accompanied by changes to the Oxford bus routes to serve new homes.  |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |   | 19           |                         |               | The Interim Transport Assessment was inadequate if it did not recognise the present congestion in Kidlington and how this would be hugely aggravated by any development. This includes roads leading north out of Oxford, the A4260 and leafy pleasant roads like The Moors. The quality of life for residents along with the environment would also greatly suffer.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield   |   | 19           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen      |   | 19           |                         |               | The existing transport systems do not support current loadings let alone potential increases and little attention has been given to the daily traffic chaos around Oxford. Lack of local knowledge has resulted in wrong assumptions with regards to bus routes. At Begbroke and Yarnton there is no longer a bus service to Kidlington or Oxford Parkway, and no consideration of the A44 splitting Begbroke in two with no pedestrian crossing.  |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber     |   | 19           |                         |               | These sites should certainly be listed but be mindful of providing London overspill.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley    |   | 19           |                         |               | The bus has already gone, see no use of promises.  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley    |   | 19           |                         |               | There will be too much traffic and doubt the proposals as buses have already been taken off the route.   |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw    | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw | 19           |                         |               | Client's experience of the transport issues on the roads running through and around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington is very poor. There are no buses linking Begbroke to Kidlington, Oxford Parkway or Water Eaton P&R.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick                | Small      | Stagecoach  | 19           |                         |               | Detailed response with a commentary on the different criteria used in the ITA.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn     | Phillips  |  | 19           |                         |               | Kidlington is in the process of losing its village centre. Doubling the size without consideration to the main shopping area is not wise.   |
| PR-B-0723 | RA         | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited       | 19           |                         |               | Note that Yarnton is within Area A having been identified as the most sustainable broad location for identifying sites. Whilst acknowledging the need for an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, are concerned that no such proposals are in place in advance of the site selection process.  |
| PR-B-0743 | John       | Tremlett  |  | 19           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve      | Pickles   | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                            | 19           |                         |               | According to Fig 10 those sites that are the most sustainable in transport terms are those located in the green gap between Oxford and Kidlington/Yarnton. However, these sites raise other issues and would lead to the coalescence of Oxford and Kidlington if subject to large scale development. It is therefore considered that other sites around Kidlington, such as sites 32 and 91 should also be allocated for development to ensure that development around Kidlington maintains its distinct identity as a separate settlement. |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane       | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council   | 19           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip     | Morley    | North Oxford Golf Club   | 19           |                         |               | Criteria for the interim transport assessment should be revisited in light of the comments to other questions on transport.   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian        | Sheppard  |  | 19           |                         |               | Do not seem to meet Cherwell's district needs, only to actively pacify City Council.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris      | Robbins   |  | 19           |                         |               | The assessments may reflect the identified transport criteria, but this should not be allowed to override the need to prevent coalescence of communities.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam       | Ryder     | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 19           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan       | Dobson    |  | 19           |                         |               | There is already massive congestion in this area. The pressure on the A40 and A34 as major routes without alternatives will only increase: adding to this pressure with local Green Belt development is folly   |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus     | Campbell  | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group                                   | 19           |                         |               | Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in their representation.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard    | Hills     |  | 19           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0837 | David      | Jackson   | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 19           |                         |               | The findings of the ITA for the North Oxford Triangle site are supported.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard    | Cutler    | Bloombridge LLP  | 19           |                         |               | Agree that Area A offer the best 'green' scores   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim        | Perkins   | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC                   | 19           |                         |               | In relation to the sites within the Parish we note that many perform poorly in terms of criteria relating to congestion, road safety incidents and proximity to AQMAs. These are major areas of concern. As stated in response to Q15 very concerned as to whether sufficient transport infrastructure can be put in place to cope with such large scale development. In addition any additional infrastructure will also have impacts on the GB and on the environment and local communities.  |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt       | Todd      |  | 19           |                         |               | No. Nothing in the GB should be considered. Favourable inclination to areas A and B which are in the GB. Imperative that GB is preserved. These are not exceptional circumstance when many options available.   |
| PR-B-0877 | David      | Flavin    | Oxfordshire County Council   | 19           |                         |               | Has provided specific comments on the sites - Oxfordshire County Council RAG assessment is attached in Appendix 1 of the representation.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds      | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 19           |                         |               | Unable to respond due to lack of time   |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul       | Buckley   |  | 19           |                         |               | Yes. It is unreasonable, it neglects factors of extreme importance to the local community. The impact on the GB and the necessity to ensure infrastructure provision matches the need.  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris      | Dicks     |  | 19           |                         |               | An independent review should be commissioned to establish the impact of road improvements, following the unacceptable disruption from the Cutteslowe and Wolvercote works.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street        |  | 19           |                         |               | Welcome the plan to continuously review the transport assessment.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence      |  | 19           |                         |               | It is not fit for purpose from the perspective of Cherwell residents. Radical changes are needed by Oxford with public transport to and within the city. Road access to Banbury railway station car park is convoluted and need streamlining to prevent traffic congestion at peak times. Banbury to Oxford is overcrowded at peak times. Park and Ride requires a direct metro link to Oxford and not rely on buses. Quicker to get to Marylebone from South Newington than to Oxford with less hassle.  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar        |  | 19           |                         |               | Fails to consider how many people from the proposed sites will reach transport hubs. Increased traffic and housing has made the roads unsafe for cyclists. The state of these roads needs to be addressed by the council to improve road safety and to prevent fatalities. Public transport needs to be in place form every development site, so as to reduce residents using their own cars. Where are the plans for public transport, footpaths and cycle routes. This is crucial to reduce the pressure on the roads, the plans as they are only increase the pressure on local roads.   |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall      | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 19           |                         |               | There is not sufficient information in the ITA on the journey types from the people living in the proposed homes. The assumption is flawed and not all journeys would be to the centre of Oxford but would be likely to be to the Hospitals and Cowley Business Parks, which are a long way away from the sites. The fact that some of the sites are near a No2 bus route does not begin to address the question of how someone working on the South and East of Oxford (where most employment is located) can get to work by public transport. The buses are already overcrowded and a simple journey of 2.5 miles can often take half an hour. There is no room for any more buses in St Giles and no means are suggested to alleviate the problem. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux      | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 19           |                         |               | The Metrics used should be weighted in order to prioritise the assessment criteria. Some metrics do not appear to be very significant, but still offer Green ratings, resulting in sites appearing more suitable than others, without solid reasons. The assessment focuses primarily on existing infrastructure rather than the opportunities for sustainable transport enhancements. Detailed comments are made on the individual metrics.  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane                   | Olds          | Fringford Parish Council   | 19           |                         |               | Agrees  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip                 | Rawle         | Greenlight Developments  | 19           |                         |               | No specific comments on the findings of the strategic development sites selected. Earlier comments relating to Bicester and GB reiterated.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David                  | Stone         |  | 19           |                         |               | This rep has criticism of the repetition of the questions. Acknowledgement is needed of the realities of traffic congestion and pollution and how this would be exacerbated.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                 | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 19           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan               | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd  | 19           |                         |               | Detailed response provided. Development in rural areas gives the opportunity to provide significant benefits to rural communities. Development in Deddington can deliver much needed sports facilities alongside new homes.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth                   | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council   | 19           |                         |               | Supports selection of sites that are south west, south and south east of Kidlington, as close as possible to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver                 | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   | 19           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice                  | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments      | 19           |                         |               | See response to Q15 above. Do not consider that the ITA should have been limited to only those sites within Areas A and B.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri           | Dyson         |  | 19           |                         |               | Using low or zero emission transport is good. Sustainable transport always respects the integrity of the existing natural environment and heritage with the inclusion of GB. Encourage communication technology to minimise commuting and enable dispersed employment.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1069 | JP               | Lyes      |   | 19           |                         |               | Could not locate on website.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val              | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council   | 19           |                         |               | Concerned that The Banbury Masterplan has not yet been implemented. With Brexit and Local Plan Part 2 still in preparation, the housing numbers are yet to be realised. New development and any required infrastructure will impact on many of the search areas identified in the Options Paper. The provision of adequate infrastructure must play an important part when deciding on sites for new housing.  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg             | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 19           |                         |               | The ITA is wholly flawed and cannot be considered a robust evidence base against which to take forward significant decisions on future growth scenarios. The metrics adopted have been inconsistently applied, do not make reasonable assumptions about future conditions, and fail to identify likely opportunities or constraints. The report is particularly biased towards development immediately adjacent to the Oxford built up area.   |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan             | Storah    | Oxford City Council   | 19           |                         |               | Endorses the benefits of good transport connections associated with close proximity to Oxford in the Initial Transport Assessment of the 38 sites.   |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson   |   | 19           |                         |               | CDC has consistently marked sites closest to Oxford as positive. While understanding the reasoning and reluctance to negatively impact the residents of Cherwell district towns, results impact the existing residents of North Oxford, who are not your constituents. Namely by removing our GB, area of conservation, increasing pollution and increasing traffic congestion.  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |   | 19           |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council   | 19           |                         |               | The spatial development options in areas A (Kidlington) and B (Land north and east of Kidlington) are considered to represent the locations where CDC could most sustainably accommodate Oxford's unmet housing need. Do not agree as there is widespread road congestion with the villages of Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton particularly affected. Residents of Begbroke have no controlled pedestrian crossing and access/egress to A44 is at times very difficult. There are no buses linking their villages to Kidlington and its many services, Oxford Parkway station or Water Eaton Park and Ride. |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |   | 19           |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher      | Hardman   | Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum  | 19           |                         |               | The ITA methodology is flawed. It takes 'no account of the capacity implications associated with transport infrastructure – simply whether it was present or not in relation to each area of search' (6.10, page 69). However, as in Figure 10, consider that the 'At-a-glance summary of site findings' (Transport Assessment page 75, fig.6-2), gives a misleading view of the benefits or otherwise of the areas of search. Have provided a detailed comment in the representation.   |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 19           |                         |               | Yes, The Parish Council is concerned with the statement "The District Councils in Oxfordshire have accepted Oxford City meet its own housing needs..." this is incorrect, as South Oxfordshire has rejected this claim. If the Interim Transport Assessment Summary of Oct 2016 is not aware of South Oxfordshire's decision of the previous month, what confidence can the public have in the accuracy of this assessment?  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |   | 19           |                         |               | No. The exercise does not feel transparent. The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal" has predetermined which sites will go forward to the next phase, regardless of objections. If it was a site near to Oxford, that appears to have been the deciding factor. The planning officers have so little resource and are being urged on by the July deadline to complete the Local Plan Review, they seem obliged to seek for evidence that fits the desired outcome of the Growth Board and the Local Enterprise Partnership.  |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson   |   | 19           |                         |               | The major impact is going to be on Oxford City not on Cherwell DC. This effect will be highly significant. Is this effect being examined?  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 19           |                         |               | No comments  |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol            | Matheson  |   | 19           |                         |               | Do not believe that there is sufficient transport and infrastructure in place to support all these extra houses and people. Gosford and Water Eaton perform badly in relation to congestion, road safety incidents and air quality management too.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss            | Adderbury Parish Council  | 19           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt            | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 19           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway        | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 19           |                         |               | Detailed comments are made. It includes a preliminary Access Options Study.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 19           |                         |               | No comments.  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green           |   | 19           |                         |               | The document produced for consultation is much too elaborate and difficult to understand for the layman.  |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark       | Schmull         | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 19           |                         |               | Consider that these exercises have been carried out prematurely, and should be repeated once all sites put forward as part of this current consultation have been considered as a whole. Additional sites/proposals (including strategic infrastructure proposals) may result in different findings for these assessments.  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 19           |                         |               | No comments to make.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 19           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 19           |                         |               | In relation to sites within Gosford and Water Eaton, many of these sites perform poorly in terms of criteria relating to congestion, road safety incidents and proximity to AQMA's. Is very concerned as to whether sufficient transport infrastructure can be put in place to cope with such large scale development. In addition any additional infrastructure will also have impacts on the Green Belt and on the environment and local communities.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 19           |                         |               | Not able to make a comment in the time available.   |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 19           |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 19           |                         |               | Agrees with the assessment and findings of the ITP report and that without significant improvements, new development of the scale envisaged cannot be accommodated in Areas A and B in particular. Press reports indicate that Oxfordshire is likely to be awarded less than 10% of the Transport Infrastructure bid submitted by LEP. There is no certainty that the Rapid Transport system will be deliverable. This is a deal breaker for new housing and increased strain on already overloaded routes, worsening conditions for existing residents and failing to sustainably meet the needs of newcomers. The capacity of the existing infrastructure is minimal or exceeded in and around Kidlington. Developers can only be asked to address the needs of their own scheme before the delivery of Affordable Housing becomes unviable. The funding gap has to have realistic prospects of resolution before any land is allocated for development in the future. Larger sites require developer agreements. Are concerned about the lack of time for a site by site assessment; therefore they have adopted an approach of considering group of sites and these comments are provided with this representation. |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling        |   | 19           |                         |               | No comment at this stage.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry           | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 19           |                         |               | Do not consider that the ITA of the Strategic Development Sites should have been limited to only those sites within the Areas of Search A and B.  |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes          | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 19           |                         |               | Transport is an important aspect that will need to be given significant weight in the final decision as to which sites to promote.  |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk          | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 19           |                         |               | Nothing further to the above.   |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura      | Precious        | Quod on behalf of Albion Land   | 19           |                         |               | Have assessed the sites using CDC's own methodology for ITA and consider that the site south east of Bicester ranks better than or equal to many of the sites in Areas A and B. Consider that, their site is more sustainable in terms of its connectivity with Oxford and its potential transport impacts than many of the sites in Areas A and B. Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in the representation and that sites in Areas A and B would be inappropriate by definition and would cause harm.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific      | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--|
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun          | Richards  | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                         | 19           |                         |                    | Sites appear to be well connected to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan       | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd  | 19           |                         |                    | Option I has been assessed as having only a single Key Strategic Opportunity - Oxfordshire HMA. Development in rural areas gives the opportunity to provide significant benefits to rural communities. Their sites can deliver much needed sports facilities highlighted in LP2-A-023 - Jan 2016, LP2-A-013 - rep by Deddington Parish Council and LP2-A-031 - Deddington Neighbourhood Plan. Do not agree that the infrastructure is necessarily a constraint, where development in rural areas offers the opportunity to improve this infrastructure for both new and existing residents. Their sites would provide housing and additional playing fields, being in a sustainable location accessible to the rest of the village whilst offering a sufficient area to provide a comprehensively designed solution. |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick           | Alston    | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd                | 19           |                         |                    | Disagree with the findings of the ITA Report. Have provided a detailed assessment in (enclosure 2) which is included in the representation. The TA should be re-run having regard to site specific details set out in their earlier representation of 11 March 2016. A table with specific comments and recommended RAG scores are included within the representation.   |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil           | Tiley     | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                              | 19           |                         |                    | The options have not been robustly selected and so it is unnecessary to comment on the ITP.  |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz            | Boden     | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                               | 19           |                         |                    | The ITP assessed a total of 38 sites in areas A and B. It considers site suitability in terms of transport and air quality concerns.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG | Oldfield  |  | 20           | A, B                    |                    | Areas A and B should not have been included as they destroy the GB.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David          | Stone     |  | 20           | A, B                    |                    | This rep has criticism of the repetition of the questions. It is not sustainable to destroy GB and sites within search areas A and B will not benefit from their own sense of community and independence or space for recreation. Will not have access to pollution and congestion free transport systems. I strongly oppose development of the sites identified in response to question seven. Separate more sustainable solutions need to be looked at in other areas of Cherwell District. Strongly oppose development of the sites identified in response to question seven. Separate more sustainable solutions need to be looked at in other areas of Cherwell District.   |
| PR-B-1298 | James          | Jocelyn   |  | 20           | A, B                    |                    | A lengthy study is not needed to conclude that Areas A and B are most attractive to developers and, most convenient for transport into Oxford for work. The SHMA suggests that the vast majority of the new homes will be surplus to local requirements; having failed to consider this, find the SA's finding invalid. Like the Transport Assessment, the Sustainability Appraisal smells of a document written to justify a preconceived set of conclusions.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris          | Dicks     |  | 20           | A,B                     | PR20, PR34         | This rep refers to the full LUC initial sustainability report and has criticism of sections of it. There is a need to recognise the value of the countryside, GB and agricultural land. The importance of the canal for tourism and the need to preserve low light levels between Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton. The increase in pollution and congestion have not been assessed correctly.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris          | Dicks     |  | 20           | C, E                    |                    | Criticism of the score for SA16 given the good railway connections.  |
| PR-B-0933 | Peter          | Bateman   | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                               | 20           | I                       |                    | Area I is a very broad area covering the majority of the District. This causes the conclusions of the SA to be unduly broad and strategic. Should more focused areas be assessed it is considered that a more robust conclusion and scoring system would result  |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert         | Davies    | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace | 20           |                         | PR124, PR41, PR177 | The sites they are promoting PR124, PR41 and PR177 perform consistently well in terms of SA objectives relating to Oxford, including 4 significant positive effects and one significant negative effect (SA Objective 10). They set out their considerations on the negative effect in detail.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific     | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------|--|
| PR-B-1228 | Juliet              | West        | ICOMOS-UK   | 20           |                         | PR22, PR25, PR118 | A number of detailed comments are made specifically in relation to the setting of the Blenheim Palace WHS. Although in West Oxfordshire its south southern edge is adjacent to the boundary of Cherwell DC. Sites PR118, PR22 and PR25 are all potentially within the setting of the WHS.  |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter               | Collins     | Islip Parish Council                                  | 20           |                         | PR30              | Detailed comments are made in the representation in respect of site PR30   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike                | Gilbert     | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd                             | 20           |                         | PR48              | Yes. Specific detailed comments are made on the assumptions and objectives of the ISA in particular how it relates to site PR48. The suggested changes would mean that site PR48 would become one of the higher scoring sites in Table 9.2. An important issue not addressed in the ISA is the need to avoid coalescence between settlements and loss of village identity. This issue needs greater emphasis.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard             | Boother     | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies | 20           |                         | PR74              | Have some concerns that the scope of the appraisal has been too narrow in some cases and has taken too cautious an approach to scoring the site as a result of paying insufficient attention to the specific characteristics of the site. A detailed critique is provided.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward              | Dowler      | Middle Aston Parish Meeting                           | 20           |                         |                   | No   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry               | Munday      |   | 20           |                         |                   | Don't include Kidlington   |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia             | Hall        |   | 20           |                         |                   | No building on the GB.   |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew             | Taylor      | Aitchison Rafferty                                    | 20           |                         |                   | The initial SA findings could have given further consideration to increasing the unit allocations in existing SHLAA sites, rather than a presumption of only new sites being required to meet the unmet housing need. A combined approach of reviewing and adjusting unit numbers for existing SHLAA sites, along with identifying new sites, may prove a more efficient and effective approach.   |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony             | Hall        |   | 20           |                         |                   | The "sustainability" assessment is ludicrously mistitled, since many of the criteria are about its opposite, economic growth. So the apparently green scores for many areas on many criteria are utterly misleading, simply allowing you to appear to justify choosing unsustainable areas by appearing to balance the red scores with spurious green ones.  |
| PR-B-0119 | C A                 | McCall      |   | 20           |                         |                   | Not had a chance to read documents.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul                | Goulding QC |   | 20           |                         |                   | Agree with the initial sustainability appraisal that sites within Area I are unsuitable for housing development given their remote, rural character, poor transport links and generally inadequate infrastructure. This particularly applies to Noke.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth       |   | 20           |                         |                   | Not impressed, it reads wrong. Sites that are close to Oxford have been killed off for the wrong reasons.  |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia   | Jennings    |   | 20           |                         |                   | Do not agree that certain sites will create any more job opportunities than other sites (ref. table 9.2 of Cherwell Local plan part 1 Partial Review SA report) . This appears to be used to sway the argument in favour of certain sites. The science and justification behind these grading's does not stand up to scrutiny. Also 'Access to services and facilities' is only really applicable if the council is aiming to place more strain on existing facilities rather than provide new ones. More importantly Table 9.3 outlining SA Objectives SA7 and SA8 ('Conserving and enhancing Biodiversity' and 'Protecting and Enhancing the Landscape') for site 38 are graded '++'. It is absolutely nonsensical that there is a positive impact. It would destroy the landscape of Site 38 and impinge on areas where many unusual fauna breed and live. This should be graded '- -' at least. This plainly wrong data completely invalidates any conclusions from this report. |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright  |   | 20           |                         |                   | Cannot comment as do not know how to access the Initial Sustainability Appraisal Tables 9.1 and 9.2.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0643 | L              | Allen     |  | 20           |                         |               | The existing transport systems do not support current loadings let alone potential increases and little attention has been given to the daily traffic chaos around Oxford. Lack of local knowledge has resulted in wrong assumptions with regards to bus routes .At Begbroke and Yarnton there is no longer a bus service to Kidlington or Oxford Parkway, and no consideration of the A44 splitting Begbroke in two with no pedestrian crossing. Constant expansion in any form is not sustainable and development in other centres within Oxfordshire and surrounding counties must be considered. |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter          | Webber    |  | 20           |                         |               | These sites should certainly be listed but be mindful of providing London overspill.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary | Shirley   |  | 20           |                         |               | The sites are too close to Oxford flood plain.   |
| PR-B-0704 | J              | Kershaw   | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw                    | 20           |                         |               | No. See general comments on consultation.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick           | Small     | Stagecoach   | 20           |                         |               | Main comments on specific sites made in response to Q11.   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn         | Phillips  |  | 20           |                         |               | Kidlington sits in a flood plain, is it wise to cover this with concrete. It would appear that the numbers agreed by councillors shows that they do not have any commitment to their communities.  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA             | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited       | 20           |                         |               | Note that Yarnton is within Area A having been identified as the most sustainable broad location for identifying sites. Whilst acknowledging the need for an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, are concerned that no such proposals are in place in advance of the site selection process.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John           | Tremlett  |  | 20           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane           | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council   | 20           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian            | Sheppard  |  | 20           |                         |               | Do not seem to meet Cherwell's district needs, only to actively pacify City Council.   |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris          | Robbins   |  | 20           |                         |               | No further comments  |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam           | Ryder     | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 20           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard        | Hills     |  | 20           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0837 | David          | Jackson   | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 20           |                         |               | The findings of the ISA form an acceptable starting point for the assessment of these sites. The findings demonstrate that the North Oxford Triangle site scores positively against a range of SA objectives and demonstrates the sustainable nature of the site.  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex           | Wilson    | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                         | 20           |                         |               | CDC should consider Option E at the site assessment stage also. Consider there is capacity/opportunity to accommodate further growth to meet unmet need at Bicester.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard        | Cutler    | Bloombridge LLP  | 20           |                         |               | A number of detailed comments are made on the SA. They relate to Page 38, Page 39, Para 5.5, Table 9.1, Table 9.2, Table 9.3 and Appendix 6. Generally, welcome the overall conclusions drawn but request that a finer grained SA is undertaken in relation to the 38 sites. Feel that The Moors is a site that is capable of performing well in terms of overall sustainability, whilst also meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs.  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim            | Perkins   | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC                   | 20           |                         |               | Already explained in response to Q17 some of the concerns in relation to the SA assessment scoring process. This would also apply to the appraisal of specific sites. In response to Q11 highlighted specific environmental impacts which need to be taken in to account. These comments are equally relevant to the SA.   |
| PR-B-0862 | Peter          | Nicholson |  | 20           |                         |               | The Initial SA are well formulated and appropriate for testing the positive and negative effects of proposed development. However disagrees that the site have been tested in an objective and accurate way against all of them. A very detailed response discussing the assessments against sites in provided in the representation.  |
| PR-B-0877 | David          | Flavin    | Oxfordshire County Council   | 20           |                         |               | Recommend that the scope of Objective 2 is widened to include a broader definition of health and wellbeing or that health and wellbeing benefits of the three objectives with particular spatial relevance to Oxford are recognised and overtly stated.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane           | Olds      | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 20           |                         |               | Unable to respond due to lack of time  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul           | Buckley   |  | 20           |                         |               | Yes. Sites in Areas A and B have been considered unreasonably favourably because impact on the GB has been ignored.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname       | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|---------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street        |  | 20           |                         |               | No specific comments.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence      |  | 20           |                         |               | There has been insufficient time allowed by CDC for people to review the Sustainability Appraisal as well as the extensive main options paper.  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar        |  | 20           |                         |               | Fails to consider how many people from the proposed sites will reach transport hubs. Increased traffic and housing has made the roads unsafe for cyclists. The state of these roads needs to be addressed by the council to improve road safety and to prevent fatalities. Public transport needs to be in place from every development site, so as to reduce residents using their own cars. Where are the plans for public transport, footpaths and cycle routes. This is crucial to reduce the pressure on the roads, the plans as they are only increase the pressure on local roads.   |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton        |  | 20           |                         |               | The sites appear to be guesswork and supported by notions of non-existent transport infrastructure.   |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall      | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 20           |                         |               | No significant data is referenced to support the initial findings which would therefore appear to be merely guesswork at this stage.  |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux      | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 20           |                         |               | The SA's initial findings for sites 19 and 29 are based on the existing situation, where it is obvious that major bus routes would not currently serve an area of mineral extraction. The Quarry could be included within the routes without significant alterations to the timetables.   |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane                   | Olds          | Fringford Parish Council   | 20           |                         |               | Agrees  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip                 | Rawle         | Greenlight Developments  | 20           |                         |               | No specific comments on the findings of the strategic development sites selected. Earlier comments relating to Bicester and GB reiterated.  |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim                    | del Nevo      |  | 20           |                         |               | Criticism to a document that is 175 pages long which contains very technical and detailed wording.  |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark                   | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council   | 20           |                         |               | The Town Council considers the SA initial findings of the sites as appropriate, however it points out that as new development adjacent to deprived neighbourhood has positive benefits. None of these sites are adjacent deprived neighbourhoods, therefore it seems off that these site have not been discounted for that reason.  |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin                 | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group      | 20           |                         |               | Do not have any specific comments on the Initial SA, but state that their assessment of the 38 sites against our records of designated heritage assets indicates 19 that contain or are within the setting of designated heritage assets, not 20 as indicated in paragraph 9.48 of the Sustainability Appraisal Report (site 92 being where the difference of opinion occurs). Their concern is that the significance of heritage assets has not been discussed in the assessment. This is discussed in detail in their representation.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth                   | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council   | 20           |                         |               | Supports selection of sites that are south west, south and south east of Kidlington, as close as possible to Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben                    | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                                    | 20           |                         |               | Concerned that the SA does not adequately assess or compare the proposed areas of search and sites with respect to items of infrastructure that they are able and committed to deliver. This is a fundamental omission from the SA and in the case of New Alchester, means no account is taken of the location of the site across the railway line from Bicester to Oxford and our stated intention to deliver a new railway station there. The rep includes a comparative matrix that compares New Alchester against the other sites within the Areas of Search. This indicates a high score in comparison with other candidate sites. |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver                 | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd   | 20           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew                 | Hornsby-Smith |  | 20           |                         |               | Supports the SA findings, and considers that the selection of criteria for the detailed assessment of sites within Areas A and B to be partial and lacking any inclusion of the impact on the host community within Cherwell.Has provided a detailed response to this question.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1032 | David        | Burson    | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford           | 20           |                         |               | The initial findings are noted. Welcome suitable refinements prior to the plan progressing. One uncertain impact raised in relation to site PR20 is landscape impact. This seems not to take account of the previously submitted Masterplan which demonstrates scope for comprehensive landscaping across the site.   |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice        | Suttie    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments         | 20           |                         |               | See response to Q13 and Q17 above.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri | Dyson     |   | 20           |                         |               | No. Cherwell is being pressurised into this. The unmet housing need comes from a wish to grow population and to drive the economic growth. Regardless of the damage to the environment, heritage and social benefits. Sustainable is not an appropriate word describing development on any existing GB. Consideration should be given to previously developed land, be affordable and house the current population first.   |
| PR-B-1069 | JP           | Lyes      |   | 20           |                         |               | Could not locate on website.  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val          | Russell   | Bodicote Parish Council   | 20           |                         |               | There are a lot of issues brought up by the SA Report, which point to policies that the Local Plan Part 2 would supposedly address. Given that this document is still in preparation, with policies yet to come forward, this is strange. As it stands, have no idea how many homes could be allocated throughout Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg         | Blaquiere | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 20           |                         |               | Whilst the SA demonstrates that the area subject to these representations is justified against the alternatives, contend that the SA underscores the positive benefits of the sites and lack of constraints. The ranking of these sites should be at least equal to, if not better than, Option B Area. The rep continues by giving a detailed critique of the SA in its analysis of the promoted sites.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain         | Johnson   |   | 20           |                         |               | Pleased that you state more work and investigation is required to make sure GB and areas of conservation are not affected adversely (7.53 to 7.56) . Traffic is a major concern as know how congested the area around Oxford parkway going into Oxford already is. (7.59)   |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim          | Spencer   |   | 20           |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey      | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council   | 20           |                         |               | The whole SA appraisal is weighted towards their areas (A and B). Why would Oxford wish unmet housing need elsewhere in the Cherwell District but on its doorstep?  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger        | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council  | 20           |                         |               | The Initial Sustainability Assessment is work in progress and these are their early considerations of options, therefore incomplete, and as such can hardly be commented upon until it is concluded?  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine    | Arakelian |   | 20           |                         |               | No. The exercise does not feel transparent. The "Initial Sustainability Appraisal" has predetermined which sites will go forward to the next phase, regardless of objections. If it was a site near to Oxford, that appears to have been the deciding factor. The planning officers have so little resource and are being urged on by the July deadline to complete the Local Plan Review, they seem obliged to seek for evidence that fits the desired outcome of the Growth Board and the Local Enterprise Partnership. |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline     | Johnson   |   | 20           |                         |               | Oppose the findings. There is not an exceptional reason to build on GB land especially in the way proposed which will effectively remove it and cause neighbouring communities to coalesce.   |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi         | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands  | 20           |                         |               | No comments   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol        | Matheson  |   | 20           |                         |               | Whilst the sites in Gosford and Water Eaton score positively in meeting Oxford's needs, they score negatively in many aspects too. These lie in the impact on the environment, the use of GB land, air quality and congestion.  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa      | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council  | 20           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul         | Butt      | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd                   | 20           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew       | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 20           |                         |               | It is considered that the scoring in the SA does not accurately reflect the site. A revised SA is included in this rep.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry        | Brougham  |   | 20           |                         |               | No comments.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1232 | Mark       | Schmull         | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | 20           |                         |               | Consider that these exercises have been carried out prematurely, and should be repeated once all sites put forward as part of this current consultation have been considered as a whole. Additional sites/proposals (including strategic infrastructure proposals) may result in different findings for these assessments.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 20           |                         |               | Would welcome further investigation of potentially developable sites outside Areas A and B.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 20           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 20           |                         |               | Concerned about some of the SA scoring for sites in Area A. The SA results show that many of the sites in Gosford and Water Eaton have positive scores in relation to meeting Oxford's needs, as they have negative impacts when considering the environment, the use of green field land, and potential effects on air quality/congestion. Specific environmental impacts as discussed in response to question 11 should also be taken into account.  |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 20           |                         |               | Insufficient time for research.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 20           |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 20           |                         |               | The findings are very generic, overstate likely benefits, and do not exercise sufficient caution in advance of detailed assessment.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling        |   | 20           |                         |               | No comment at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry           | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 20           |                         |               | The Partial Review can only be considered as an Addendum to the LPP1; therefore the sites and SA needs to be entirely consistent with the vision and spatial strategy of LPP1 and should not in any way depart from the fundamental principles it defines for the location of growth in Cherwell.  |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes          | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 20           |                         |               | The impacts on West Oxfordshire have been considered even though some sites adjoin or a very close to West Oxfordshire. Do not agree with the mixed assessment given to site PR22 against the sustainability appraisal heritage objective. Although the fact that there is a scheduled ancient monument on site is referenced there is no acknowledgement that it is next to a World Heritage site within West Oxfordshire. The significance of these heritage assets is very high and this should be addressed in the appraisal and reflected in the subsequent scoring. There is no evidence in the appraisal to back up the conclusion that there may be instances where a site allocation on site PR22 could enhance heritage assets. The impact of urbanisation on the currently rural setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage site and on the setting of the buried Roman Villa would be significant and negative. The assessment of site PR22 on this aspect does not appear consistent with the assessment of site PR92. |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk          | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 20           |                         |               | Nothing further to the above.  |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards        | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                          | 20           |                         |               | Refer to Q18.  |
| PR-B-1345 | Nick       | Alston          | Bilfinger GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd                 | 20           |                         |               | Disagree with the findings of the SA Report. Request that the assessment is re-run having regard to site specific details set out in the earlier representation of 11 March 2016. Have provided a detailed assessment in (enclosure 2) which is included in the representation. A table with specific comments and recommended RAG scores are included within the representation.  |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley           | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                               | 20           |                         |               | The options have not been robustly selected and so it is unnecessary to comment on the SA.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation                             | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1352 | Liz                 | Boden      | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates | 20           |                         |               | The SA assessed the 38 sites in areas A and B. With regards to SA Objective 8 all sites except PR195 have significant negative effects. The rest of the sites all score significant negative effects due to their location in the open countryside. This is due to the fact that Areas of Search A and B are predominantly Green Belt with the village of Kidlington inset. The exclusion of Areas of Search E and H meant that much of the land around existing settlements was excluded from the site analysis.            |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council                | 21           |                         | PR10, PR97    | The evidence does not adequately address the issues of flooding (PR10 and PR97), surface water from A41 is channelled across the site, is the culvert and discharges into Wendlebury brook. Any development on this site would not work. The site is largely in Flood Zone 3. The Environment Agency have been looking at major flood relief plans for Oxford. It will be critical to check if the proposed development on this site will have implications for this scheme.   |
| PR-B-0985 | Peter               | Collins    | Islip Parish Council                     | 21           |                         | PR30          | The Parish Council is working closely with the owners of the site to bring this site forward for 50 houses and 50 bed care home, which would provide limited growth and enhance its services and facilities. A detailed comments is provided in the representation.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain                | Johnson    |  | 21           |                         | PR38          | How will you incorporate the views and evidence presented to you by North Oxford areas bordering PR38? We are not your constituents but as this development will materially affect us you MUST take any evidence we provide to you into account.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward              | Dowler     | Middle Aston Parish Meeting              | 21           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry               | Munday     |  | 21           |                         |               | 7.56 Building houses for Oxford City cannot be exceptional circumstances.  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia             | Hall       |  | 21           |                         |               | Improve public transport, and identify and exploit brownfield sites. Consider the Oxford-Cambridge corridor that the new railway will open up. Do not bring new industry into Oxford.  |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew             | Taylor     | Aitchison Rafferty                       | 21           |                         |               | See response to question 3.  |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony             | Hall       |  | 21           |                         |               | You quote the NPPF statement on green belt, while your proposals fly in its face. So presumably by "require close scrutiny" you mean "We need to find what words the government wants us to use so it can collude with us while pretending that green belt is 'sacrosanct' ". You have produced no arguments to justify destroying green belt – because there are none. There is nothing "exceptional" about lazy and greedy developers wanting to build where it suits them, rather than where would actually be beneficial |
| PR-B-0119 | C A                 | McCall     |  | 21           |                         |               | Not had a chance to read documents.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth      |  | 21           |                         |               | Run an additional process for sites which meet the criteria but have not been volunteered for development. It will flush out some new capacity.  |
| PR-B-0186 | Paul                | Walker     | Oxford Bus Company                       | 21           |                         |               | Supports the Green Belt Review if it meant developments could be more sustainably located closer to the urban fringe.  |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |  | 21           |                         |               | The NPPF states that GB should be permanently protected from development, it is required to conserve and enhance the natural environment and minimise impacts on biodiversity. Respect should be given to the character of local areas and their social and cultural well-being. The NPPF also stipulates re-use of previously developed land. A revised transport assessment is necessary to take into account likely accumulative effects of increased demand.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield   |  | 21           |                         |               | It is too narrowly based on Oxford's stated, over exaggerated, housing need. The evidence base should include the wishes of the local residents of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke and those who live in Oxford and benefit from the GB.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen      |  | 21           |                         |               | The full cost of each development must be evaluated. This must include capital cost, maintenance, third party infrastructure costs, environmental effects and quality of life. The cost of this evaluation should be born by Oxford City. What incomes are likely to be generated by each development and where will this go? Who will have access to these new homes?   |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0653 | Peter          | Webber    |  | 21           |                         |               | Don't believe Oxford has fully demonstrated why GB sites outside the city are being considered when GB sites within the city i.e. Port Meadow were rejected.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary | Shirley   |  | 21           |                         |               | There needs to be consideration for future generations and the affects on overstretched emergency services.  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G         | Shirley   |  | 21           |                         |               | You need to consider everyone's objections as the majority of people in the village are against this amount of houses.   |
| PR-B-0704 | J              | Kershaw   | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 21           |                         |               | The Council should look at studies concerning the potential effects on Brexit and whether such effects are likely to effect the projected growth in jobs in Oxfordshire. Although the Oxfordshire Knowledge Spine is world renowned, if economic factors conspire against it then the number of jobs will be lower than predicted. This is further reason to not to accommodate new housing until there is a review of Oxford's needs in five or six years.  |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick           | Small     | Stagecoach   | 21           |                         |               | Have some real concerns about the robustness of many of the methodological assumptions in the High Level Transport Assessment of Spatial Options. Detailed comments on recent and propose schemes are made; and the transport model used.  |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn         | Phillips  |  | 21           |                         |               | How about some evidence from the government and local MP's in writing supporting the increase.   |
| PR-B-0723 | RA             | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 21           |                         |               | Note that Yarnton is within Area A having been identified as the most sustainable broad location for identifying sites. Whilst acknowledging the need for an Infrastructure Delivery Plan, are concerned that no such proposals are in place in advance of the site selection process.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John           | Tremlett  |  | 21           |                         |               | No opinion   |
| PR-B-0745 | Dr Ian         | Scargill  | Oxford Green Belt Network  | 21           |                         |               | Ox SHMA is based on highly exaggerated estimates of economic growth and this results in massive over-estimates of housing and land requirements. Criticisms of SHMA and those of other organisations have never been seriously addressed.Suggest commissioning a further study from an independent organisation before irrevocably destroying large areas of the GB and other countryside within Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve          | Pickles   | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 21           |                         |               | Site specific reports are needed in order to enable a meaningful assessment of sites to be made. As noted above the SA sometimes identifies potential significant negative effects where a better acquaintance with the site would demonstrate that none would occur.  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane           | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council   | 21           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive          | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                                  | 21           |                         |               | Despite the volume of material, there appears to be inadequate consideration of the environmental suitability of sites for housing, e.g. in relation to noise, vibration and air quality. The Green Belt assessments appear not to consider the extent of existing degradation by development, e.g. of solar farms, car parks and electricity sub-stations. The Green Belt assessment criteria ('purposes') have not been applied to sites outside the Green Belt, though some, at least of the criteria are just as valid for such sites. |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian            | Sheppard  |  | 21           |                         |               | No evidence base, only a speculation on Oxford needs.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris          | Robbins   |  | 21           |                         |               | No further comments  |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam           | Ryder     | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 21           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan           | Dobson    |  | 21           |                         |               | No, but think again about the damage to Cutteslowe Park  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard        | Hills     |  | 21           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike           | Gilbert   | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 21           |                         |               | The evidence base needs to include measures to ensure the identified issue of avoiding ' <i>coalescence between settlements and the loss of village identity</i> ' is achieved.  |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren         | Bell      | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd        | 21           |                         |               | It is necessary to update and review Cat A villages to establish which settlements are the most sustainable to meet Oxford's housing needs through their connectivity and access. Criteria are suggested.  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex           | Wilson    | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                   | 21           |                         |               | Consider it premature to decide on areas of search and potential strategic development sites until the HELAA and other studies have been completed.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler     | Bloombridge LLP  | 21           |                         |               | The full GB review is essential, in particular looking at the strategic issues and long term integrity of the GB, and how associated development can roll back the GB to ensure permanence in the long term.   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC             | 21           |                         |               | The PC believes that housing need should be based on up to date economic forecasting. EG Brexit has already seen a downturn in EU research funding and a decline in the level of recruitment by the University.  |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt                   | Todd       |  | 21           |                         |               | Oxfordshire SHMA based on highly exaggerated estimates of economic growth. Resulting in massive over-estimates of housing need and land requirements. A further study must be commissioned from an independent organisation before irrevocably destroying large areas of the GB within Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council   | 21           |                         |               | Suggest that wider strategies in Connecting Oxfordshire should be taken into account. E.g. Active and Healthy Travel, Bus/ Rapid Transit and Rail Strategies to understand the full transport policy approach in Oxfordshire. It is also recommended that the evidence in the Oxfordshire's Joint Strategic Needs assessment or the Director of Public Health's Annual Reports should be considered.   |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia                  | Trowles    |  | 21           |                         |               | No confidence in the conclusions with the SHMA 2014 in relation to Oxford's unmet housing needs. No sufficient weight given, in the current review, to the amenity, pollution and environmental impacts of developments in the Areas of Search, before selecting those areas which should proceed to site assessment.  |
| PR-B-0883 | Peter                  | Trowles    |  | 21           |                         |               | No confidence in the conclusions with the SHMA 2014 in relation to Oxford's unmet housing needs. No sufficient weight given, in the current review, to the amenity, pollution and environmental impacts of developments in the Areas of Search, before selecting those areas which should proceed to site assessment.  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks      |  | 21           |                         |               | The SA should not have pre-judged the sites for options testing without completion of the further evidence listed in Table 18.   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street     |  | 21           |                         |               | Have no comments.  |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence   |  | 21           |                         |               | There has been insufficient time allowed by CDC for people to review the Sustainability Appraisal as well as the extensive main options paper.   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss       | Bloxham Parish Council   | 21           |                         |               | Consider Health provision both General Practice and General Hospital services  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar     |  | 21           |                         |               | Review previous plans and planning decisions, important evidence about sustainability of locations seems to have been ignored. Look at the numbers and density based on location.  |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton     |  | 21           |                         |               | The evidence base is inadequate and should be updated to take account of Prof Wenban-Smith's studies.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall   | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 21           |                         |               | The Oxfordshire SHMA is based on a flawed analysis which has not been tested or validated (see our answers to Questions 1 and 6). Our objections have been set out in our representations to the Cherwell Part 1 Examination in Public and supplemented by the report from Prof Alan Wenban-Smith <sup>1</sup> and his further note on local needs which takes account of DCLG 2012-based household projections. You should address these criticisms together with those of other organisations by revising the housing need assessment downwards. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux   | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 21           |                         |               | Detailed and technical comments are made on the ITP and traffic and transportation more generally.   |
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric                | Sidebottom |  | 21           |                         |               | Evidence base is clearly controversial, which is illustrated well by the response from the Oxford GB Network. New employment would be better based outside the city. Like in the new 'science parks, new housing would be more appropriately based alongside these sites.  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane                   | Olds       | Fringford Parish Council   | 21           |                         |               | No   |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0933 | Peter       | Bateman       | Framptons on behalf of the Donger Family                        | 21           |                         |               | The following concerns have been expressed through this representation: deviation from Part 1 Plan strategy; age of Housing Assessment (2013/2014); need for up to date Oxford Urban Capacity Study; need for employment to run in parallel to housing; scope of SA in relation to Area I; lack of county wide IDP; need for GB review.  |
| PR-B-0935 | David       | Lock          | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates            | 21           |                         |               | The responses to Q15 and Q18 report Gallagher Estates concerns with the assessment approach to date. There is a need to review the assessment due to the obvious and marked differences in the relative sustainability performance of sites grouped within each area of search, notably H and I.   |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip      | Rawle         | Greenlight Developments   | 21           |                         |               | The essential GB Study work is missing from the evidence base. On this basis there is a fundamental flaw in the Options Consultation document as it is proposing to release land from the GB yet the requisite GB study work does not accompany such an approach. The selection of Options A and B must therefore be considered premature and unjustified based on the current evidence base.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David       | Stone         |   | 21           |                         |               | Consideration need to be given to GB and the reason it exists and to the serious consequences for community cohesion, wellbeing and traffic congestion for areas A and B. The proposals do not address the need for affordable housing. There is a need to explore and develop options to expand other areas of Cherwell through improved connectivity and capitalise the potential of the Oxford Cambridge Express Way.   |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim         | del Nevo      |   | 21           |                         |               | Criticism to a document that is 175 pages long which contains very technical and detailed wording.   |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark        | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council  | 21           |                         |               | Agrees with the evidence base, and suggests that the recent economic growth projections in the wake of recent political developments in the UK should be included.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin      | Small         | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group | 21           |                         |               | Would have liked to see more historic environment evidence identified – the Oxfordshire Historic Landscape Character Assessment and up-to-date Conservation Area Character Appraisals for example.   |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A | Webb          |   | 21           |                         |               | As an experienced wildlife recorder I know for a fact that most sites of value to wildlife are lacking in sufficient evidence as full biodiversity surveys are almost never available. Surveys need to be not only for protected species, but the whole range of wildlife, especially records are lacking for invertebrates of importance. There needs to be very good calculations for cumulative ecological impact and in the case of Oxford Meadows SAC this needs coordination and cooperation of three districts. The consultation does not show any of the sites with wildlife designation in any of the maps for potential housing. You have not given the public who might care about wildlife enough information to make decisions. |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth        | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council                                      | 21           |                         |               | Supports selection of sites that are south west, south and south east of Kidlington, as close as possible to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver      | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 21           |                         |               | Presently the evidence base is not sound. It fails to consider fully all the reasonable alternatives. Predetermining options for growth without first considering all reasonable alternatives is dangerous. Failing to get the evidence base correct at this stage will result in a protracted examination and further pressures due to the lack of housing delivery.  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew      | Hornsby-Smith |   | 21           |                         |               | Objects to the GB assessment which sets out on sites that abut Kidlington, that: 'This parcel [of land] lies adjacent to Kidlington which is not considered to be a large built up area. Therefore, the parcel is not considered to contribute to checking the unrestricted sprawl of built-up areas.' Feels strongly that Kidlington is a large built up area and impact on unrestricted sprawl should be assessed in terms of the GB.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David       | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford   | 21           |                         |               | As noted above it appears little regard has been paid to the submitted draft masterplan. This should be considered as a submitted document.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice       | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 21           |                         |               | See response to Q7. With regard to the transport evidence base, it is noted that it is based upon a series of traffic models which are in the process of being updated. It is considered essential that the Plan is based upon the most up-to-date evidence available to ensure the soundness of the Plan.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1038 | Mrs Margaret     | Sidebottom |   | 21           |                         |               | Evidence base is clearly controversial, which is illustrated well by the response from the Oxford GB Network. New employment would be better based outside the city. Like in the new science parks, new housing would be more appropriately based alongside these sites.  |
| PR-B-1039 | Igor Niladri     | Dyson      |   | 21           |                         |               | Yes. GB plays a crucial role in maintaining and encouraging physical, spiritual and mental health.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP               | Lyes       |   | 21           |                         |               | There are several areas where the specifics of Kidlington have been ignored as the data is not available. As Kidlington would be providing 30% of Oxford's unmet housing needs the data should be obtained. This rep raises questions on the cost of the consultation and which authority is paying it?   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F         | Hickman    | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 21           |                         |               | A major omission is that the OGB - Green Belt Study PR13a-b specifically did not set out to advise on the suitability or potential of land for development.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val              | Russell    | Bodicote Parish Council   | 21           |                         |               | Concerned that current Banbury Masterplan has not yet been implemented. There are uncertainties with Brexit and Local Plan Part 2 potential allocations. So, housing numbers are yet to be realised. Implications of infrastructure requirements and impact on area are major concerns.   |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg             | Blaquiere  | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 21           |                         |               | This response is essentially the same as those to Q19 and Q20. They are detailed and comprehensive responses.   |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda            | Ward       | Kidlington Development Watch  | 21           |                         |               | Evidence submitted previously criticising the Oxfordshire SHMA and the economic forecasts underpinning it. CDC should therefore, in collaboration with the other Oxfordshire authorities, revise downwards these unrealistic forecasts.   |
| PR-B-1133 | Philip           | Towler     |   | 21           |                         |               | The consultation period was poorly advertised and the timing, over the Christmas period does not give confidence in CDC. Local residents' views should be sought as stated on page 3 of the summary booklet 'The partial review must be supported by robust evidence, through community and stakeholder engagement'   |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan             | Lodwick    |   | 21           |                         |               | Oxfordshire SHMA is a deeply flawed document based on assumptions of highly exaggerated economic growth. The economic forecasts underlying the SHMA should be revised downwards to reflect realistic expectations of future growth and the consequent housing need adjusted downward accordingly.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French     | Deddington Development Watch  | 21           |                         |               | There is a lack of evidence about environmental and social impacts and how these may be mitigated.  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer    |   | 21           |                         |               | The consultation appears extensive and inclusive.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright     | Begbroke Parish Council   | 21           |                         |               | Oxford City are providing the businesses and getting business rates which are probably greater per hectare than putting up domestic houses. It will be down to Cherwell to pay for the planning, consultation and for the infrastructure of this whole project.   |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis      |   | 21           |                         |               | The evidence is based on flawed analysis. The number of additional homes is based on jobs not yet created in Oxfordshire. This exaggerated number was predicted before the UK voted to leave the EU so the uncertainty of the economic implications of this make the numbers even more questionable. To release GB on this evidence would be hasty and irresponsible, given the permanence of the destruction of countryside. Moreover, the majority of the top ten employers in Oxfordshire are heavily dependent on Government funding which is already under pressure, so there is no guarantee that these organisations will be able to support the growth predicted. |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy    | Hornton Parish Council  | 21           |                         |               | Incomplete, patchy and predicated upon a series of assumptions as noted in the introductory part of this response   |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian  |   | 21           |                         |               | The lack of democratic process (no-one voted to increase Kidlington's size by 40%), the poverty of information to the public, and then the speed at which the whole review process is progressing, together with a compromised evidence base, fitted to the outcomes desired. Disguising itself as a plea on behalf of people who can't afford to live and work in Oxford, Oxford's so-called unmet housing need is a fiction to permit profiteering from the relaxation in planning laws.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline   | Johnson         |   | 21           |                         |               | The exercise is predicated on exaggerated estimates of employment growth and over estimates of unmet housing need. Basing a decision that will irrevocably remove open country and change the character of Oxford, Kidlington and Cherwell on one set of data produced by the interested party would not be meeting your duty.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi       | Stokes          | Persimmon Homes Midlands                                | 21           |                         |               | No comments   |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi      | Lancaster       |   | 21           |                         |               | The evidence base is flawed as it's based on a desire for growth that will be unsustainable. Oxford has a limited area and if it cannot meet its own housing needs then further growth is clearly unsustainable. Growth should be directed towards community projects and improvements to the surrounding environment which would create a better quality of life for residents. The consultation was poorly promoted and needs extending as many residents are completely unaware of it.   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol      | Matheson        |   | 21           |                         |               | Housing should be based on up to date information. Already the university has fewer applicants, fewer academics (slowdown in funding caused by Brexit) and central staff are being made redundant.  |
| PR-B-1223 | Judith     | Johnson         | Environment Agency                                      | 21           |                         |               | The Environment Agency recommends that sufficient evidence for the local plan needs to be in place to show that any environmental constraints have been considered and that any mitigation necessary has been undertaken or is capable of being undertaken. They are happy to note that it is proposed to undertake a water cycle study, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (level 1) and a flood risk sequential test. Subject to the findings of the SFRA level 1 and the output of the flood risk sequential test, if it is proposed to allocate any sites for development in any areas at risk of flooding then may also need to undertake a level 2 SFRA. |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa    | Goss            | Adderbury Parish Council                                | 21           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul       | Butt            | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd   | 21           |                         |               | The absence from the evidence base of a number of documents is not helpful. In particular the 'Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment', the 'Transport Assessment', the HELAA and the 'Strategic Development Sites - Place Shaping Principles and Capacity Assessment'.  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway        | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm     | 21           |                         |               | A Green Belt review is required, or provision made that Oxford's unmet need constitutes very special circumstances for development in the Green Belt.   |
| PR-B-1227 | Richard    | Silvester       |   | 21           |                         |               | The Oxfordshire SHMA is based on exaggerated estimates of economic growth that lead to overestimated housing need. Criticism of the SHMA from various organisations have never been seriously addressed. Before destroying GB a further study should be commissioned by an independent organisation.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 21           |                         |               | No comments.  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt    | 21           |                         |               | No comments to make.  |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd | 21           |                         |               | Would have expected the further evidence set out in Table 19 to have informed part of the Options consultation.   |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies   | 21           |                         |               | In general terms have no comments on the evidence base. However, it is clear from the Initial Sustainability Report that there are a number of topics where more detailed site specific work would be of benefit.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 21           |                         |               | Housing need should be based on up to date economic forecasting. For example, that Brexit has already seen a down turn in EU research funding and a decline in the level of recruitment by the University. The University has called for voluntary redundancies from centrally employed staff. Employment is not set to grow any further at this time. On this basis, an independent review of the economic forecasting should be undertaken which takes these factors into account, as they could affect future housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 21           |                         |               | Insufficient time to comment.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1251 | Susan      | Silvester |   | 21           |                         |               | The Oxfordshire SHMA is based on exaggerated estimates of economic growth that lead to overestimated housing need. Criticism of the SHMA from various organisations have never been seriously addressed. Before destroying GB a further study should be commissioned by an independent organisation.   |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard  |   | 21           |                         |               | No.  |
| PR-B-1256 | Nicola     | Mallows   | Gresswell Environmental Trust   | 21           |                         |               | The Oxfordshire SHMA should be reassessed. It proposes land availability and housing levels that are entirely ridiculous: were any to be built would seriously undermine the Oxford Green Belt, and would ruin for ever the quiet backwater of low lying flood plain of the river Cherwell, the Ray, and the villages that adjoin Cherwell district into South Oxfordshire, such as Woodeaton, Noke, Beckley, Stanton St John, and Forest Hill.  |
| PR-B-1263 | Katie      | Silvester |   | 21           |                         |               | The Oxfordshire SHMA is based on exaggerated estimates of economic growth and this results in massive over estimates of housing need and land requirements. Criticisms of the SHMA from various organisations have never been seriously addressed. You should commission a further study from an independent organisation before irrevocably destroying large areas of the Green Belt and other countryside within Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells     | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 21           |                         |               | Suggest that an impact assessment of major new growth close to Kidlington and its potential impact on viability of the Village. Concerned that the circumstances have altered since the economic forecasting was undertaken that underwrites the 2014 SHMA. Brexit has already resulted in a reduction in EU funding, and thus a decline in recruitment by the University. An independent review of economic forecasting should be undertaken to calibrate and check up to date housing need.  |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling  |   | 21           |                         |               | No comment at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry     | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 21           |                         |               | Have no comments at this stage, but reserve the right to comment on this topic in the future.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn   |   | 21           |                         |               | The evidence base is disappointing. The work done by consultants on the SHMA plays fast and loose with the requirements of the NPPF, it does not make 'reasonable adjustments' to numbers provided by specified basic data sets (for example the DCLG local household projections) but abandons them in favour of significantly less robust calculations. Concerned with the council's and OGB's misrepresentation and misapplication of the outcomes of the SHMA, also the integrity of the Oxford GB study. Further evidence on the relationship of new housing construction to the availability of affordable housing should be sought and considered.          |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk    | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 21           |                         |               | Nothing further to the above.  |
| PR-B-1346 | Neil       | Tiley     | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                               | 21           |                         |               | The Partial Review responds to the identified OAN and plans to meet the identified unmet needs of Oxford City. However, it is necessary to review the SHMA in order to take account of the meaningful changes within the 2014 projections which have been published since the Local Plan Part 1 was adopted. This will need to be addressed (alongside the other issues identified) through the necessary comprehensive early review of the Local Plan. Have provided comments regarding Policy Villages 5 and affordable housing requirement of 30% for strategic sites on viability grounds, which should apply to the strategic sites allocated in this review. |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden     | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                                | 21           |                         |               | Other documents such as The Oxford GB Study, Oxford SHMA should be taken into account. The evidence base does not support Council's decision to only assess sites in Areas A and B.  |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward     | Dowler    | Middle Aston Parish Meeting   | 22           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry      | Munday    |   | 22           |                         |               | Too short a time, flats would be better than houses.   |
| PR-B-0041 | David      | Pratt     |   | 22           |                         |               | 2021 is justifiable if Oxfordshire County Council puts in the infrastructure required.   |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia    | Hall      |   | 22           |                         |               | No, houses should be built in response to actual not projected need.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname     | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|-------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew             | Taylor      | Aitchison Rafferty   | 22           |                         |               | The market will best respond to the deliverability of sites. The infrastructure requirements are a long term goal. By setting a minimum threshold for sites risks increasing the pressure on the early implementation of infrastructure and development timescales which result from their construction. The deliverability of sites should include small to medium sized developments. LEPs and the HCA should help unlock infrastructure investment required for larger sites. |
| PR-B-0119 | C A                 | McCall      |  | 22           |                         |               | In five years time Oxford City's housing may have been found elsewhere, it is all rushed and chaotic.  |
| PR-B-0153 | Paul                | Goulding QC |  | 22           |                         |               | There is a material risk that this is over-ambitious. It is essential that all necessary services and infrastructure are in place before housing development proceeds.   |
| PR-B-0169 | Colin               | Carrit      |  | 22           |                         |               | Yes. It is an appropriate start date. Sooner if possible.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter               | Worth       |  | 22           |                         |               | Keep it as a rolling 5 year plan, it will probably show the lack of impetus with the numbers going to the right.   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright  |  | 22           |                         |               | No 2021 is totally unrealistic as a start date, as this is too short a time for the necessary infrastructure to be in place.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG      | Oldfield    |  | 22           |                         |               | No, because Oxford's stated housing needs are unrealistic and it's unnecessary to go beyond the 2014 Cherwell plan.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L                   | Allen       |  | 22           |                         |               | Given that Oxford City has yet to prove its needs and infrastructure changes are unlikely to be in place, 2021 is not achievable.  |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter               | Webber      |  | 22           |                         |               | Not unless City has been able to demonstrate its housing needs.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary      | Shirley     |  | 22           |                         |               | Why is there a start date before the consultation period is complete, this suggests it's a pointless exercise.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G              | Shirley     |  | 22           |                         |               | It sounds as if it has already been decided by Oxford City Council.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                   | Kershaw     | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 22           |                         |               | Should be a period of waiting and seeing prior to ploughing ahead and building a greater number of homes than may be required.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick                | Small       | Stagecoach   | 22           |                         |               | Strongly agrees.   |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn              | Phillips    |  | 22           |                         |               | Fine, but do we need to keep hearing about "Oxford's housing need" it is Oxfordshire's.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony             | Matthews    | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 22           |                         |               | 2021 seems reasonable but any delay to this would clearly have an adverse effect on the delivery of the 4,400 target for Oxford housing by 2031. Can 2021 be improved upon?  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA                  | Humphreys   | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 22           |                         |               | Are aware of the requirement to maintain a five year housing land supply. However, do not consider it is reasonable to expect Cherwell to accommodate such a significant proportion of Oxford's unmet housing needs in addition to the 22.840 new homes already allocated under the adopted local plan.  |
| PR-B-0743 | John                | Tremlett    |  | 22           |                         |               | Yes, I suppose   |
| PR-B-0769 | Debbie              | Jones       | Bidwells on behalf of City of Oxford Charity                         | 22           |                         |               | It is anticipated that the Partial Review of the Local Plan will be adopted in April 2018. Bearing in mind the extent of Oxford City's housing shortfall, the start date for delivery should be the date of adoption of the Local Plan Review. (April 2018)  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve               | Pickles     | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 22           |                         |               | The sooner the housing can be supplied the better so that Oxford's unmet needs can be addressed. A sooner date should therefore be used.   |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane                | Olds        | Caversfield Parish Council   | 22           |                         |               | Adequate   |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive               | Booth       | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                                  | 22           |                         |               | The 2021 start date for 5 yr. housing land supply is justified and appropriate start date for being required to meet Oxford's housing needs and to deliver a five year supply.   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian                 | Sheppard    |  | 22           |                         |               | No. Do not feel that Oxford's needs are required outside the city limits, given that future business will go away from Oxford apart from research within the university areas which have enough room.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris               | Robbins     |  | 22           |                         |               | 2021 appears to be a reasonable start date.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0820 | Liam                   | Ryder      | Gladman Developments Ltd                                      | 22           |                         |               | No. Whilst the Oxfordshire Growth Board Statement of Cooperation assumes the start date for the provision of houses will be after 2021, it does not preclude delivery before 2021. The Council need to acknowledge and plan to deliver Oxford's unmet need as soon as possible to ensure the needs are met by 2031. There should be a range of sites, rather than a single allocation to provide the greatest possible chance of delivery in advance of the cessation of the SHMA period in 2031. |
| PR-B-0825 | Simon                  | Joyce      | Strutt and Parker on behalf of Mrs A Darbshire                | 22           |                         |               | Yes. In line with the NPPF relating to deliverability of sites our client's site is available now for residential development, offers a suitable location for new housing and is achievable and could be developed from 2021 onwards  |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan                   | Dobson     |   | 22           |                         |               | This question seems to assume the development will go ahead in full regardless.   |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard                | Hills      |   | 22           |                         |               | This is fine. Consideration of housing supply year by year, identifying supply each year, calculating and publishing a running deficit as we fall further behind. Oxford requires approximately 1,500 homes per year. Oxford is currently building 0-500 homes per year. Running figures should be published regularly, and part of a continuous discussion about identifying new sites and reforming the planning system.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike                   | Gilbert    | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd                                     | 22           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren                 | Bell       | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd | 22           |                         |               | The start year of 2021 is not justified and is inconsistent with Government policy. The 4,400 dwellings should be added to the requirement at the earliest opportunity and certainly no later than the adoption of the Partial Review.  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex                   | Wilson     | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd            | 22           |                         |               | The Council needs to augment its housing land supply to identify and allocate additional deliverable land for housing in the short term. Development should not be precluded from coming forward before 2021. This should be reflected in the Partial Review.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler     | Bloombridge LLP   | 22           |                         |               | No. The 5 year supply is relevant on the adoption of the Partial Review and, given that Oxford's unmet housing need is a current, pressing need the Partial Review needs to set a strategy that makes in-roads in to this need straight away.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David                  | Smith      |   | 22           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC      | 22           |                         |               | The Parish considers that the case for meeting Oxford's housing needs on the scale envisaged has not been proved. We therefore have no specific comment in response to this question at this time. However, note that once housing has started the practicalities of identifying whether or not new housing is contributing towards Oxford's unmet need or to Cherwell's existing need are likely to be very difficult.   |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer               | McFadden   |   | 22           |                         |               | Seems very soon for such a major undertaking. Although this greatly affects North Oxford Residents it appears many were unaware of these proposals as the Oxford City Council didn't seem to disseminate the information widely.  |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter                  | Hainsworth |   | 22           |                         |               | No. Transport need's much more serious consideration. So do questions of whether growth is necessary or desirable. Criticism with the documentation and consultation process.   |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council                                    | 22           |                         |               | Agrees with the start date  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council                                     | 22           |                         |               | 2021 is not justified start date, and suggests that Cherwell needs to meet its own needs first. A more appropriate start date would be 2031.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley    |   | 22           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street     |   | 22           |                         |               | This would seem appropriate.  |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence   |   | 22           |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss       | Bloxham Parish Council  | 22           |                         |               | The year 2021 seems reasonable, by this date National Govt. may have resolved a definitive method to calculate the five-year housing land supply.   |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar     |   | 22           |                         |               | The start and supply period needs to be based on actual economic growth of Oxford not inflated projections. Growth needs to be monitored with robust testing for the need which is not to be influenced by the desire to attract funding to drove growth.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0910 | Ken        | Pelton   |  | 22           |                         |               | Disagree with the existence of Oxford's housing need and therefore the need for any start date. 2021 might be a suitable date to look at the position again, having done nothing on the meantime.   |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen      | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 22           |                         |               | There is clearly a need for developers to be required to activate planning permissions and get on with developments. In a recent Dispatches program on Channel 4, it became apparent that this is a real problem with building land being hoarded. The Minister for Communities and Local Government Sajid Javid stated that he would bring forward urgent measures to oblige developers to start and complete projects. Until those measures are known we cannot comment on this question.     |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan        | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 22           |                         |               | The aim should be to meet unmet need as soon as possible. Whilst it is likely that allocation of land, through to grant of planning permission could take up to 5 years. This should not be allowed to prevent development earlier if this can be achieved.   |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds     | Fringford Parish Council   | 22           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0935 | David      | Lock     | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates                 | 22           |                         |               | This approach is not supported by the NPPF and is inconsistent with Government guidance. The 4,400 dwellings should be included as part of the adopted CDC requirement at the earliest opportunity, the demand for housing being current and significant. This also reinforces the need for a range of sites that can help deliver supply in the short term.  |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle    | Greenlight Developments  | 22           |                         |               | This is a lengthy and detailed response. Concludes by stating that the Council should be factoring Cherwell's apportionment in to its 5-year supply position now, as per the approach of Inspector Emerson ( the examining inspector of the West Oxon Local Plan).  |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone    |  | 22           |                         |               | It is not appropriate and would cause problems, especially as work is likely to have started on the Northern Gateway and other development sites accessing the A40 and A34. It needs careful evaluation. Do not agree with Oxford's housing needs destroying the Green Belt, More consideration and respect needs to given to the natural environment and means of retaining the identity and separation of present established communities. Brexit needs consideration.                        |
| PR-B-0948 | Tim        | del Nevo |  | 22           |                         |               | The need for wholesale development has been hugely exaggerated. Is Oxford to be sacrificed for greed and profit.  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk     | Banbury Civic Society  | 22           |                         |               | This as a reasonable date, subject to the resolution of the issues raised by our comments.  |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia  | Banbury Town Council   | 22           |                         |               | This is appropriate given the decision to create separate 5 year land supplies for Cherwell itself and meeting Oxford's unmet need.   |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett  |  | 22           |                         |               | No because of the factors such as The express way between Oxford and Cambridge. The outcome of the feasibility study for an additional junction between 8 and 9 on the M40. Changes to employment like at Cowley before the Brexit vote and housing need from the social economic changes in the region which will arise from Brexit., this will take time to become clear. Unclear to educational institutions because of Brexit as immigration decision are yet to be made.                   |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner   | Launton Parish Council   | 22           |                         |               | On the borderline of being achievable   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles   | Kirtlington Parish Council   | 22           |                         |               | To answer this question one must know if CDC will first deliver the infrastructure near Oxford. That the timetable might be a bit short of there should be delays for appeals, etc. What is important is that should CDC proportion of Oxford's unmet needs (the 4,400) for some reason fail any timescale created for the 5-year housing supply of that proportion, then it should be made clear that the areas to be looked at remain consistent with all the previous points they have made. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher       | Rosconn Group   | 22           |                         |               | On the basis that the PR is expected to be adopted in 2018, which will include allocated sites to meet Oxford City's unmet needs, 2021 is unnecessarily late in that some (smaller) sites may well be able to come forward in advance of then. As it is necessary for the unmet need, alongside Cherwell's own housing needs, to be met by 2031 every effort should be made to bring forward sites as soon as possible to ensure there is a realistic opportunity for the HMA's housing needs to be met in full during the Plan period.   |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                                       | 22           |                         |               | It would be possible to start delivering against their housing needs before 2021 providing the Plan process proceeds swiftly and applications are dealt with concurrently. New Alchester is available and could deliver homes within the first five year period. The land is under the control of Bonnar Allan; there are no infrastructure constraints; it would help deliver the perimeter road from a new junction with the A41 which is in Bonnar Allan's control to the edge of Graven Hill; and it can deliver most, if not all of the 6000 homes within the adopted plan period to 2031. |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 22           |                         |               | Yes, certainly not unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | 22           |                         |               | Supports 4,400 homes for Cherwell provisionally based on the assumption that actual land at Pear Tree can be released for housing.  |
| PR-B-1027 | Jonathan   | Porter        | Archstone Projects Ltd  | 22           |                         |               | Given the urgent need for new housing to assist Oxford City, the arbitrary date of 2021 should be considered a backstop, with the aim of commencing delivery at the soonest opportunity.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David      | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford           | 22           |                         |               | Understand 2021 has been indicated as a pragmatic start date for the delivery of new homes. This should not preclude an earlier commencement should a development be in a position to offer it; in view of the significant housing need this would clearly be beneficial.   |
| PR-B-1033 | Matthew    | Symons        | Hollins Strategic Land  | 22           |                         |               | It has demonstrated that 2021 is not an appropriate start date for being required to meet Oxford's housing needs to deliver a 5-year supply. Have provided more detailed information in their submitted representation  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice      | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments         | 22           |                         |               | No comment at this stage. Do however, reserve the right to comment on this topic in future rounds of consultation.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP         | Lyes          |   | 22           |                         |               | The speed at which the work is being done presently is already showing signs of weakness in the specifics that relate to Kidlington. Quite clearly with everything being so hastily put together there is more scope for error and omission. All the electorate can do is assume the officials are not being driven at too fast a pace by their political masters to do their jobs to the standards required.   |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F   | Hickman       | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 22           |                         |               | Not qualified to assess whether 2021 is a reasonable start date. It is essential that a five year land supply is maintained in order to inhibit speculative development.  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val        | Russell       | Bodicote Parish Council   | 22           |                         |               | Oxford's unmet need will result in putting Cherwell's 5 year land supply being put at risk, if the number of houses allocated to our part of the district become undeliverable.<br>AMR - Does Cherwell put itself at risk of speculative development, housing intended for Oxford, if the 'number of dwellings with 'planning permission but not built', falls short of any targets set in delivery plans. Are not in a position to comment on 2021 as an appropriate start date.   |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg       | Blaquiere     | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 22           |                         |               | National planning policy provides no support to holding back sustainable development whilst the local plan process is concluded. It is unreasonable to put a date restriction on the delivery. The need for homes is immediate.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1099 | Alan             | Storah     | Oxford City Council                                   | 22           |                         |               | There is neither any need nor any reason to wait until 2021. When the additional figure that will contribute to Oxford's housing need has been agreed, (with the adoption of the Partial Review of the Local Plan), that should become the start date to meet Oxford's housing needs and to deliver a five-year supply. That distinction between the commencement date of the 5 year housing land supply for the district and that specifically to meet Oxford's needs may well result in the optimum approach being to keep the two distinct and separate. This would also be expected to contribute, as soon as reasonably possible, to meeting the pressing need for more housing for Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom              | Hockaday   |   | 22           |                         |               | This depends on the approach of other Districts, notably Oxford itself. The Districts, including Oxford, need to work constructively together.  |
| PR-B-1126 | Jamie            | Lewis      | Hunter Page Planning on behalf of M and G Real Estate | 22           |                         |               | Suggest that the overall housing target for Cherwell should also be reviewed to ensure it is up to date and is 'drawn up over an appropriate time scale, preferably a 15 year time horizon' (para 157 NPPF). Final publication of the Partial Review is anticipated 2018, as such it is suggested that the Oxfordshire SHMA should be updated to include a housing target that extends beyond the current time horizon of 2031, to provide a basis on which to positively plan for growth over a sufficient time horizon, that being at least 15 years as advocated by the NPPF.  |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine        | Richenburg |   | 22           |                         |               | No, it is too soon. Insufficient time for consultation with the Northern Gateway.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French     | Deddington Development Watch                          | 22           |                         |               | Objects. The "very high delivery requirement" (per paragraph 8.15) in respect of Cherwell's own targets under Local Plan Part 1 imposed by the 2014 SHMA, which we believe to be unrealistic, suggests that a 2021 start date is unduly optimistic. Accordingly, feel that 'ring-fencing' a specific supply for Oxford is required to avoid harm to the Cherwell strategy. This is likely to be facilitated if strategic sites in Options A and B close to the north of Oxford are selected. If there is a 'total requirement', even more of the local supply of housing land risks being used to meet the requirements of Oxford. There is also likely to be an imbalance over the plan period between Oxford's housing needs and Cherwell's housing needs which will be difficult to manage without 'ring-fencing'. |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer    |   | 22           |                         |               | A start cannot be made soon enough.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright     | Begbroke Parish Council                               | 22           |                         |               | Do not agree. Why should they consider 2021 as a justified start date?  |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis      |   | 22           |                         |               | That seems a reasonable date by which developers should be required to activate planning permission already available on brownfield sites and release building land being hoarded.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy    | Hornton Parish Council                                | 22           |                         |               | No. Not enough examination of Oxford's prior efforts has been shown to establish that a) there is a need, and b) Oxford has seriously investigated all ways and means of meeting their target.  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian  |   | 22           |                         |               | No. It compromises CDC own five year supply, and any other need that to be taken into consideration for its own rate-payers. You can only concrete over the countryside once.   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson    |   | 22           |                         |               | It should be no earlier given that there is no evidence that Oxford can deliver the employment growth that is being estimated. Your analysis assumes that the only possibility is that Oxford has a need earlier than expected, what approach will be taken if the employment growth does not materialise at the rate suggested?  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes     | Persimmon Homes Midlands                              | 22           |                         |               | No. The consultation paper indicates that the Partial Review will be adopted in April 2018, therefore this would be a more realistic and appropriate start date. The start date should be when the reviewed plan is adopted.  |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol            | Matheson   |   | 22           |                         |               | Cannot comment on this because of the flawed information that has been presented. Oxford has not proved that it needs all this housing and needs to review its findings with up to date figures. It needs to take into account GB and local village communities.  |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa          | Goss       | Adderbury Parish Council                              | 22           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul             | Butt       | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd | 22           |                         |               | No. Oxford's unmet housing needs, as part of the Oxfordshire HMA, are present now and the delivery of housing should not be delayed by specifying a commencement date at 2021, including for the calculation of a five year supply. Detailed references are made to the NPPF.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew     | Garraway        | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm                     | 22           |                         |               | The unmet housing need apportionment of 14,850 is derived from figures in the 2014 SHMA of 15,105 over the period 2011-2031. It is therefore sensible to make provision for homes to come forward as soon as is practicable rather than assigning 2021 as a commencement year for the provision of homes to meet Oxford's need.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry      | Brougham        |   | 22           |                         |               | Yes, in order to identify, design and programme the infrastructure requirements for the housing, prior to development commencing.  |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M      | Green           |   | 22           |                         |               | Building should only commence when the necessary infrastructure is in place, roads, railway, buses, schools and other amenities capable of sustaining the new housing.   |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon      | Gamage          | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt                    | 22           |                         |               | No comments to make.   |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 22           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.   |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 22           |                         |               | 2021 is a justified an appropriate start date. But it should be kept under review as the Local Plan progresses, and should be sufficiently flexible to take account of changing market conditions over time.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 22           |                         |               | The Parish considers that the case for meeting Oxford's housing needs on the scale envisaged has not been proved. Notes that once housing has started, the practicalities of identifying whether or not new housing is contributing towards Oxford's unmet need or to Cherwell's existing need are likely to be very difficult.  |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 22           |                         |               | Insufficient time to comment.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 22           |                         |               | Don't know.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 22           |                         |               | 2021 is an appropriate start date.   |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling        |   | 22           |                         |               | Don't know about an appropriate start date but justification only to be considered within the constraints of the responses to questions 1 to 5 and question 7 above.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry           | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 22           |                         |               | Have no comments at this stage, but reserve the right to comment on this topic in the future.  |
| PR-B-1287 | Tenley     | Soanes          |   | 22           |                         |               | Will you be back for more in five years? Oxford City need to stop being greedy and look at their own resources. Why do we need to keep growing all the time? A reduction in students numbers and use their accommodation for housing stock. Create jobs in areas where there are none and people are struggling like in the North and West Country.  |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes          | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 22           |                         |               | Agrees, this is the common start date assumed in the OGB apportionment, and reflects the wording of the agreed memorandum of cooperation.  |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha    | Blackmore       | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family                    | 22           |                         |               | The NPPF requires LPA's to maintain a 5 yr. housing land supply. Many sites will encounter delays in delivery, particularly for the larger strategic allocations, where barriers to delivery can result in long delays to works being commenced on site and dwellings becoming occupied. In the absence of a 5 yr. housing land supply. LA's can become exposed to speculative planning applications on appropriate sites. It is therefore, important that the planning and delivery of houses to address the unmet housing need should commence as soon as practicable. |
| PR-B-1297 | Simon      | Handy           | Strutt and Parker LLP on behalf of Dairystock Ltd                       | 22           |                         |               | Site PR27 is available now and could certainly be developed from 2021 onwards, particularly in conjunction with site PR14.   |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn         |   | 22           |                         |               | If the question is amended to read '...to help meet Oxford's affordable housing needs...' then Yes. Otherwise, No.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk          | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 22           |                         |               | No. Development that is sustainable should go ahead without delay. This is a national policy requirement. The deliverability of sites should be an important consideration in the site assessment process.   |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards        | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                          | 22           |                         |               | 2021 is justified and an appropriate start date.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1346 | Neil              | Tiley    | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group               | 22           |                         |               | By the time PR is adopted in 2018 there will be a 7 year shortfall, with no homes having been delivered to meet the annual requirement for 220 homes in Cherwell to meet the needs of Oxford City because the identified OAN for Oxfordshire relates to the period 2011 to 2031. The shortfall amounts to 1,540 homes. The PR should be required to respond as soon as possible rather than implementing a further 3 year delay in the need to deliver housing. The housing strategy should also incorporate a 20% buffer in recognition of the shortfall. The proposed started date of 2021 will delay delivery further constraining the housing market for residents in Oxford, who will need to remain in their current potentially crowded and unsuitable accommodation, etc. which would be contrary to the objectives of national policy. |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz               | Boden    | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                | 22           |                         |               | Delaying the five year housing supply date to 2021 would mean imposing an artificial constraint on the housing market. There may be a high volume of applications/permissions in the intervening years from now until 2021, meaning that the delivery would be skewed to the first 5 years of the time period from 2021. Grange Farm Launton is available for development now.  |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry             | Munday   |   | 23           |                         |               | Will CDC cooperate with developers with planning, building regulations, section 106 and is there any flexibility in the plan as it proceeds?  |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia           | Hall     |   | 23           |                         |               | Believe this will be outside of council control. GB will be given to developers and social housing will be a low priority.  |
| PR-B-0057 | Matthew           | Taylor   | Aitchison Rafferty                                      | 23           |                         |               | No. Small to medium sized sites should be encouraged to avoid house builders developing more favourable sites before building out allocations.  |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue               | Mackrell | Bicester Town Council                                   | 23           |                         |               | Agree with phasing of land release to assist 5 year land supply.  |
| PR-B-0119 | C A               | McCall   |   | 23           |                         |               | The appropriate housing must be planned carefully, if land release is to work. Stop properties which are three stories high with one parking space.   |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter             | Worth    |   | 23           |                         |               | Once planning is approved put a tax on the land owners to promote delivery of the housing   |
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia | Jennings |   | 23           |                         |               | Yes land releases should be phased to ensure that there is not over development if requirements should change. This also ensures the developers will be forced to deliver on early phases or risk being dropped from further bid lists.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG    | Oldfield |   | 23           |                         |               | No. Developer competition benefits developers but not necessarily the people who live in Cherwell. Sensitive planning by CDC is needed which takes into account the wishes of local residents. The developers have been given an open goal for months to suggest areas for development, while the "consultation" to local residents has consisted of little publicity followed by a draconian deadline for comments   |
| PR-B-0643 | L                 | Allen    |   | 23           |                         |               | No, there are already approved development sites not yet started. Developers wishing to make a profit will not build unless they can see a return. So unless councils are prepared to offer financial assistance house are unlikely to be built on time.  |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter             | Webber   |   | 23           |                         |               | Phasing in is essential so that needs can be reviewed and necessary adjustments made, and to ensure that relevant infrastructure is in place.   |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary    | Shirley  |   | 23           |                         |               | Building should be limited and our identity preserved. Maybe some of the council grounds could be used for housing.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G            | Shirley  |   | 23           |                         |               | If the universities are considering selling ground outside of Oxford they should also consider building on the land within the city.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J                 | Kershaw  | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw | 23           |                         |               | Agree with the Council on this point.   |
| PR-B-0705 | Nick              | Small    | Stagecoach  | 23           |                         |               | Strongly disagrees that any evidence exists nationally to suggest that attempting to manipulate developer activity through phasing releases will promote competition. A detailed argument and justification is set out in the rep.  |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn            | Phillips |   | 23           |                         |               | Existing buildings and land banks should be used first. There needs to be a number of skilled local workers to deal with the high level of building.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony          | Matthews  | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                              | 23           |                         |               | It seems to us that if the Oxford housing need is to be specifically designed for and sited close to the City then it cannot be spread over a widely dispersed number of sites. How, therefore, can it form part of fulfilling the Cherwell need - should it not be subject to a separate land acquisition, infrastructure provision, housing development strategy and programme if the 2031 target is to be achieved?  |
| PR-B-0723 | RA               | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited       | 23           |                         |               | Are aware of the requirement to maintain a five year housing land supply. However, do not consider it is reasonable to expect Cherwell to accommodate such a significant proportion of Oxford's unmet housing needs in addition to the 22.840 new homes already allocated under the adopted local plan.   |
| PR-B-0743 | John             | Tremlett  |  | 23           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve            | Pickles   | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                            | 23           |                         |               | The developers will automatically phase development on strategic sites and so there is no need for the LPA to get involved in this particular issue.  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane             | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council   | 23           |                         |               | Yes   |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive            | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group  | 23           |                         |               | An innovative approach which places the Cherwell DC in the role of overall spatial growth 'Master Planner'. As local planning authority it could be argued that this role is already assumed. Suggest however that the role of the DC in determining where infrastructure for development will be located should be emphasised, asserting the DC's strong negotiating position with developers. This negotiation will include further capturing land value increases associated with the infrastructure provision. The process should not be led by the developers.<br>The assertive role will include building on the work done by the District and County to indicate improvements to road and rail links which enhance the value of the strategic sites. It will also include continued work on other infrastructure components and evaluating the potential financial and economic impacts of different patterns of density and growth rates in terms of both private investment and Council tax revenue as well as congestion or travel time over the next 30 years (at 5-year intervals). Asserting this role should make it clear that the development of the strategic sites is to benefit the DC as well as the developers – the certainty that development of these sites will be associated with adequate infrastructure provision and adequate financial and economic returns should help to ensure maintenance of the land supply. |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard  |  | 23           |                         |               | No. Do not feel that Oxford's needs are required outside the city limits, given that future business will go away from Oxford apart from research within the university areas which have enough room. Do not seem to meet Cherwell's district needs, only to actively pacify City Council.  |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris            | Robbins   |  | 23           |                         |               | Phasing of land release appears reasonable.   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam             | Ryder     | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 23           |                         |               | Whilst phasing may have a role to play in maintaining a 5 year housing supply, it is equally important that there is a wide range of allocated sites, in terms of both size and location to promote developer competition.  |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor    |  | 23           |                         |               | Yes. Land release should be phased as requirements may change. This would also help to deliver integrated affordable housing.   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan             | Dobson    |  | 23           |                         |               | Have little confidence that developer competition will produce significant amounts of affordable housing.   |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard          | Hills     |  | 23           |                         |               | No – land must be released immediately. Need the homes now, not staggered over 5 years. Phased release of land does not encourage competition. Allocating different plots to different construction companies within the same development is enough to drive competition.   |
| PR-B-0837 | David            | Jackson   | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 23           |                         |               | There is little evidence to support the phasing/delay of the identified strategic development sites. The scale of Oxford's outstanding housing requirement, including the unmet element of need, is so great that relevant policies should be focussed on the earliest possible delivery of available sites.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0840 | Mike                   | Gilbert  | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 23           |                         |               | Yes  |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren                 | Bell     | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd        | 23           |                         |               | CDC should identify a good range of housing sites in varied locations and capable of being delivered in the first 5 years and beyond the first 5 years. It would also be inappropriate to establish separate sources of supply and 5 year requirements within the same district and housing market area.   |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex                   | Wilson   | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                   | 23           |                         |               | Each strategic site should be dealt with on a site by site basis at the planning application stage. The Local Plan should not stipulate the phasing of strategic allocations.  |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler   | Bloombridge LLP  | 23           |                         |               | Disagree, although the extent to which we disagree depends on the size of each strategic site. Alternative is a 'blended strategy' with a blend of small, short term, lower impact sites combining with one or two major strategic sites. There is also a case for considering 'safeguarded land' as part of the strategic review of the GB, and this could provide for the future requirements of the University.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David                  | Smith    |  | 23           |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins  | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC             | 23           |                         |               | As the Parish considers that the case for providing to meet Oxford's housing needs on the scale envisaged is unproven at this time we have no comment in response to this question.  |
| PR-B-0871 | Patricia               | Redpath  |  | 23           |                         |               | A sensible review of the SHMA is required to look at current circumstances and the projected figures. Claimed unmet need is not to accommodate Oxford currently, rather seeking to provide for economic growth in Oxford's hub. Lack of available land and destruction of the area if approved, this needs to be re-evaluated for its need. Alternatives need to be found. Areas have been considered and rejected before which has been a lengthy and expensive exercise. This is being overturned with little change to the circumstances. |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin   | Oxfordshire County Council   | 23           |                         |               | Recommend that wherever possible health and wellbeing facilitating infrastructure is included in the earliest phases of any development.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane                   | Olds     | Wendlebury Parish Council  | 23           |                         |               | Unable to respond due to lack of time  |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks    |  | 23           |                         |               | The ability of developers to land-bank sites must be prevented.  |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |  | 23           |                         |               | Would expect the Council to insist on a balance of competitive interests.  |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob                    | Lawrence |  | 23           |                         |               | No. Phasing of land would lead to poor quality and design of the houses built at different times with inconsistent approaches to planning and appearance. There would be a long period of disruption for residents. Better to release the land in a way that promotes developer competition whilst ensuring that design standards are maximised.   |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council   | 23           |                         |               | Welcomes Developer Contributions.National Policy on preventing land banking and promoting financial penalties for delaying development commencement is welcomed. Granting permissions needs to include shorter start dates for implementation and build-out rates timetables.  |
| PR-B-0907 | Alison                 | Forfar   |  | 23           |                         |               | Once brownfield sites in Oxford have been released and a robust assessment of the housing need has been undertaken with the revision of the numbers only then it would make sense to release land. However the approach used in Bicester at a lower density has not produced an attractive area. There needs to be greater control and thought with the developers to keep the areas attractive and to enhance the beauty of the areas.  |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton   |  | 23           |                         |               | Again the question presupposes a need which I don't accept. The GB should be protected and nothing should be done to meet Oxford's supposed needs.   |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 23           |                         |               | There appears to be little competition between builders due to the restricted output of new homes built. The Dispatches program reported that sites appear to be subject to a policy of keeping construction low and prices high and that new homes are effectively rationed to enhance builders' profits.   |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | 23           |                         |               | No, phasing of land supply does not promote developer competition, this is achieved within the open market. Phasing is an artificial restriction on the rate of development, which if it is to meet an unmet need, should proceed at the pace the market is able to deliver housing.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0929 | Rosie      | Lodwick   |  | 23           |                         |               | The projections of unmet need are very likely to be false. If that is the case because the methodology is flawed, or if the local or national economic context was incorrectly forecast, it would seem to her to be prudent to allocate a much more modest amount of land for housing at this time, and allocate more land at a future date should it become necessary.  |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane       | Olds      | Fringford Parish Council                             | 23           |                         |               | Planning permissions should have a three year expiry date  |
| PR-B-0935 | David      | Lock      | David Lock Associates on behalf of Gallagher Estates | 23           |                         |               | There is no reference in Government policy nor guidance that the phased release of strategic sites is a mechanism through which a 5 year housing land supply can be maintained. It is critical that the supply provides a range that offers choice and competition in the market. It would appear that the weight placed on the need to phase developments is to encourage competition across sites. However, if a strategy that sought a mix of sites across the District were pursued, choice and competition would be embedded in that strategy.                |
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle     | Greenlight Developments                              | 23           |                         |               | If Cherwell chooses to phase land release then it should be made clear that any future phasing is indicative only and not intended to prevent development coming forward earlier than indicated. There should be no policy that seeks to impose an arbitrary cap on development, even if the housing requirement figure is reached. In addition a range of large and smaller sites should be proposed to ensure a 5 year housing supply is achieved.   |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone     |  | 23           |                         |               | The Plan should make clear that land i.e. sites mentioned in Question 7 are enshrined as GB, have enduring permanence and are not for sale. Otherwise this defeats the whole reason, protection and purpose of GB. More sites could be brought forward in other areas of Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk      | Banbury Civic Society                                | 23           |                         |               | Have reservations regarding the apparent involvement of developers - unless acting as 'contractors' via another mechanism. This could be a jointly owned, not for profit development company (similar to the 'self-build' project at Bicester) that would assemble the land and promote the construction to meet the identified requirements, but with particular emphasis on the provision of low cost social housing. Are sceptical that developers would deliver on this requirement to time and budget.  |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd                                | 23           |                         |               | An alternative strategy would be to allocate a range of sites across existing settlements, in line with Option I, which would have shorter lead in times. A broad range of allocations in sustainable rural settlements would deliver housing to maintain the 5 year land supply and reduce the need for artificially controlling the release of land.   |
| PR-B-0984 | Jane       | Burrett   |  | 23           |                         |               | No. Developers work together to circumvent the best intentions of councils. Profit is the only motive, developers can not be controlled by councils. The plan to have an 'unmet housing need for Oxford's five year target is separate from those already planned by CDC. Why have CDC agreed to place these houses in this district. Green field sites which might be released at the direct benefit of Oxford City will lead to urban sprawl. Oxford City need to make better use of existing housing, look at brownfield sites and empty commercial properties. |
| PR-B-1003 | Simon      | Turner    | Launton Parish Council                               | 23           |                         |               | Unclear how this will promote developer competition or maintain the five year land supply.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles    | Kirtlington Parish Council                           | 23           |                         |               | Not able to answer this question   |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher   | Rosconn Group  | 23           |                         |               | Do not agree, consider that there is a pressing need to bring forward sites as soon as possible if the full housing need is to be met within the Plan period. Introducing phasing would only introduce delay in housing delivery.  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson   | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                    | 23           |                         |               | Yes, phasing could positively assist delivery. Phased allocation at New Alchester would provide a different market for new homes to those already consented and under construction around Bicester. Phasing would also allow larger sites to begin delivery in accordance with the level of development required to meet Oxford's needs before going on in the future plan period to deliver more for Cherwell District.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 23           |                         |               | No. The market will dictate delivery so there is absolutely no reason why the Authority should interfere.  |
| PR-B-1027 | Jonathan   | Porter        | Archstone Projects Ltd  | 23           |                         |               | The idea of phasing would assume a consistent housing market throughout the plan period. There is an acute problem with affordability in Oxford City and the District. Seeking to restrict the delivery of new homes against market demand would be counterproductive.   |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan   | Harbottle     | Land and Partners Ltd   | 23           |                         |               | An alternative strategy would be to allocate a range of sites across existing settlements, which would have shorter lead in times. Infrastructure improvements would be more localised and could be delivered more quickly. A broad range of allocations in sustainable rural settlements would deliver housing to maintain the 5 year land supply and reduce the need for artificially controlling the release of land. Additional criteria-based policy to allow for sustainable development in rural areas would introduce greater flexibility and allow smaller sites to come forward. Suggested policy wording is proposed. |
| PR-B-1032 | David      | Burson        | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford           | 23           |                         |               | It will be recalled that at the Examination of the draft Cherwell Local Plan the Council's evidence highlighted the likely market saturation which would occur with further housing developments in Banbury and Bicester. It also indicated that development would therefore need to occur more appropriately closer to Oxford. Provision of homes closer to Oxford will provide greater security of delivery to support the necessary housing land supply.  |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice      | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments         | 23           |                         |               | Concern expressed that phasing policies could run counter to the objective set out in para 8.19. The matter therefore needs further and more detailed consideration.   |
| PR-B-1069 | JP         | Lyes          |   | 23           |                         |               | It might but have no confidence in property developers or the notion of competition in that sector. What is suggested is that developers be required to show innovation in the provision of affordable housing in order to qualify for participation in the more profitable projects.  |
| PR-B-1094 | Andrew F   | Hickman       | Middleton Stoney Parish Council   | 23           |                         |               | Not qualified to assess whether 2021 is a reasonable start date. It is essential that a five year land supply is maintained in order to inhibit speculative development.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val        | Russell       | Bodicote Parish Council   | 23           |                         |               | Are not in a position to answer this question  |
| PR-B-1096 | Greg       | Blaquiere     | Terence O'Rourke Ltd on behalf of the Vanbrugh Unit Trust and Pye Homes | 23           |                         |               | The approach to phase sites is not considered reasonable. It is not necessary to address land supply in this way - any overprovision from the start of the plan period will continue to count towards the five year land supply. Early delivery should be encouraged and will positively assist the Council in maintaining a rolling 5-year housing land supply. It is also unclear how holding back sites would encourage competition between developers, there is no evidence for this and the strategy is unjustified and ineffective in this respect and therefore unsound.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain       | Johnson       |   | 23           |                         |               | Am not sure a 5 year strategic plan of land release is appropriate. In the current uncertain economic climate there needs to be flexibility. Suggest land release should only be done when there is certainty of requirement for housing in that area. Pragmatic planning based on local conditions will make sure the "5 year plan" is not followed when it is no longer appropriate.   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat        | Clissold      |   | 23           |                         |               | Yes, a phased approach provides an opportunity to assess the situation according to economic growth. An example is near to Malaga in Spain where there are rows of empty houses. We do not want this in Cherwell, there is too little green space left now.  |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard    | Bennett       |   | 23           |                         |               | If undertaken it must fully integrate transport and strategic infrastructure improvements.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French    | Deddington Development Watch                          | 23           |                         |               | Deddington Development Watch consider that it is essential to release land in phases. It is a well established fact that large developers and house builders sit on land with planning permission. The failure to develop these sites, for whatever reasons are given, results in the 5-year housing land supply being questioned at best and undermined in reality. This results in more planning permissions being granted for land which would not have been brought forward at that time or simply as an opportunistic proposal on sites which in normal conditions would not get planning permission. This is well evidenced by housing sites permitted on appeal or reluctantly granted by LPAs knowing that without a 5-year supply appeals will be successful. Have provided further comments on the need to enter into legal agreements on housing and infrastructure delivery in detail in the representation. |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer   |   | 23           |                         |               | It is essential that the phasing of land release is done fairly so as not to favour one developer over another, having said that some sites will always be more attractive for development both for the developers and the authorities involved.   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright    | Begbroke Parish Council                               | 23           |                         |               | Understand that many sites in Cherwell have development permissions but no starts.   |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis     |   | 23           |                         |               | Refusing to release any GB land will encourage competition between builders who will be encouraged to start and complete projects rather than adhering to a policy of keeping construction low and prices high.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy   | Hornton Parish Council                                | 23           |                         |               | No. Not enough examination to show that developers actively compete for whatever reason except land purchase.  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian |   | 23           |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson   |   | 23           |                         |               | If this proceeds then land should only be released in tranches with time limited planning permissions to ensure that development proceeds and that the predicted housing need occurs.  |
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi             | Stokes    | Persimmon Homes Midlands                              | 23           |                         |               | No. Phasing the release of land is unlikely to promote developer competition. It is likely to impede delivery if the release of land is not quick enough to react to completions of previous phases. This may hinder rather than encourage the effective delivery of new homes. Phasing of sites is a prerequisite of delivering viable and properly planned and sustainable schemes. It does not promote developer competition and will not assist the maintenance of a five year housing supply.   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol            | Matheson  |   | 23           |                         |               | Cannot comment on this because of the flawed information that has been presented. Oxford has not proved that it needs all this housing and needs to review its findings with up to date figures. It needs to take into account GB and local village communities.   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa          | Goss      | Adderbury Parish Council                              | 23           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.   |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul             | Butt      | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd | 23           |                         |               | No. The Partial Review would better assist deliverability of the appropriate housing requirement, and the maintenance of a Framework - compliant 5 year housing supply, which ought not to be a calculation specific to Oxford's unmet housing needs, by considering all reasonable locations in contributing to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs, allocating a range of sites of varying sizes in a wider range of locations across the HMA within sustainable villages, including Arncott.  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew           | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm   | 23           |                         |               | It is noted that delivery rates are to be prepared as part of the Local Plan Part 2, however, it is agreed that the phasing of a development is an appropriate means of ensuring the correct provision of uses to provide the required services for any new settlement.  |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry            | Brougham  |   | 23           |                         |               | It is likely that the majority of development sites are already owned or optioned by volume house builders wishing to maximise profits. Additional measures, such as CPO of parts of these sites for release to small developers, housing associations and self-builders will be needed to achieve development at the rate required.   |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M            | Green     |   | 23           |                         |               | Yes. Land release should be phased as requirements change. This would also help to deliver integrated affordable housing.  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon            | Gamage    | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt  | 23           |                         |               | Generally agree with this principle however would welcome provision to allow earlier release of sites in the event that planned strategic sites do not come forward as expected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname         | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1235 | Ed         | Barrett         | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd                 | 23           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard    | Boother         | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies                   | 23           |                         |               | Agrees that phasing of land release within individual sites will promote developer competition and assist the maintenance of a five year housing supply. PR74 is available and can make an early contribution to meeting Oxford's unmet housing need as a stand-alone site in its own right. It could also be included as part of a wider site.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne    | Willson-Higgins |   | 23           |                         |               | The case for providing to meet Oxford's housing needs on the scale envisaged is unproven.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera  | Kantor          |   | 23           |                         |               | Insufficient time to comment.   |
| PR-B-1252 | Philip     | Boxall          |   | 23           |                         |               | Agree with phasing of land release.   |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard        |   | 23           |                         |               | No because Oxford University controls and owns most of the land in Oxford. How can developer competition be a thing when it's owned by one source?  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells           | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | 23           |                         |               | Suggest that realistic expectations of delivery should be carefully assessed. As far as possible delivery of Affordable Housing should be prioritised. Agreements and Conditions enforcing early delivery should be considered if the purpose of the strategy is to be met.   |
| PR-B-1272 | S G        | Wakeling        |   | 23           |                         |               | Please see responses to questions 1 to 3.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon      | Barry           | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                                 | 23           |                         |               | Specific phasing policies could run counter to this approach and restrict appropriate development. Reserve the right to comment further on this issue when the need for, nature and purpose of the phasing policies are more clearly defined  |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles      | Hughes          | West Oxfordshire District Council                                       | 23           |                         |               | No objection to CDC considering the phasing of land release if this helps deliver houses to help meet Oxford's unmet need and maintain a 5 year housing land supply.  |
| PR-B-1295 | Natasha    | Blackmore       | Sheldon Bosley Knight on behalf of the Wright Family                    | 23           |                         |               | For sites with less than 200 units, phasing is not appropriate as they can be delivered in a single phase by a single developer.  |
| PR-B-1298 | James      | Jocelyn         |   | 23           |                         |               | No comment.   |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel      | McGurk          | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust                        | 23           |                         |               | No, there is no evidence to support the contention that this would promote developer competition such that any relevant benefits would arise. Attempting to phase the meeting of need would result in unnecessary restrictions and could prevent appropriate investment in associated infrastructure. The approach set out is unduly restrictive, fails to provide for sustainable development and would be likely to result in the repeated building of soulless housing estates, rather than sustainable communities.   |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun      | Richards        | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd                          | 23           |                         |               | No do not agree. The best way to ensure a 5 year supply is to have a range of sites both in size and location. This must be better than limited development sites coming forward in a phased manner. A further requirement for exemplar design (whatever that means) will also slow down the delivery of houses.  |
| PR-B-1344 | Jonathan   | Harbottle       | Land and Partners Ltd   | 23           |                         |               | An alternative to this strategy would be to allocate a range of sites across existing settlements, in line with Option I, which would have stronger lead-in times. Infrastructure improvements would be localised and could be delivered quickly. A broad range of allocations in sustainable rural settlements would deliver housing to maintain the 5 year land supply and reduce the need for artificially controlling release of land. Suggest that criteria based policy would introduce greater flexibility and allow smaller sites to come forward. Development to meet identified needs in rural settlements would respond positively to the findings of the Taylor Report. "Development proposals which are located adjoining the built-up area of villages and which meet the criteria of sustainable development will be supported where they help to meet identified housing need. Neighbourhood Plans may seek to allocate further sites to support the vitality of the villages and these will be supported." |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific      | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------|--|
| PR-B-1346 | Neil           | Tiley    | Pegasus on behalf of the Dorchester Group                              | 23           |                         |                    | The phasing of land releases can constrain housing delivery and cause further delays to site delivery whilst willing developers are prevented from bringing forward deliverable sites to accord with arbitrary phasing policy. This is contrary to the significant boost to housing supply required by the NPPF. Do not consider that developer contribution is a factor in the delivery of sites. The developer would deliver as soon as possible. The issues that slow down delivery are planning process and market demand, as developers will only build where they are able to sell and ensure a return. These are largely beyond the control of the Local Plan. Suggest allocating a range of different sites in different locations which will appeal to a range of different developers, thereby ensuring that as many developers are working in the District as possible. This also accords with para 47 and 50 of the NPPF. Another way of supporting delivery is to identify reserve sites, such that if any of the allocated sites are delayed then sustainable alternatives can be brought forward quickly. |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz            | Boden    | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                               | 23           |                         |                    | It is understood that Cherwell District Council has taken into consideration the size of strategic sites and likely build-out rates in forming the view that the phasing of land release within individual strategic development sites will assist in maintaining a five year housing land supply. In Cherwell developer interest is high. As developer competition already exists there is not a basis on which to justify a phased release of strategic sites. Indeed, it would constrain housing supply and as there is already a shortfall against targets, this may mean a further undersupply. This would be contrary to Council's intention of encouraging housing delivery and ensuring that supply is maintained.   |
| PR-B-1108 | Tom            | Hockaday |  | 24           | H                       |                    | Development needs to be near Oxford, area H is subject to excessive development already.   |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert         | Davies   | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace | 24           |                         | PR124, PR41, PR177 | Sites PR124, PR41 and PR177. The Oxford Transport Strategy has identified a link through this site. This link is considered as an essential infrastructure if housing is to be developed along the A40/A44 transport corridors. This link road would relieve congestion around Wolvercote roundabout. This would free up the roadway for cars moving into and out of Oxford thereby reducing commuting times. They have provided a sketch showing the preliminary link road path showing how the link road could be located through sites 124, 41, and 177. They consider that without a link between Duke's Cut (A40) and Loop Farm Roundabout (A44) key transport issues are not entirely solved but are moved closer to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0019 | Edward         | Dowler   | Middle Aston Parish Meeting  | 24           |                         |                    | No   |
| PR-B-0033 | Henry          | Munday   |  | 24           |                         |                    | 8.20 How will the housing be allocated with regards to local residents and those from Oxford? There will be unsustainable pressure on the roads.   |
| PR-B-0055 | Cynthia        | Hall     |  | 24           |                         |                    | Building along the proposed Oxford-Cambridge railway line would be beneficial, as this is where people will want to live.  |
| PR-B-0058 | Anthony        | Hall     |  | 24           |                         |                    | Yes, you should conform with the NPPF rather than circumvent it.   |
| PR-B-0060 | Sue            | Mackrell | Bicester Town Council  | 24           |                         |                    | The assessment and proposals made seem to cover all bases, however traffic generation remains a central issue.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A            | McCall   |  | 24           |                         |                    | Infrastructure.  |
| PR-B-0171 | Peter          | Worth    |  | 24           |                         |                    | Run an additional process for sites which meet the criteria but have not been volunteered for development. It will flush out some new capacity.  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG | Oldfield |  | 24           |                         |                    | Yes. Take more notice of local opinion and allow more time for consideration. Also, ask residents whether they wish to retain the GB.  |
| PR-B-0643 | L              | Allen    |  | 24           |                         |                    | The question is asked 'How do you work out what is delivered against the Cherwell or combined Cherwell and Oxford plan?' For example if the need does not materialise as BMW shuts Cowley?   |
| PR-B-0653 | Peter          | Webber   |  | 24           |                         |                    | Phasing in is essential so that needs can be reviewed and necessary adjustments made, and to ensure that relevant infrastructure is in place. Consideration should be given to avoiding the creation of a London corridor, and the effects of Park and Ride sites  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary | Shirley  |  | 24           |                         |                    | Propose you listen to the vast majority who strongly oppose the plans.   |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G         | Shirley  |  | 24           |                         |                    | Not too many houses, green space is needed for people and wildlife.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0704 | J          | Kershaw   | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw              | 24           |                         |               | Please see response to Q21 above.  |
| PR-B-0710 | Selwyn     | Phillips  |  | 24           |                         |               | Yes. Provide regular presentations to the local communities. Employ a communications person to present the plan. Make use of the Cherwell newsletter and provide regular updates.  |
| PR-B-0711 | Anthony    | Matthews  | Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Parish Council                        | 24           |                         |               | The housing requirement is of an order of complexity and difficulty beyond any experienced in recent time - in our view there would seem to be a need for strong leadership, overall detailed planning and development control and adequate resources and skills, provided perhaps, by creating a specialist design and development team tasked with the overall integration, design and delivery of the development site(s) selected including all related infrastructure to support any development programme is designed and put in place prior to occupation of the housing.   |
| PR-B-0723 | RA         | Humphreys | Humphreys and Co Solicitors LLP on behalf of Oxford Programs Limited | 24           |                         |               | Are aware of the requirement to maintain a five year housing land supply. However, do not consider it is reasonable to expect Cherwell to accommodate such a significant proportion of Oxford's unmet housing needs in addition to the 22.840 new homes already allocated under the adopted local plan.  |
| PR-B-0743 | John       | Tremlett  |  | 24           |                         |               | No   |
| PR-B-0769 | Debbie     | Jones     | Bidwells on behalf of City of Oxford Charity                         | 24           |                         |               | Where it can be demonstrated that the purposes of the GB are no longer functional, GB boundaries should be reviewed and land released in sustainable locations to allow for the most sustainable development to come forward.  |
| PR-B-0770 | Steve      | Pickles   | West Waddy ADP on behalf of JA Pye (Oxford) Ltd                      | 24           |                         |               | No comments  |
| PR-B-0786 | Jane       | Olds      | Caversfield Parish Council   | 24           |                         |               | This project should be a 'one off' agreement with Oxford and it should not be expected to be expanded in the future. The developers will need to be held to account to ensure that they do actually supply the housing promised.   |
| PR-B-0788 | Tom        | McCulloch | Community First Oxfordshire  | 24           |                         |               | Community funding will only be sought through CIL funding. Believe that this will likely significantly reduce the amount available for the crucial process of place making on new development. Strongly argue that CDC support should continue to be additionally sought through S106 agreements and CDC should be explicit in outlining its vision and roadmap for the criteria of thriving, engaged and self-servicing new communities. They base their arguments on the outcomes of the 2016 Community Spaces and Development study which CFO was commissioned to undertake by CDC, The study offered new models of indoor space provision on new developments and made best practice recommendations - derived from extensive primary and secondary research - for place making on major new housing developments. Have provided a detailed note on place making principles, need for community facilities, provision of adequate physical infrastructure on new developments, like water, sewerage and transport connections. Creating healthy and thriving new communities should be at the heart of its place making activity and negotiations with developers. The Local Authority should set up Site Development Forums (SDF's) for strategic development locations, involving key stakeholders. All this is discussed in detail in their representation. |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive      | Booth     | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                                  | 24           |                         |               | Monitoring the negotiation process will help to identify improvements to the financial and economic analyses (i.e. through assessing the validity of assumptions and risks identified at the outset). This will enable focused changes to policy, for example enhanced land value estimation, changes in green belt boundaries and investment in local rail, with the aim of facilitating further infrastructure and housing investment.   |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian        | Sheppard  |  | 24           |                         |               | All comments made.   |
| PR-B-0808 | Chris      | Robbins   |  | 24           |                         |               | No further proposals   |
| PR-B-0820 | Liam       | Ryder     | Gladman Developments Ltd   | 24           |                         |               | No   |

| Rep No.   | First Name             | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus                 | Campbell | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group                                   | 24           |                         |               | Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in their representation.  |
| PR-B-0832 | Richard                | Hills    |  | 24           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0837 | David                  | Jackson  | Savills on behalf of Christ Church, Exeter College, Merton College and OUP | 24           |                         |               | Specific measures should be introduced to monitor delivery and to allow for adaption of the Plan in the event that sites are not delivered/deliverable in the timescale that the Local Plan anticipates.  |
| PR-B-0840 | Mike                   | Gilbert  | Mike Gilbert Planning Ltd  | 24           |                         |               | No  |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren                 | Bell     | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd              | 24           |                         |               | Full consideration of deliverable sites in Cat A villages and inclusion of a proportion of the overall Oxford housing numbers in defined Cat A villages, as part of a balanced development strategy, to meet the additional housing requirements of Oxford City.  |
| PR-B-0842 | Alex                   | Wilson   | Barton Willmore on behalf of A2 Dominion Group Ltd                         | 24           |                         |               | The monitoring approach should be set out in the Plan. Consideration should be given to: Augmentation of housing land supply in the short and long term; monitoring of member authorities delivery rates; reporting process to Oxford City Council.   |
| PR-B-0847 | Richard                | Cutler   | Bloombridge LLP  | 24           |                         |               | A key missing component is the regeneration of Kidlington. The Alan Baxter work in 2013 took important steps forward. Rather than abandoning this work, it should be extended to re-engage with the true potential of Kidlington. Proper, proactive engagement is required in order to marry the costs and benefits of accommodating the proposed 4,400 homes.  |
| PR-B-0856 | David                  | Smith    |  | 24           |                         |               | Insufficient knowledge  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim                    | Perkins  | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC                   | 24           |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer               | McFadden |  | 24           |                         |               | Will the housing really be affordable? London commuters will drive prices up.   |
| PR-B-0877 | David                  | Flavin   | Oxfordshire County Council   | 24           |                         |               | Whilst good data is available on public transport ridership limited data is available on the numbers of people travelling actively. It is strongly recommended that developers are asked to consider how they will facilitate the evaluation of whether their developments have encouraged people to walk, scoot (push scooters) and/or cycle.  |
| PR-B-0887 | Paul                   | Buckley  |  | 24           |                         |               | Yes. CDC along with other District Councils need to review the target figures for housing, on the belief that future planning decisions in Oxford will constrain building for employment growth, along with the compatible level of housing and commuting that can sustainably be achieved. Not simply agreeing to the wishes of potential employers.   |
| PR-B-0890 | Chris                  | Dicks    |  | 24           |                         |               | Air quality plan, light pollution and transport impact, including any construction works of the roads and developments themselves   |
| PR-B-0895 | Dr Alison and Dr Simon | Street   |  | 24           |                         |               | No comments.  |
| PR-B-0905 | Theresa                | Goss     | Bloxham Parish Council   | 24           |                         |               | Reiterates the point on build-out rates timetables agreed with planning permissions (Question 23), possibly through a legal s106 agreement (as Oxford City does not have a 5 year land supply)  |
| PR-B-0910 | Ken                    | Pelton   |  | 24           |                         |               | Would like you to improve the transport infrastructure so that the needs of the existing housing are met, whether sustainably or not, before you do anything else.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen                  | Marshall | CPRE Oxfordshire   | 24           |                         |               | An Oxfordshire Structure Plan is now urgently required, that could take a more holistic view of employment and housing requirements across District and City boundaries, including looking at appropriate transport and infrastructure issues. This could be carried out by the Oxfordshire Growth Board and should be subject to Examination in Public by an Inspector. This should be completed before any decision is taken on the allocation of Oxford's housing to Cherwell. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan                    | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd       | 24           |                         |               | Development to cater for Oxford's unmet need should be capable of providing mixed and balanced sustainable communities.   |
| PR-B-0931 | Jane                   | Olds     | Fringford Parish Council   | 24           |                         |               | There should be an agreed time based delivery structure for the monitoring reports  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0937 | Philip     | Rawle         | Greenlight Developments   | 24           |                         |               | Are cautious over the deliverability of large strategic sites (particularly where significant infrastructure is required). These sites have not historically delivered at the rates expected. Local Plan inspectors have fallen back on the corrective mechanism built in to the Framework if the large sites do not perform at the rates expected. This should be incorporated in to the Partial Review.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David      | Stone         |   | 24           |                         |               | Infrastructure and road improvements need to be made prior to building on sites and impact and capacity of adjoining roads assessed. Developers need to pay for medical, school and community facilities before completion. GB needs to be respected and wildlife corridors protected. Urban sprawl should be avoided by developing other areas of Cherwell. Development should not be accepted that causes road disruption to present traffic flows. Ensure bus routes are adequate.  |
| PR-B-0949 | Peter      | Monk          | Banbury Civic Society   | 24           |                         |               | This is crucial, both in the evaluation and realisation phases.  |
| PR-B-0956 | Mark       | Recchia       | Banbury Town Council  | 24           |                         |               | Suggest that design specifications are attached to planning conditions to ensure properties in new developments are in keeping with the areas where they eventually are sited.   |
| PR-B-1006 | Ruth       | Powles        | Kirtlington Parish Council                                      | 24           |                         |               | It is as a priority that the criteria for the designation of a green belt is reviewed in regard to many areas of the Oxford Green belt so that Oxford's unmet housing needs should be built in these areas which are far less 'countryside' than rural areas further north in Cherwell District, and CDC should continue to work to protect the rural areas in our district. To support environmental policies these new sites, if possible, should be linked to Oxford City with off-road cycle tracks, good public transport, etc.                               |
| PR-B-1015 | Daniel     | Hatcher       | Rosconn Group   | 24           |                         |               | Consideration should be given to the identification of 'Reserve Sites' to supplement the supply to meet Oxford's unmet needs, as recommended by the LPEG recommendations. Such sites should ideally be smaller, discreet sites that can be delivered quickly with short notice.  |
| PR-B-1016 | Ben        | Simpson       | WYG on behalf of Bonnar Allan Ltd                               | 24           |                         |               | In summary, consider that allocation of land at New Alchester is the optimal solution. It represents an opportunity to provide a comprehensively planned new community that will have excellent connections to Oxford and the Science Vale, as well as making a positive contribution towards the future growth of Bicester Garden Town and Cherwell's own development needs.  |
| PR-B-1017 | Oliver     | Burton-Taylor | Simply Land (Oxford) Ltd  | 24           |                         |               | Yes, please consider the potential for Site 41 to provide a highly sustainable urban expansion of Oxford without the same degree of harm caused as the presently preferred growth options, in particular south east Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-1024 | Andrew     | Hornsby-Smith |   | 24           |                         |               | Suggests that the affordable homes target be raised from 35% to 50% and that densities are site specific.  |
| PR-B-1036 | Robert     | Davies        | Gerald Eve LLP  | 24           |                         |               | To achieve truly sustainable development in close proximity to Oxford in order to meet its unmet housing needs, the Council should consider Area of Search A as the main area of search for housing given that the area is best placed to serve the needs of Oxford. Notwithstanding this, it is vitally important that different market places and varying sizes of development allocations are created within Area of Search A in order to maximise the housing trajectory and to find the most suitable, deliverable, sustainable and logical sites for growth. |
| PR-B-1037 | Alice      | Suttie        | Boyer Planning on behalf of Redrow Homes and Wates Developments | 24           |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-1069 | JP         | Lyes          |   | 24           |                         |               | Any project of this scale should conduct and publish an annual performance review. Also feel there must be a public presentation of the plans once they have been decided upon but before it takes place.  |
| PR-B-1095 | Val        | Russell       | Bodicote Parish Council   | 24           |                         |               | Are not in a position to answer this question  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation                 | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------|------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1099 | Alan             | Storah     | Oxford City Council          | 24           |                         |               | One probable means of seeking to ensure this is to make the distinction between the housing intended to meet the needs of the district and that of the city when monitoring. That would enable the two distinct and separate strands of housing requirement to be monitored with a view to managing each one if and when required to try to ensure the delivery of sustainable development.  |
| PR-B-1110 | Iain             | Johnson    |                              | 24           |                         |               | This is essential. Developers will only want to maximise profits. Smaller developments in Oxford have resulted in developers not delivering any affordable houses or local infrastructure improvements. Plans need to be monitored to take into account any changes in the local economy and demographics. Any developments on the edge of Oxford need to be mindful of what the university is doing and there needs to be regular feedback to affected residents. The council needs to be prepared to change with regards to the 5 year strategic plan.   |
| PR-B-1111 | Pat              | Clissold   |                              | 24           |                         |               | Better intra city transport. Preservation of the historic character of Oxford. No dilution of its historic footprint. Key attributes are its culture and buildings. Please do not treat the city as a "honey pot" for development because you will destroy it.   |
| PR-B-1140 | Catherine        | Richenburg |                              | 24           |                         |               | Yes, restrict buy-to-let in the developments.  |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan             | Lodwick    |                              | 24           |                         |               | There is a lack of strategic coordination of planning in Oxfordshire. Employment generating developments are encouraged in different districts without any reference to each other or to their overall consequences. What strategic planning exists is being imposed on the local Councils without consultation by unelected bodies such as the LEP and its unrealistic Strategic Economic Plan while the consultants undertaking analysis are not independent and their work is not subject to independent verification. There is a need for an overarching and fully democratically accountable body to take responsibility for strategic planning and truly independent and thorough analysis of future needs. This might best be done by the restoration of strategic planning powers to the County Council or by a new Unitary Oxfordshire Authority. Only through properly resourced and co-ordinated strategic planning can a sound plan be established and delivered and sustainable development achieved. |
| PR-B-1145 | Richard          | Bennett    |                              | 24           |                         |               | If undertaken it must fully integrate transport and strategic infrastructure improvements.   |
| PR-B-1146 | DJ               | French     | Deddington Development Watch | 24           |                         |               | Question whether any deficiencies been identified in the monitoring arrangements already put in place for Local Plan Part 1 ?  |
| PR-B-1154 | Jim              | Spencer    |                              | 24           |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey          | Wright     | Begbroke Parish Council      | 24           |                         |               | Oxford should review its reasons for demanding this housing and review how it could provide more themselves.   |
| PR-B-1157 | Nicola and Giles | Lewis      |                              | 24           |                         |               | Having studied evidence from the CPRE agree with their view that Oxfordshire should take a more holistic view of employment and housing requirements across the region. The aim should be to increase employment opportunities further away from the city in surroundings towns - so that fewer people need to commute. Carterton, for example, would benefit from business investment that would generate wealth in the town and attract more people to live and work there. Given the distance from any train stations it would not attract commuters and house prices would reflect that. Enabling and encouraging people to work where they live will reduce traffic problems and spread wealth to less prosperous areas outside the GB. This policy would lead to more sustainable and balanced communities.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger            | Bellamy    | Hornton Parish Council       | 24           |                         |               | A simplification of the plan(it is currently far too complicated for the general public to assess). It appears inflexible, incomplete and built upon flawed premises. It would not deliver sustainable development, for several reasons, in its current form.  |
| PR-B-1163 | Catherine        | Arakelian  |                              | 24           |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-1165 | Caroline         | Johnson    |                              | 24           |                         |               | Transport links and upgrades should be met before development begins. All other infrastructure should be installed before or during the build and if this condition cannot be met the development should not proceed.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1167 | Jodi               | Stokes   | Persimmon Homes Midlands                                | 24           |                         |               | Delivery should be monitored annually to ensure that output is in line with the trajectory. Measures should be put in place to allow for the release of additional land for development if targets fail to be met for 3 years in a row. It would be prudent to include a large buffer and reserve sites in the plan so as to avoid the slow process of land release through a review of the plan.   |
| PR-B-1188 | Carol              | Matheson |   | 24           |                         |               | Include everyone, not only Oxford. Councils need to work together   |
| PR-B-1224 | Theresa            | Goss     | Adderbury Parish Council                                | 24           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1225 | Paul               | Butt     | Paul Butt Planning on behalf of Shyde Investments Ltd   | 24           |                         |               | No comment  |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew             | Garraway | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm     | 24           |                         |               | A detailed response provided. A holistic approach is required to the provision of any new settlements, with a clear vision to address the future needs of the District and Oxford, in line with the Cambridge Futures approach.   |
| PR-B-1229 | Henry              | Brougham |   | 24           |                         |               | No.   |
| PR-B-1230 | T M M              | Green    |   | 24           |                         |               | Building should only commence when the necessary infrastructure is in place, roads, railway, buses, schools and other amenities capable of sustaining the new housing.  |
| PR-B-1233 | Simon              | Gamage   | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Bratt    | 24           |                         |               | No further comments to make at this time.   |
| PR-B-1235 | Ed                 | Barrett  | Catesby Property Group on behalf of Catesby Estates Ltd | 24           |                         |               | No comments at this stage.  |
| PR-B-1236 | Richard            | Boother  | RPS Planning and Development on behalf of Mr R Davies   | 24           |                         |               | Does not have any comments on the monitoring of the delivery of the final plan.   |
| PR-B-1243 | Kazimiera          | Kantor   |   | 24           |                         |               | Insufficient time to comment.   |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia              | Sheppard |   | 24           |                         |               | Not build there, GB's are needed for environmentally positive sustainability.   |
| PR-B-1271 | Rebecca            | Hodgson  |   | 24           |                         |               | Please look at Poundbury in Dorset for examples of decent high density housing.   |
| PR-B-1272 | S G                | Wakeling |   | 24           |                         |               | The Government should put a national housing policy in place.   |
| PR-B-1284 | Simon              | Barry    | Boyer Planning on behalf of Bloor Homes                 | 24           |                         |               | Have no comments at this stage, but reserve the right to comment on this topic in the future.   |
| PR-B-1296 | Graciela Inglesias | Rogers   |   | 24           |                         |               | Yes. There are credible and effective alternatives to housing development in the GB. Use proposed employment sites. Invest in lower polluting forms of public transport such as trams. Invest on the expansion and improvement of broadband networks. These ideas were undertaken by Strasbourg in 1990's with great success.   |
| PR-B-1298 | James              | Jocelyn  |   | 24           |                         |               | Should give greater respect to the role of public consultation in the overall process. Thus far, efforts by Cherwell and other councils in this regard have been woefully inadequate. The interests of certain parties, some with vested interests in the outcomes of this process, have been greatly prioritised over the interests of 'people and communities'. This sets the scene for greater dispute in future and increases the potential for delay in delivery of a positively prepared, sustainable plan. |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel              | McGurk   | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust        | 24           |                         |               | Yes. Allocate land along the A44 to meet Oxford's unmet need. Two sites at Begbroke, together with a larger site adjacent to Woodstock would comprise the most sustainable, deliverable and effective solution.   |
| PR-B-1303 | Steve              | Gerrish  |   | 24           |                         |               | Consider retaining as many existing hedgerows as possible to provide wildlife corridors and local interest. Oxford's unmet housing need is partly created by a profoundly unsustainable policy objective. Reference is made to activities of the OGB. Growth is exponential and therefore unsustainable and should not be promoted for the sake of it. Regard at least a proportion of this housing need to be driven by unnecessary economic growth.   |
| PR-B-1343 | Shaun              | Richards | Cerda Planning Ltd on behalf of Cala Homes Ltd          | 24           |                         |               | The Council should give consideration to the production of a reserve site approach.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname      | Organisation  | Question No.               | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|--------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1352 | Liz           | Boden        | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates                        | 24                         |                         |               | Monitoring of housing delivery is an essential part of ensuring the deliverability of the final plan. Some sites may not come forward as quickly as anticipated due to constraints and this will be evidenced by the monitoring process, meaning that the Council can better manage the housing supply. In the event that some of the sites may not come forward as quickly as anticipated the Council may be advised to consider some form of contingency, such as the release of safeguarded land.   |
| PR-B-1095 | Val           | Russell      | Bodicote Parish Council   | 25                         |                         |               | There are a lot of issues brought up by the SA Report, which point to policies that the Local Plan Part 2 would supposedly address. Given that this document is still in preparation, with policies yet to come forward, this is strange. As it stands, they have no idea how many homes could be allocated throughout Cherwell.   |
| PR-B-0922 | Sarah         | Smith        | Rapleys LLP on behalf of Pandora Trading Ltd                    | 1-8                        |                         |               | The vision and principles for accommodating Oxford's unmet need should 1) follow the vision and strategic objectives identified for accommodating Cherwell's own growth needs and 2) follow and reflect the strategy established in the adopted Local Plan. I.e. concentration of development at Banbury and Bicester. Support the broad thrust of the four strategic objectives as they do not appear to undermine the overall vision and strategic objectives already identified in Cherwell itself. Cherwell needs to ensure that its own infrastructure can support all the growth identified. Who funds this and how it is apportioned between the two authorities is a key question. |
| PR-B-0922 | Sarah         | Smith        | Rapleys LLP on behalf of Pandora Trading Ltd                    | 9-10                       |                         |               | Support these areas of search. The site size threshold of 2ha and 100 dwellings is supported in principle. We consider it short-sighted at this stage to restrict the areas of search to areas A and B. These areas are, in locational terms the most sustainable as they immediately abut the City. However, they also have some key fixed environmental disadvantages. They are virtually all within the GB. Given these constraints the ability of these two areas to accommodate the whole 4,400 dwellings is likely to be severely compromised.   |
| PR-B-0793 | Philip        | Morley       | North Oxford Golf Club  |                            |                         | General       | Compliment CDC on the consultation as a very transparent public process, which they welcome. It is both wide-ranging and of great depth.   |
| PR-B-0797 | Clive         | Booth        | Oxford Civic Society Planning Group                             |                            |                         | General       | Commend CDC's efforts in presenting a thorough and detailed analysis of the options and its commitment to cooperation with other local authorities. Detailed comments are include in their representation.   |
| PR-B-0957 | Martin        | Small        | Historic England South East Historic Environment Planning Group |                            |                         | General       | Have provided some general comments in their representation particularly in relation to sites in the GB, sites 21 and 181 should be taken out from further assessment.   |
| PR-B-0747 | George A      | Doucas       |   | 1, 2                       |                         |               | No. The figure is too high based on assumptions. The country is entering a long period of transition and re-adjustment. Oxford City needs to use its available space now, so as to meet their current needs. If the projected newcomers do come, let's think again on how to encourage moving to other parts of the county with higher levels of unemployment.   |
| PR-B-1122 | Paul and Anne | Webb         |   | 11,14                      |                         | PR32          | Site PR32 is within GB and the proposed works involve substantial engineering works that affect the openness, contrary to NPPF para 90. It is also in the Kidlington Church Street conservation area and would affect the setting of listed buildings. According to Oxfordshire County Council the area may contain later medieval features and there is a badgers' sett which has legal protection. Do not believe exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated to use this land and there is an attempt by the landowners to have it removed form GB and is linked to planning application 13/00990/F.  |
| PR-B-1180 | RA            | Humphreys    | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd    | 15 - 21                    |                         | PR75          | Site PR75 is highly inappropriately located in transport and sustainability terms. Whilst acknowledging the need for an IDP, again concerned to note that no such proposals are in place in advance of the site selection process.   |
| PR-B-0765 | Layla         | Vidal-Martin | NLP Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Taylor Wimpey | 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 |                         |               | Have fundamental concerns about: the principle of Areas of search (Q16); the inadequacy of the methodological approach and conclusions within the Interim Transport Assessment and Initial Sustainability Appraisal (Qs 15, 17, and 21); and the resultant narrow focus (of Areas A and B only) for the selection for options for testing (Qs 18 and 20). It would not be sound for the Local Plan Review to draw such fundamental conclusions from such a general, and indeed flawed, analysis.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No.               | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|---|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1358 | Ian           | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                                   | 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21 |                         |               | The main objective should be sustainable development. Location of development where it can reduce the need to travel by car, and encourage walking, cycling and the use of public transport for access to the workplace. Also minimise the use of green field and make efficient use of energy and resources.  |
| PR-B-0841 | Darren        | Bell        | David Lock Associates on behalf of Hallam Land Management Ltd | 15, 17                     |                         |               | The ISA and SA key findings illustrate the flaws in the way the Areas of Search have been defined. Some Cat A villages would perform strongly but they have been dismissed because they have been grouped together in Option I. As an example, Ambrosden is assessed in some detail. This reinforces the need for CDC to undertake further and updated evidence to ensure Cat A villages are properly considered as an option and assessed.  |
| PR-B-0856 | David         | Smith       |   | 15,16                      |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-0881 | James Kenneth | Jutton      |   | 15,19                      |                         |               | Traffic gridlock at Peartree, Frieze Way and Sainsbury's roundabouts occurs far too frequently now. What would it be like in 2031 if such a huge number of houses were built north of Peartree?  |
| PR-B-0839 | Mark          | Rose        | Define on behalf of William Davies Ltd                        | 15/17                      |                         |               | It is accepted that it is unreasonable to direct all the required development to the rural area as suggested by Option I. However, the incorporation of the identified sustainable service villages masks their potential to accommodate sustainable development in both the ITA and ISA. The final conclusions relating to the selection of the 2 preferred Areas of Search on the basis of the SA findings are unconvincing. There is actually little differential in the SA's analysis between those options and other wider options across the District. It appears as though predetermined policy decisions have influenced the final conclusion.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David         | Smith       |   | 18, 19, 20,21              |                         |               | No comment   |
| PR-B-1180 | RA            | Humphreys   | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd  | 22 - 24                    |                         |               | For the reasons given above do not consider it reasonable to expect Cherwell to accommodate such a significant proportion of Oxford's unmet housing needs in addition to the 22,840 new homes already allocated in the adopted Local plan.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian           | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                                   | 22, 23, 24,                |                         |               | Would like to see an occasional architectural competition to bring out new ideas on housing. Shocked at the design of new estates at Banbury, Bicester and U Heyford.  |
| PR-B-0922 | Sarah         | Smith       | Rapleys LLP on behalf of Pandora Trading Ltd                  | 22-24                      |                         |               | Do not consider it necessary or appropriate to introduce phasing policies for individual strategic development sites. Cherwell already has a shortfall in delivery of its own requirement. We fail to see how delaying the development of these will help this position and furthermore, how phasing policies can be retrospectively introduced in to an adopted plan. Now a greater need to consider some mechanism when monitoring housing provision and delivery, which distinguishes between Cherwell's own needs and that of Oxford City. Whilst in principle we disagree with the suggested delayed start date for delivery of Oxford's needs it may be that the market and planning process itself dictates commencement of this housing. |
| PR-B-1180 | RA            | Humphreys   | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd  | 4, 5, 6, 7                 |                         |               | Have grave doubts that such a vision is achievable. In particular the existing infrastructure is already under severe pressure. These facilities are limited in Yarnton and are not capable of accommodating additional housing development on the scale proposed. There is nothing to suggest that realistic and deliverable plans are in place to provide the necessary infrastructure improvements.   |
| PR-B-0747 | George A      | Doucas      |   | 5,6,7                      |                         |               | No. The figure is too high based on assumptions. The country is entering a long period of transition and re-adjustment. Oxford City needs to use its available space now, so as to meet their current needs. If the projected newcomers do come, let's think again on how to encourage moving to other parts of the county with higher levels of unemployment.   |
| PR-B-0041 | David         | Pratt       |   | 6,7,8                      |                         |               | Support strategic objective SO17/18/19 as long as it doesn't encourage commuting more than 5 miles out of Oxford.  |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith         | Johnston    |   | 9, 11                      |                         | PR126         | This parcel of land is within the Oxford GB and includes an important water course that feeds into Yarnton village. Development on this scale will affect surface water drainage into the water course and exacerbate flooding issues. Plans on the scale proposed contradict CDC policies ESD13, ESC14 and Policy Villages 1.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| PR-B-1109 | Keith            | Johnston |               | 9, 11        |                         | PR20, PR51, PR75, PR92, PR126  | This is GB land designed to restrict urban sprawl, prevent the merging of settlements, safeguard the countryside and preserve the character of historic settlements. Am not convinced that Oxford City had demonstrated the exceptional need to use GB, and that our GB is less important than Oxford's open spaces.   |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith            | Johnston |               | 9, 11        |                         | PR51   | This is GB land providing open accessible space to the residents of Yarnton and Begbroke. There is historical importance to Frogwell Down Lane.  |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith            | Johnston |               | 9, 11        |                         | PR75   | This is GB and the land is adjacent to some of the most historic elements of Yarnton village. Parts of the area have been subjected to flooding and the A44 is restricted by volume, design and pinch points at Begbroke and Yarnton.  |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith            | Johnston |               | 9, 11        |                         | PR92   | This is GB land. Strong arguments to support this area as the only suitable site for recycling/production of building materials was upheld by CDC against the wishes of local objection. How can this site suddenly be more important for an unmet housing need of another local authority?  |
| PR-B-1109 | Keith            | Johnston |               | 9, 11        |                         |  | Any business development based on economic growth are unsubstantiated and therefore flawed. Residents of new housing developments will be free to work where they choose and with rail links to London will probably create a dormitory facility.  |
| PR-B-0881 | James Kenneth    | Jutton   |               | 9,16         |                         |  | Lived in Kidlington and Yarnton over the last 35 years, object strongly to development in the Oxford GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld. There are alternatives, better use of previously developed land in Oxford and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. It is not reasonable to develop within the GB. Check the five GB purposes. |
| PR-B-0779 | David C          | Hinde    | Hinde Law Ltd | General      | A                       |  | The sites near Yarnton are most unsuitable for development as it will not be possible to develop the necessary transport infrastructure to make them viable. I particularly object to search area A.   |
| PR-B-1051 | Michael and Kate | Hopcraft |               | General      | A                       |  | Living within the area considered as option A have concerns with the partial review. Acknowledge there's a need for housing, but concerned how these are secured for those who need them   |
| PR-B-1253 | Jon and Michelle | Mason    |               | General      | A                       |  | Objections are to the development of option A. Also strongly object to develop on GB. GB is there to prevent urban sprawl along with avoiding the loss of countryside and scenery. To avoid the merging of towns and villages, to prevent the loss of their individual character and identity which makes Oxfordshire unique. Why have a policy if it can be disregarded. Traffic would increase significantly into the city from Kidlington and Yarnton area. Despite recent improvements to several roundabouts the traffic is still a black spot for the flow of traffic. Increasing houses in Kidlington and Yarnton will only add to the situation and there's not enough space to improve the capacity of these roads.                               |
| PR-B-1161 | Janet            | Warren   |               | General      | A, B                    | PR14, PR194, PR195, PR118, PR49, PR178, PR27, PR39, PR168, PR177, PR41 | Do accept that some additional, affordable housing is necessary to assist Oxford and Kidlington and that some should be sited in Kidlington. They should be of a size that demands provision of infrastructure such as schools alongside development. Would expect to see 50% of the houses affordable and of a high environmental specification. If areas A and B are to be used, Kidlington must be allowed to retain its identity and the proximity to flood plains considered. Have ranked the identified areas around Kidlington in order of desirability for development thus: 14 (most) 194, 195, 118, 49, 178, 27, 39, 168, 177, 41(least).  |
| PR-B-0041 | David            | Pratt    |               | General      | A, B                    |  | Sites A and B are good and should be pursued. GB that has already been encroached around Oxford should be utilised as they no longer meet all GB criteria.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname     | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0687 | A             | Johnston    |              | General      | A, B                    |               | Object to various elements of the Partial Review of Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2013. The selection of options A and B both involve destruction of precious GB land which is just as important as the open space within Oxford city. GB is a local amenity important to residents of Kidlington and nearby villages. The number of homes proposed is disproportionate to existing number of properties in Yarnton and Begbroke and will change the character of the communities. GB is supposed to protect against over-urbanisation and the coalescence of individual communities. If CDC permits development it is in breach of its own policy. Within the review CDC appears to contradict policy Villages 1 which categorised Yarnton and Begbroke as Category A villages in which only minor development is allowed. The dominant proportion of housing should be in the east and south where most employment is.  |
| PR-B-1122 | Paul and Anne | Webb        |              | General      | A, B                    |               | Object strongly to meeting Oxford's unmet housing needs as most of the Kidlington sites in the document are in GB. This goes against the NPPF which states that 'very special circumstances' are required to build in GB. The road infrastructure in Kidlington could not cope with an additional 4,400 houses and the schools and GP surgeries are at capacity. Oxford City's housing targets are based on speculation and discredited analysis.  |
| PR-B-1265 | Kathleen      | Hayes       |              | General      | A, B                    |               | The current preferred option in Cherwell to concentrate the whole 4,400 in areas A and B is inequitable. It would be better to spread development across the district and to the north of the new Park and Ride at Kidlington Airport. The scale of the proposal would destroy Yarnton and Begbroke and is unacceptable. Building at Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington will create a large urban sprawl not the balanced communities stated in the Draft Vision.  |
| PR-B-1289 | Berwyn        | Jones       |              | General      | A, B                    |               | Am raising concerns and objections to the development around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke, areas A and B. Main concern is the destruction of the countryside and the effect this will have on residents and wildlife. GB around Oxford supports a diverse range of plants and animals which will be lost. The countryside is important for the resident's mental health, well-being and is used for many recreational activities, losing this wouldn't be good for the residents. Also concerned with the impact on the local infrastructure and services, which I believe are already very stretched. Am not against development, but feel that it would be better on a smaller scale and dispersed across the district. Strongly disagree with the proposed minimum size threshold of 100 homes. Areas A and B should be limited to one or two small scale developments like 30 houses, anything more would have a severe impact on the area. Concerned with potential flooding in the areas of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. A river, brook and canal flow through the proposed sites. Begbroke is mentioned in the Domesday Book, its historical value and identity will be lost and merged with Kidlington and Yarnton. Need to protect Frogwelldown Lane which was used by King Charles on his escape from Oxford in 1644. |
| PR-B-0722 | A             | Mayes-Baker |              | General      | A,B                     |               | Objection to various elements. Options A and B involve destruction of the GB. Oxford City has areas of open space. Destruction of GB is a loss of the local countryside amenity, which is important to Kidlington residents and nearby villages.   |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark          | Lowen       |              | General      | C                       |               | Sites around Junction 9 of the M40 with good access would be ideal for an entirely new settlement with its own schools.  |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark          | Lowen       |              | General      | F                       |               | A settlement around former RAF Upper Heyford would have good access into Oxford and without causing great disruption to the local community. A self sufficient settlement with schools, medical facilities, shops and Park and Ride should be considered.  |
| PR-B-0015 | Moira         | Speakman    |              | General      |                         | Kidlington    | The site between the Moors and the river at Kidlington is used extensively for recreation and has far-reaching views. Doubling the size of the village will turn it into a town and displease everyone. Additional parking will be required for the centre of Kidlington, additional traffic will cause gridlock and lower the quality of life for residents. Development around the edges of Kidlington would be better although there are some concerns regards flooding. Bicester is being planned to be a healthy town: I would like the same for Kidlington.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific         | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| PR-B-0706 | Edmund           | Smith    | Carter Jonas LLP  | General      |                         | Land at Hampton Poyle | Promoting 49.62ha site at Hampton Poyle for approximately 1000 houses. It has good access links, close to settlement of Hampton Poyle and is open and broadly flat. The flood zoning of this land is disputed and it is expected that this could be proven if required.  |
| PR-B-1232 | Mark             | Schmull  | Nathaniel Litchfield and Partners on behalf of The Church Commissioners | General      |                         | New sites             | CCE are majority landowners of the land that surrounds Islip. Earlier representations sought to promote three sites at Islip, which have the potential to deliver c.350 dwellings. These have been identified in the Options Paper. In response to the NIC call for evidence CCE presented 3 options for the creation of a sustainable new neighbourhood which would complement and support the existing village of Islip. CCE now wish to promote these as part of the current options consultation. Particular focus is on Option A comprising up to 1,700 homes and associated infrastructure. Detailed submissions are made in support of these options, including the document submitted to the NIC.              |
| PR-B-0158 | Jon              | Waite    | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Mewslade (Eastern) Ltd                       | General      |                         | PR105 and other       | Promoting two sites, Land adjoining Rau Court Caversfield (PR105) and Land south of Springfield Road, Caversfield as suitable housing allocations. Does not support the approach of only allocating sites capable of accommodating 100 dwellings or more. Medium to large sites are quicker to bring forward. Concern expressed over a number of inaccuracies in CDC's SA which assesses the sites. This rep addresses these inaccuracies and provides further information about the sites.  |
| PR-B-1234 | Hywel            | Morse    | Sworders on behalf of the Beecroft Family                               | General      |                         | PR11                  | Wish to clarify the site boundary to be considered in relation to site PR11 - Weston on the Green. The boundary of PR11 may have been taken from a previously promoted scheme. This scheme is no longer progressing with the boundary or landowners identified and our clients (Beecroft and Godwin) are progressing with a different promoter than that shown in Table 8, and a different area of land. The land is available, deliverable and can be considered as part of your consultation, as a separate site from PR11. A site plan is provided.   |
| PR-B-0715 | Wendy            | Manning  |   | General      |                         | PR125                 | Site PR25 is objected for development. It has flooded every year during Winter and Spring. Increased household water usage leads to less land for surface water to drain, serious issues for households around the area. Few places to enjoy the countryside enjoyed by many. Its a natural habitat for wildlife which needs protecting. GB land gradually being taken over for development.   |
| PR-B-0804 | Barrie and Linda | Teasdale |   | General      |                         | PR125                 | To satisfy the demand from Oxford site in the north of Banbury and Bicester should be discounted. Kidlington and the local area are like locations for development, however local services are already struggling to cope. Site PR125 at the north end of Water Eaton Lane is farmland that floods every year, this will only get worse if houses are built on PR125. Septic tanks suffer in the flooding this is a health hazard to the residents.  |
| PR-B-0975 | Andrew           | Lintott  |   | General      |                         | PR125                 | Objection to build a large number of houses in Gosford Parish on the West side of the A34. Site PR125 is subject to flooding. The last few years water has covered the whole area between the Cherwell and Water Eaton Lane. The natural landscape of the lane is important to block further flooding, the water table is already high and would be raised by the weight of new structures. Current houses are able to get house insurance on normal terms. The present footpath which is a circular walk around Kidlington and is an old wright of way will be smothered. Development without services is likely to unbalance and be disagreeable for Gosford. Increased air and noise pollution will become wearing. |
| PR-B-1170 | Matthew          | Brock    |   | General      |                         | PR125                 | Object to the plans for additional housing north of the A34 and south of Bicester Road at site PR125. The drainage in this area is very poor and land waterlogged in winter. Houses built close to the A34 will experience severe noise and pollution. The road network is already at capacity and would require major improvements. The proximity to Oxford Parkway would mean these houses being bought by London commuters and therefore not alleviate the local housing concerns.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|---|--|
| PR-B-1170 | Matthew    | Brock    |               | General      |                         | PR125   | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Particularly object to building on GB north of the A34 and south of Bicester Road. The land has poor drainage and is waterlogged in winter. GB prevents urban sprawl. There will be serious noise and pollution issues. |
| PR-B-0981 | Joyce      | Ruiz     |               | General      |                         | PR125, PR178  | Kidlington has serious flooding issues in several areas. This is due to the high water table in the area that contains the Cherwell Estate, areas also on the Orchard Estate suffer major flooding. This comes from surface water and the River Cherwell. The Environment Agency map shows that this area is in the risk area for flooding. The rep. has provided a lengthily account to flooding in 1998 on the Cherwell Estate. Strongly objects to the development in sites PR125 and PR178 these would contribute to flooding in the area. Residents of Kidlington are alarmed that not a single person has been involved in the proposals and what the consequences are to the people already living there.   |
| PR-B-1078 | Samantha   | Perera   |               | General      |                         | PR125, PR178  | Object to the proposed housing development around Water Eaton Lane in Gosford at sites PR125 and PR178. It will be detrimental to the health and well being of residents and Gosford will lose its identity. The GB is precious and used by the community for walking and exercise. It is our only buffer from the A34 pollution. Already experience flooding each year, reducing the GB it will make it worse. The road infrastructure will not cope and pollution will increase.   |
| PR-B-0687 | A          | Johnston |               | General      |                         | PR126   | Development on site PR126 at this scale, will affect surface water drainage and is likely to increase flooding. This site includes an important water course that flows into Yarnton village.  |
| PR-B-0779 | David C    | Hinde    | Hinde Law Ltd | General      |                         | PR126   | Site PR126 lies wholly within GB. Local Plan Policy ESD 14 seeks to safeguard the countryside from development. Policy ESD 14 seeks to prevent urban sprawl and to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Policy Villages 1 has Yarnton as a category A village. Only minor development, infilling and conversion allowed or alongside. Access to and from the A44 is restrictive and near impossible at this location. There is an important water course that flows into Yarnton, over paving will exacerbate flooding which already occurs in the south part of the village.  |
| PR-B-1089 | Dave       | Bevis    |               | General      |                         | PR126, PR34, PR92, PR49, PR127, PR51, PR20  | Object strongly to plans to build on large areas in and around Kidlington which will swallow up villages and lose their characters. Both doctors and schools are at capacity and traffic and policing at their limit. Some of the sites are natural drainage areas and so it would be foolish to build on them.  |
| PR-B-1010 | Richard    | Pye      |               | General      |                         | PR14, PR20, PR23, PR24, PR27, PR32, PR34, PR48, PR49, PR51, PR74, PR75, PR91, PR92, PR125, PR126, PR178 | These sites form part of the rich and diverse countryside surrounding the three villages and in the absence of a public park provide recreational facilities. PR20 is surrounded by countryside with well used footpaths and agricultural land and mass development would be inappropriate.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0663 | KD         | Liversage |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27    | Have concerns with sites PR14 and PR27 The Moors, which is GB and the current government's manifesto stated it would take measures to protect it. Moorside Place off the Moors, is a purpose built care facility for the elderly and disabled, it is a peaceful and tranquil place that befits the people who live there. CDC are partners in this enterprise and should be aware that any development would cause upheaval and discomfort to retired, disabled, and vulnerable people. There is a wildlife corridor within Moorside Place and the fields beyond attract many species of birds and mammals. As many residents are house bound this is a wonderful stimulant and source of interest. Any increase in traffic along The Moors would be problematic. |
| PR-B-0664 | Maxine     | House     |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27    | Have concerns with sites PR14 and PR27 The Moors, which is GB and the current government's manifesto stated it would take measures to protect it. Moorside Place off the Moors, is a purpose built care facility for the elderly and disabled, it is a peaceful and tranquil place that befits the people who live there. CDC are partners in this enterprise and should be aware that any development would cause upheaval and discomfort to retired, disabled, and vulnerable people. There is a wildlife corridor within Moorside Place and the fields beyond attract many species of birds and mammals. As many residents are house bound this is a wonderful stimulant and source of interest. Any increase in traffic along The Moors would be problematic. |
| PR-B-0665 | M          | Thorne    |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27    | Have concerns with sites PR14 and PR27 The Moors, which is GB and the current government's manifesto stated it would take measures to protect it. Moorside Place off the Moors, is a purpose built care facility for the elderly and disabled, it is a peaceful and tranquil place that befits the people who live there. CDC are partners in this enterprise and should be aware that any development would cause upheaval and discomfort to retired, disabled, and vulnerable people. There is a wildlife corridor within Moorside Place and the fields beyond attract many species of birds and mammals. As many residents are house bound this is a wonderful stimulant and source of interest. Any increase in traffic along The Moors would be problematic. |
| PR-B-0666 | Ann        | Chandler  |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27    | Have concerns with sites PR14 and PR27 The Moors, which is GB and the current government's manifesto stated it would take measures to protect it. Moorside Place off the Moors, is a purpose built care facility for the elderly and disabled, it is a peaceful and tranquil place that befits the people who live there. CDC are partners in this enterprise and should be aware that any development would cause upheaval and discomfort to retired, disabled, and vulnerable people. There is a wildlife corridor within Moorside Place and the fields beyond attract many species of birds and mammals. As many residents are house bound this is a wonderful stimulant and source of interest. Any increase in traffic along The Moors would be problematic. |
| PR-B-0667 | Mrs P      | Webb      |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27    | Have concerns with sites PR14 and PR27 The Moors, which is GB and the current government's manifesto stated it would take measures to protect it. Moorside Place off the Moors, is a purpose built care facility for the elderly and disabled, it is a peaceful and tranquil place that befits the people who live there. CDC are partners in this enterprise and should be aware that any development would cause upheaval and discomfort to retired, disabled, and vulnerable people. There is a wildlife corridor within Moorside Place and the fields beyond attract many species of birds and mammals. As many residents are house bound this is a wonderful stimulant and source of interest. Any increase in traffic along The Moors would be problematic. |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname         | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific    | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|---|
| PR-B-0668 | BJ and W        | Bower           |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27       | Have concerns with sites PR14 and PR27 The Moors, which is GB and the current government's manifesto stated it would take measures to protect it. Moorside Place off the Moors, is a purpose built care facility for the elderly and disabled, it is a peaceful and tranquil place that befits the people who live there. CDC are partners in this enterprise and should be aware that any development would cause upheaval and discomfort to retired, disabled, and vulnerable people. There is a wildlife corridor within Moorside Place and the fields beyond attract many species of birds and mammals. As many residents are house bound this is a wonderful stimulant and source of interest. Any increase in traffic along The Moors would be problematic. |
| PR-B-0672 | Grace MM        | Kurn            |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27       | Have concerns with sites PR14 and PR27 The Moors, which is GB and the current government's manifesto stated it would take measures to protect it. Moorside Place off the Moors, is a purpose built care facility for the elderly and disabled, it is a peaceful and tranquil place that befits the people who live there. CDC are partners in this enterprise and should be aware that any development would cause upheaval and discomfort to retired, disabled, and vulnerable people. There is a wildlife corridor within Moorside Place and the fields beyond attract many species of birds and mammals. As many residents are house bound this is a wonderful stimulant and source of interest. Any increase in traffic along The Moors would be problematic. |
| PR-B-0950 | Mr S and Mrs T  | Lloyd and Atley |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27       | Sites PR14 and PR27, concerned that development north of The Moors would have a detrimental impact on biodiversity. For example increased disturbance and recreational pressure on sites such as St Mary's Field Local Wildlife Site. Many Kidlington residents and others enjoy this area with its valuable green space for walking in the countryside and tranquillity without the need to use a car to access the countryside.   |
| PR-B-0976 | Nigel and Tracy | Payne           |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27       | Recently sent in an objection for development on GB around Kidlington, sadden that GB counts for so little, so much for government promises. Sites PR14 and PR27 north of Kidlington adjacent to The Moors, should not be built upon. Easy access to the countryside with the footpath that crosses it that are well away from busy roads. The area supports the Skylarks which are on the RSPB red list, how does this fit in with CDC Corporate Biodiversity Action Plan, once built over the Skylarks will be gone forever. North of Kidlington traffic to and from Oxford would have to travel through or around the village, more congestion and added fumes to the busy roads. This is GB which needs to be protected.                                      |
| PR-B-1200 | Katie           | Holt            |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27       | Object to proposals to build north of Kidlington specifically in relation to PR14 and PR27, these sites are within the GB and should be protected. Part of the site is in a Special Area of Conservation. The proximity of the sites to Kidlington provides amenity land that is so important. Appreciate the need for affordable housing in Cherwell. However it's essential to provide a balance between housing and nature and not create an urban sprawl that would dramatically affect the whole of the Cherwell valley.   |
| PR-B-1246 | Christine       | Kennell         |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27       | Strongly object to development at sites PR14 and PR27 where the footpaths and walks provide peace and tranquillity to the residents who use them. The fields are home to wildlife and the high water table leads to flooding. There are little facilities and an increase in traffic will have a detrimental effect on local health.  |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark            | Lowen           |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Access to sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 is limited and would not be able to cope with the volume of traffic created. New developments at these locations would be entirely out of character to what is known as Old Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-1130 | Mr and Mrs      | Bray            |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Object to the proposed plans for new homes in Kidlington which would change from a village into a town. Currently have one secondary school which is oversubscribed and the doctors run at capacity. Particularly concerned about sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 which are GB with lovely walks, enjoyed by many and has flooded before.   |
| PR-B-1210 | Tina            | Merry           |              | General      |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Object to proposed sites PR14, PR27 and PR32 as GB would be destroyed impacting nature and wildlife. Countryside walks with well used footpaths would be lost.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation                               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific    | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| PR-B-1336 | Patricia   | Stokes   |  | General      |                         | PR14, PR27, PR32 | Another objection of GB is to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. CDC produced a leaflet, " Kidlington Historic Village Trail" highlighting the historic and remarkable properties and the wonderful walk around them which maximises the beauty and surroundings of these architectural gems in the GB setting. How can two of the sites be close to the historical St Mary's Church. It has been highly visible for centuries from the surrounding GB. The St Mary Fields Reserve attracts a huge diversity of wildlife because of the green space, these are referred to as sites PR14, PR27 and PR32.  |
| PR-B-0692 | Rachel     | Watmough |  | General      |                         | PR148            | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development on Flood Zone 3 and the Ray Conservation Target area. Photo provided to illustrate the point  |
| PR-B-0698 | Bob        | Watmough |  | General      |                         | PR148            | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development on Flood Zone 3 and the Ray Conservation Target area. Photo provided to illustrate the point  |
| PR-B-1019 | Jon        | Waite    | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Manor Oak Homes | General      |                         | PR148            | Promoting Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton as a suitable site for housing. Due to the site's close proximity to Oxford and excellent transport links it is considered that it can help meet Oxford's unmet housing need. However, concern expressed over a number of inaccuracies in the SA.   |
| PR-B-1201 | Nigel      | Timms    |  | General      |                         | PR148            | Object to the proposed development in Launton at site PR148 which would be detrimental to the character of the village and is inherently flawed. Most off the site has already been rejected by CDC as it doesn't meet the minimum requirements for a strategic development site and is in Flood Zone 3 of the Ray Conservation Target Area. The remaining portion is only 0.61 hectares which is too small to be considered for development. With substantial building works at Bicester underway it is unlikely that a small amount in Launton will be of real benefit to housing need.  |
| PR-B-1020 | Jon        | Waite    | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Manor Oak Homes | General      |                         | PR149            | Manor Oak Homes is promoting Land at Murcott Road, Arncott as a suitable housing allocation. Due to the site's close proximity to Oxford and excellent transport links it is considered that it can help meet Oxford's unmet housing need. However, concern expressed over a number of inaccuracies in the SA.   |
| PR-B-0700 | Diana      | Clark    |  | General      |                         | PR15             | Object to the proposal to build 4,400 homes in North Oxford destroying the countryside and its wildlife in favour of urban sprawl. PR51 is an area of outstanding natural beauty with a wide variety of wildlife and rich history. The GB and its pathways are used by many and separates the villages keeping their identities and allowing for a balanced and healthy lifestyle. More traffic will increase congestion, journey times, pollution and danger to road users. The government and councils should protect these areas as there are no exceptional circumstances. There are a number of empty houses within Oxford and brownfield sites should be considered first. Jobs growth is an exaggerated assumption and any new houses will be bought by people from London. |
| PR-B-0927 | Dr Hilary  | Bridge   |  | General      |                         | PR158            | Object strongly to development on site PR157. The rep. spoke with a member of CDC regarding the proposal for this site. Being the landowner for some of the land in the proposed site they have not provided consent and require the land in the map to be removed. The rep. has provided a photo outlining their land in blue. Development of this size and density in Noke would be entirely out of keeping with the surrounding area.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname            | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0790 | RF                 | Kendal             |  | General      |                         | PR161         | Site PR61 for 61 houses in Middle Aston. The field to the rear of Moonstone captures the essence of the Cherwell Valley incorporating a ridge, footpath and fields. There is a break between Middle Aston and North Aston, the space provides habitats for wildlife and this would be lost if developed. It is also the only local break as Middle Aston south joins Steeple Aston, which then almost meets Lower Heyford's. Rep refers to planning applications made in 2001 and 2005. CDC documentation "site location and description" quote 1.1 "on 3 sides Moonstone is open countryside noted as being of high landscape value".  |
| PR-B-0207 | Susan              | Robertson          |  | General      |                         | PR164         | Site PR164, land east of Sands Lane is unsuitable as South Newington is classified as a category B, which limits development and is contrary to planning controls contained in the 2014 Conservation area appraisal. Bus service is limited and there is no footpath along the A361 to Milcombe, a car is therefore essential. Local schools are already oversubscribed and could not support this development. Sands Lane is maintained by residents and could not support the level of traffic during and after development. The proposed access point is at the junction of three well used footpaths so presents a safety risk. This development will impact the wildlife such as the Great crested Newt and the open rural aspect which is characteristic of South Newington.                                    |
| PR-B-1014 | Norma              | Hunter             |  | General      |                         | PR164         | Having read the proposal suggested in the Partial Review concerning site PR164 and the comments made by South Newington Parish Council with reference to the above proposal am in complete agreement with SNPC that the proposal is totally unsuitable on the grounds given by the Council. Object to the proposal.   |
| PR-B-1023 | John               | Hunter             |  | General      |                         | PR164         | In respect of the proposal of Fisher German to build 57 houses in the area agree with the South Newington Parish Council view of the unsuitability of the project. Wish to have my name added to the list of objectors of the project.  |
| PR-B-0930 | Philip             | Marsh              | Knights on behalf of Philip King Homes and Oxford City Charity | General      |                         | PR178         | The purpose of these representation is to reaffirm the availability and deliverability of land to the east of Kidlington for development. The site comprises PR178 and an adjoining parcel of land to the north (east of Bicester Road and west of Water Eaton Lane) A site location plan is provided. A detailed justification for the development of this site is included in the rep.  |
| PR-B-1028 | Amanda and Michael | Roberts and Graham |  | General      |                         | PR181         | Site PR181 is not viable as the access is only the narrow and congested Mill Lane and closing of the level crossing also limits access. No gas or sewage here. The roads can get congested with no help from refuse lorries, skips and parked cars in the road. This is a vital area of open space that borders the Conservation Area on three sides - the fourth side being the railway line which isn't in the Conservation Area as the defined boundary loops around the border of this field, permitting new development on the scale proposed in this field would effectively put inappropriate, modern development in the middle of two areas that are within the defined Conservation Area - i.e., the centre of the village and Islip Mill. The Conservation Area was extended in 2008 to include Islip Mill. |
| PR-B-0661 | Mr and Mrs         | Messenger          |  | General      |                         | PR186         | Object to the proposed development at PR186 as it would extend the boundaries of Bodicote village which already has developments at Cotefield Farm and 1100 houses at Langford Park. All three proposed access/exit points lead onto congested roads that do not have the capacity for growth and are not suitable for widening. Flooding which happens at the lower end of the site will increase and cause concern to residents adjacent to Sor Brook. Bodicote should not be made to take up Oxford's housing quota, it is their responsibility.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-0694 | John and Joyce | Washburn |  | General      |                         | PR186, PR199  | Object to the proposed building in Bodicote at sites PR186 and PR199 which were not included in CDC's agreed plan. It is ironic that Oxford doesn't want to build on the city's GB but villages are being asked to put forward greenfield sites. The developments would put a strain on amenities such as the school and exacerbate exiting traffic problems. At site PR199 access would be via a narrow lane already overused and at site PR186 traffic would have to pass through the centre of the village. The Wards Crescent site is low lying and prone to flooding. The parish of Bodicote has already contributed to housing needs with 1,000 homes at Langford Park, a further 170 homes at Cotefield Farm and plan for another development to the north of the village. |
| PR-B-0924 | Jan            | Molyneux | Molyneux Planning for SBPC on behalf of Earthline Ltd and U-Stay Ltd | General      |                         | PR19, PR29  | This representation relates to land at and adjacent to Shipton Quarry and its potential for the provision of approx. 1,000 homes, a primary school and commercial centre, employment area, local rail station, recreational facilities, ecological protection area, cycle ways and links with nearby villages and countryside.  |
| PR-B-0180 | Dr Ben         | Allen    |  | General      |                         | PR20  | The canal side, footpath between Begbroke and Kidlington and fields adjoining Rowel Brook need to be preserved, they are a natural environment enjoyed by many.   |
| PR-B-0645 | Stephanie      | White    |  | General      |                         | PR20  | If development were to go ahead am keen to defend site PR20 where footpaths are well used by many and provide a positive effect on peoples' wellbeing.  |
| PR-B-0779 | David C        | Hinde    | Hinde Law Ltd  | General      |                         | PR20  | Site PR20 lies wholly within GB. Local Plan Policy ESD 14 seeks to prevent coalescence of settlements, a strong case for Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington. GB Policy ESD 14 seeks to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Policy ESD 13 seeks to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, particularly in urban fringe locations. Policy Villages 1 has Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington as a category A village. Only minor development, infilling and conversion allowed or alongside. Exceptional circumstance can not be shown on this site.  |
| PR-B-1032 | David          | Burson   | JPPC on behalf of the Tripartite and the University of Oxford        | General      |                         | PR20  | The Tripartite (comprising the University of Oxford, Merton College and local landowner) are the landowners of land which includes Begbroke Science Park and adjacent land. A location plan is provided. This land is put forward as a suitable site to meet at least part of the unmet need in association with protecting land which is likely to be required in the longer term to enable the further expansion of Begbroke Science Park. A formal draft masterplan submitted to the Council also indicates how the development could assist in meeting transport objectives.  |
| PR-B-1178 | Bryony         | Thomas   |  | General      |                         | PR20  | Have concerns that building on all the available soakaways will increase the risk of flooding. At site PR20 there is regular flooding.  |
| PR-B-1010 | Richard        | Pye      |  | General      |                         | PR20, PR23, PR24, PR34, PR48, PR49, PR51, PR74, PR75, PR91, PR92, PR126 | These sites are part of the settlement gap between Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke and construction in any of these would have a substantial impact on the prevention of urban sprawl. Sandy Lane, the only road that links Kidlington and Yarnton is narrow with a single file bridge so development would create traffic and safety issues.  |
| PR-B-1185 | Claire         | Blake    |  | General      |                         | PR20, PR23, PR24, PR34, PR51, PR74                                      | Have concerns and objections to the plans for new housing around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. It will destroy the GB that is a crucial recreation space and area for wildlife. At site PR74 in particular there are many animals including bats and barn owls both of which are protected species. The footpaths at sites PR20 and PR51 are valued by many for their scenery and local walks. The GB was designed to safeguard the countryside from encroachment as well as preventing communities from merging. The recommendations for housing at PR20, PR23, PR24, PR34, and PR74 are in clear contradiction to this. Pressure will increase on already overloaded roads, schools and doctors surgeries.  |
| PR-B-1210 | Tina           | Merry    |  | General      |                         | PR20, PR23, PR24, PR51  | Strongly object to proposed sites PR20, PR23, PR24, PR51 and all other sites that merge Kidlington to Begbroke and Yarnton. All three villages will lose their identity.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname            | Organisation                              | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific     | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------|---|
| PR-B-1076 | Jana               | Gnappova           |   | General      |                         | PR20, PR24        | Begbroke is a small village with a unique character and history going back to the 17th century. It has open countryside and wildlife. The development would not bring anything good to the local people. It will join us to Oxford and provide a place for London commuters. CDC has to protect the GB and not destroy the village.   |
| PR-B-1129 | Michael and Jo     | Collett            |   | General      |                         | PR20, PR24        | Object to building 4,400 homes in GB specifically sites PR20 and PR24. Begbroke with its strong history has fantastic character and community spirit which would be lost as PR20 would merge Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington into an urban sprawl. The GB is what makes villages so special, they have wonderful wildlife and walks and bring quality to life. PR20 floods every year due to Rowel Brook.  |
| PR-B-1221 | Martin             | Perisi             |   | General      |                         | PR20, PR24        | Object to the proposal to build 4,400 new houses, in particular at sites PR20 and PR24. Was attracted to Begbroke as it's surrounded by open countryside of GB and wildlife. It is quiet and private with trees, fields and wildlife behind my house. The proposed development will destroy my life and am shocked, upset and dismayed that CDC agreed to this proposal. The village would blend with Oxford and turn into a noisy, over-crowded dirty place as many towns are.   |
| PR-B-1221 | Martin             | Perisi             |   | General      |                         | PR20, PR24        | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Strongly object to this proposal at PR20 and PR24 on GB at Begbroke. |
| PR-B-1028 | Amanda and Michael | Roberts and Graham |   | General      |                         | PR21              | Site PR21 would be inappropriate to the village and significantly extend its current boundaries. Mill Lane is too narrow and not designed for any volume of traffic. This is mentioned in the conservation area document as being of vital importance to the external views of the village. The land is also low lying and prone to flooding Traffic flows would no doubt increase in the village which already is a rat run.   |
| PR-B-1238 | Chris & Kathryn    | Rogers & Bryan     |   | General      |                         | PR21, PR55, PR181 | Strongly object to sites PR21, PR55 and PR181 put forward for development in Islip. The sites impact the character of the village by imposing development within the GB which is over bearing, out of scale and out of character in terms of appearance. In particular site PR55 impacts the properties along Kidlington Road and Bletchingdon Road with loss of privacy and open aspect. There would be an impact on traffic and safety of road users.   |
| PR-B-0180 | Dr Ben             | Allen              |   | General      |                         | PR23, PR24, PR74  | Recognises the need for further housing development in the area, but as a resident of Begbroke have some concerns. It is important to maintain a separation between the village and Langford Lane industrial area.  |
| PR-B-0645 | Stephanie          | White              |   | General      |                         | PR24              | If development were to go ahead am keen to defend site PR24 as large scale building in this area would significantly increase traffic through Begbroke, to the disruption of local residents.   |
| PR-B-1022 | Jon                | Waite              | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of W Lucy and Co. | General      |                         | PR24              | W Lucy and Co is promoting Land South of Sandy Lane, Begbroke. Due to the site's close proximity to Oxford and excellent transport links our client considers it to offer a perfect opportunity to help meet Oxford's unmet housing need. However, concerned expresses over a number of inaccuracies in the Council's assessment of the site.   |
| PR-B-1029 | Jane               | Verdon             |   | General      |                         | PR24              | How will the infrastructure of Begbroke cope with more houses? There are existing problems with lack of good school places. The roads are deplorable. Also question of the Immigration Detention Centre. The village is split by A44 with no crossing point. Loss of village identity a concern. Problems of flooding. Additional housing must be of the right type and in the right areas. Without losing too much Green Belt and putting in enough infrastructure so the villages can cope. Listening to local people is a must.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific    | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|------------------|--|
| PR-B-1051 | Michael and Kate | Hopcraft   |              | General      |                         | PR24             | Backgarden is 4m in length which backs directly on to this field. Development would significantly devalue property and change the outlook. This would have a significant negative impact on well being unless there was the opportunity to extend the current garden in order to mediate for this. If development is inevitable it is essential that the infrastructure and services are in place to support this and the countryside is maintained. There needs to be sensitivity to the local communities and their future needs.  |
| PR-B-1093 | Christine        | Arthur     |              | General      |                         | PR24             | Site PR24 is in a rural open setting with historical views and a wealth of wildlife. The fields and hedgerows provide an important habitat and corridor for the wildlife and prevent soil erosion. The area with its ancient footpaths is well used and enjoyed by many. Frogwell lane and the Shakespeare Way allows locals and visitors to keep fit and healthy as encouraged by the local government. The fields around Begbroke including PR24 are liable to flooding due to the proximity of Rowel Brook.   |
| PR-B-1214 | Richard          | Arthur     |              | General      |                         | PR24             | Strongly object to the proposed development of 4,400 houses around Begbroke and Yarnton. The destruction of GB contradicts CDC's own policy plans agreed in 2015 and goes against the wishes of 76% of Oxfordshire residents who want to protect the GB. It prevents urban sprawl and maintains village identities. Local roads and the A44 are already congested and schools and doctors are at capacity. The perceived housing needs for Oxford are questionable and it's doubtful they would provide housing for local key workers. The village would become an expensive dormitory town for London commuters. Site PR24 offers views of the historical setting of Begbroke. It provides a habitat and corridor for the wealth of wildlife and prevents soil erosion. The ancient footpaths such as Frogwelldown Lane and the Shakespeare Way are well used and enjoyed by many for health and leisure. Consideration needs to be given to the flooding that occurs in the fields around Begbroke including PR24 due to the proximity of Rowel Brook. CDC should oppose the plans and the loss of GB. |
| PR-B-0709 | Dr E J           | Williamson |              | General      |                         | PR27, PR14       | Some of the sites proposed are particularly unsuitable. Those in the northern part of Kidlington, particularly 27 and 14 are liable to flood. They would mean people having to travel through the village to get to Oxford. This is totally unacceptable due to traffic congestion. Kidlington is a large village blessed by GB, providing pleasant countryside, nature reserves, footpaths and walks. To destroy this would remove these benefits of village life forever. The Northern Gateway area, in Oxford's domain, is scheduled for industrial development -not houses. This will surely aggravate the housing situation. The North Oxford Golf Course is under consideration, but why not Southfield Golf Course in Oxford? Wish to strongly object to the proposals as they stand and urge the District Council to reconsider its position.  |
| PR-B-0629 | Ann              | Crane      |              | General      |                         | PR27, PR14, PR23 | Wish to object to the proposal to build 4,400 houses around Kidlington as it's not sustainable and within GB. The present infrastructure is already overstretched and could not cope with further demands on its schools, health services and roads. There would have to be new schools and health centres built. Sites PR27, PR14 and PR23 are dangerously close to the flood plain so should be considered unsuitable. The GB is an amenity for the health and well-being of residents and a natural habitat. CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname            | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|--|
| PR-B-1060 | Nicola A           | Forsythe           |   | General      |                         | PR27, PR32, PR14             | Object to the proposed plan to build 4,400 homes north of Oxford, in particular around Kidlington at sites PR14, PR27 and PR32, it is not sustainable. Traffic problems will become worse and schools and medical practices will be unable to cope with the additional numbers. The open countryside we enjoy will be lost and quality of life will suffer as air, noise and light pollution increase. There will be implications for flooding and drainage. Particularly object to development on GB which is designed to protect villages from urban sprawl and is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from overdevelopment, and the government's manifesto promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. There are alternatives to building on the GB including making better use of previously developed land in Oxford. |
| PR-B-1208 | Hilary             | Hastings           |   | General      |                         | PR3, PR13, PR20, PR26, PR35, | Whilst understand the need for housing in the Cherwell area, strongly object to blanket development around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. This would be an excessive overdevelopment of the GB creating one urban mass, removing the character and open countryside. The GB was set up to protect the green space which improves the mental and physical well-being of the local community. Consideration needs to be given to the impact on the Conservation Target areas that provide a habitat and corridor for wildlife. The local infrastructure is already struggling to cope as are GP's and hospitals. The development would create a dormitory town for London commuters.  |
| PR-B-0157 | Jon                | Waite              | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Newcore Capital Management LLP | General      |                         | PR30                         | Newcore is promoting this site as a suitable housing allocation with associated services and facilities. The site's close proximity to Oxford, brownfield land designation and excellent transport links offer a good opportunity to meet Oxford's unmet housing need. Concern expressed over inaccuracies in CDC's assessment of the site. This rep corrects those inaccuracies and provides further information about the site including contamination, current massing and landscape information.   |
| PR-B-1028 | Amanda and Michael | Roberts and Graham |   | General      |                         | PR30                         | Site PR30 Although still within GB, this is a brownfield site, which is most suitable for some development. Lacking in infrastructure, services and with significant traffic problem in Islip this all needs to be considered when determining the scale of any permitted development.   |
| PR-B-1238 | Chris & Kathryn    | Rogers & Bryan     |   | General      |                         | PR30                         | Site PR30 within the village is brownfield land and would be more suitable. However we object to the whole site being developed.   |
| PR-B-0284 | Marilyn            | Marshall           |   | General      |                         | PR32                         | Site PR32 around St Mary's church is an area where a lot of time and effort has been made to manage wildlife and provide outdoor space for Kidlington residents. Has there been any consultation with the RSPB or Berks, Bucks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust?   |
| PR-B-0807 | Justin             | Scroggie           |   | General      |                         | PR32                         | St Mary's church which stands at the bottom of Church Street adjacent to site PR32 is a grade 1 listed building dating back to 1220. 3 years time there will be celebrations for its 800th anniversary. By this time this will be engulfed by new buildings destroying the surrounding habitat, nature, peace and quite which has been there for eight centuries.  |
| PR-B-1202 | Gaynor             | Thorpe             |   | General      |                         | PR33, PR150, PR190           | The proposals are all within the boundary of Caversfield Parish Council which has been designated as a Category C and a separate entity to Bicester. There is not the infrastructure to maintain this level of housing as there is no bus service and only country roads. Water pressure is low and there are no schools or shops. There is also a shortage of doctors in Bicester. Plans to develop site PR33 were refused some time ago by the planning inspectors and these reasons have not changed.   |
| PR-B-0779 | David C            | Hinde              | Hinde Law Ltd   | General      |                         | PR34                         | Site PR34 lies wholly within GB. Local Plan Policy ESD 14 seeks to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. This site is isolated, served by a class c road, adjacent to a railway line and it would affect the setting of the Oxford Canal Conversation Area.   |
| PR-B-0805 | Tamara             | Frishberg          |   | General      |                         | PR38                         | The figure of 4,400 houses in the Kidlington and Oxford corridor is far too great. The roads are already overburdened, further damage to air quality, and deprive residents of access to green areas. The infrastructure are already stretched to capacity. The houses, particularly those in PR38 are more likely to attract additional residents to Oxford rather than address the housing needs of those already living and working in the city.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific  | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|--|---|
| PR-B-1010 | Richard      | Pye       |   | General      |                         | PR38, PR39, PR41, PR50, PR122, PR123, PR124, PR125, PR167, PR168, PR177, PR178 | These sites protect against the urban sprawl of Oxford City and so development would contravene the purpose of GB, they also contain rich and diverse wildlife habitats.  |
| PR-B-0680 | Dr John      | Maddicott |   | General      |                         | PR38, PR49, PR91, PR122, PR195   | Realise some land must be found for development and consider these sites, though within GB are the least unsuitable. Most of these sites have no recreational or historic value and could be built on without great loss to the community.  |
| PR-B-0681 | Dr Hilary    | Maddicott |   | General      |                         | PR38, PR49, PR91, PR122, PR195   | If sites are needed in the area CDC should consider these sites. They have no historic or environmental value and could be built on without detriment to the community.   |
| PR-B-0794 | Prof Michael | Collins   |   | General      |                         | PR38, PR50   | This rep provides details reference to sites RP38 and PR50. Cutteslowe Park has a city boundary and farmland beyond, to build to the full extent of these sites would destroy the north of the park and the open vista on the east. This is part of Oxford's heritage and the City should fight to retain it.   |
| PR-B-0794 | Prof Michael | Collins   |   | General      |                         | PR38, PR50   | The rep has provided three key aspects that the consultation document has overlooked. The two arterial routes defined by the A34 and the A40. The effect of new houses being built on sites PR38 and PR50 without the new A40. Proximity of the New Oxford Parkway station is a positive value to building in site RP38 and PR50. Suggestions to problems referring to The two arterial routes defined by the A34 and the A40.  |
| PR-B-0805 | Tamara       | Frishberg |   | General      |                         | PR38, PR50   | Consultation papers, proposed tram and other public transport system is a fantasy. Cutteslowe roundabout, no provision made for significant number of cyclists along the Banbury Road from Kidlington to Oxford. The City and the County Council need to be more committed to solving existing traffic problems and provide adequate public transport. Without improved public transport the planned Northern Gateway will exacerbate traffic problems near the site PR38 and PR50.   |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark         | Lowen     |   | General      |                         | PR38, PR50, PR123, PR167, PR178  | Sites PR38, PR50, PR123, PR167 and PR178 are close to the new railway station and will attract London commuters and increase congestion. Southfield Golf Course is better placed than North Oxford Golf Course to provide houses as it's within walking distances of employment sites such as BMW and Oxford hospitals. These sites seem to have been discounted before becoming public, based on an announcement by a councillor at Gosford and Water Eaton PC annual meeting.   |
| PR-B-1226 | Andrew       | Garraway  | Turnberry on behalf of Exeter College - Frieze Farm | General      |                         | PR39   | This representation sets out a clear justification for a new innovation village in this location, and demonstrates how the vision for site PR39 adheres to the Council's vision to meet Oxford's unmet housing need and adheres to Oxford's pattern of development.   |
| PR-B-1030 | Jonathan     | Harbottle | Land and Partners Ltd                               | General      |                         | PR46   | This representation is made in respect of Land at Sibford Ferris. The owners of the site are willing to make the site available for housing development. Sibford Ferris is a highly sustainable location to support housing growth.   |
| PR-B-0818 | Robin        | Grimston  |   | General      |                         | PR46, PR66   | Sibford Ferris resident. Two sites PR46 and PR66 have been identified to accommodate at least 100 houses inappropriate resulting in dwarfing the village. The village boundary abuts the Cotswold AONB which is to be cherished and not squandered. The immediate road network is poor and some are classed as unclassified. Both sites being offered by same landowner and site PR46 submission from Fisher German misrepresents the local amenities. There is no supermarket or schools for this site. The existing facilities in Sibford Ferris do they have capacity? Aside from the road network other aspects of the infrastructure need to be considered, the sewage system and water supply. Sibford is a particularly rural, unspoilt part of Cherwell district and any development, of whatever scale needs to be carefully thought through. 100 houses would completely ruin the area. |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname    | Organisation                               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1021 | Jon            | Waite      | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Manor Oak Homes | General      |                         | PR49          | Manor Oak Homes is promoting Land at Stratfield Farm, Kidlington as a suitable housing allocation. Due to the site's close proximity to Oxford and excellent transport links it is considered that it can help meet Oxford's unmet housing need. However, concern expressed over a number of inaccuracies in the SA.   |
| PR-B-1222 | Alexis         | Livadeas   |  | General      |                         | PR49          | Objection to the proposed housing development around Kidlington, in particular near Garden City at site PR49. This is one of the few remaining areas of open ground and it would be a step closer to joining Kidlington with Oxford. Building here would be detrimental to the nature reserve at Stratford Brake, currently enjoyed by many people. Traffic congestion at the A4260 roundabout is appalling and restricts travel, any extra traffic would make the situation worse. Development at any of the sites in Kidlington would have an impact on the south-bound traffic feeding into the Sainsbury's and Pear Tree roundabout.   |
| PR-B-0224 | Rev Peter      | Hewis      |  | General      |                         | PR51          | Please register my objection to proposed development at PR51, Spring Hill, Yarnton. As the name suggests several springs run down Cassington Road and Rutten Lane and building would add to current flooding problems. There have been occasions when buses and cars have been unable to get through the flood water. The roads are narrow and the nearest bus stop is Rutten Lane. The land is in GB, well used by ramblers and one of the few remaining undeveloped hill sites in the area. Home to deer, sparrowhawks and the endangered barn owls that nest at College Mead. Frogwell Lane is a historic route, in 1644 King Charles I led his troops up this lane to Bladon then on to Hanborough heath. Before housing is considered Oxford City must ensure students are housed in appropriate accommodation thus releasing houses for families and number of houses empty or rarely used quantified. |
| PR-B-0266 | J M            | Titchmarsh |  | General      |                         | PR51          | There is a history of flooding in parts of Yarnton after heavy rain, due to water running off Springhill. I therefore propose area PR51 should be removed for this reason.   |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG | Oldfield   |  | General      |                         | PR51          | Particularly concerned by the inclusion of Site PR51, which encompasses Spring Hill, it is in the GB and is adjacent to our village of Begbroke. Spring Hill is an area of exceptional natural beauty, with ancient paths (Frogwelldown Lane, Dalton Lane and the Shakespeare Way), and is enjoyed by many. There are ancient and valuable oak trees near the top of the ridge and furrow fields, and run off from Spring Hill is a source of local flooding. Begbroke is an ancient village with a conservation area and being narrow and twisty is unsuitable for any increase in traffic. The development would cause it to lose its character and identity.  |
| PR-B-0645 | Stephanie      | White      |  | General      |                         | PR51          | If development were to go ahead am keen to defend site PR51 which is of huge historical significance and the footpaths offer stunning views.   |
| PR-B-0658 | Susan          | Oldfield   |  | General      |                         | PR51          | At site PR51, Spring Hill Road is a narrow, twisting lane through a conservation area that is prone to flooding. The 'Shakespeare Way' is used by many as is the ancient footpath which contains beautiful views and trees. Building in PR51 would destroy hundreds of years of rural history and beauty.  |
| PR-B-0675 | Elaine         | Titchmarsh |  | General      |                         | PR51          | Yarnton suffers from flooding in certain rainy conditions from water running off land within PR51  |
| PR-B-0702 | Nigel          | Clark      |  | General      |                         | PR51          | GB designed to stop urban sprawl and its purpose is to provide its residents with space, to enjoy nature, recreational use and for wellbeing. If merged the village loses its identity and village activity is affected and destroyed. Yarnton and Begbroke are of historical interest, as the route King Charles 1 took at Spring Hill Site RP51. A wealth of trees and wildlife surround the footpaths and fields in the area. Moved into the village to enjoy a well balanced lifestyle, not to be swallowed up into a city environment. GB needs to be preserved allowing us to continue to enjoy and use the surrounding countryside.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|----------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0779 | David C          | Hinde    | Hinde Law Ltd | General      |                         | PR51          | Site PR51 lies wholly within GB. Local Plan Policy ESD 14 seeks to prevent coalescence of settlements, a strong case for Yarnton and Begbroke. GB Policy ESD 14 seeks to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Policy ESD 13 seeks to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, particularly in urban fringe locations. Policy Villages 1 has Yarnton and Begbroke as a category A village. Only minor development, infilling and conversion allowed or alongside. Surface water running off the elevated site frequently causes flooding in Yarnton and along Cassington Road and Rutten Lane, this will become much greater.  |
| PR-B-0980 | John and Pamela  | Appleton |               | General      |                         | PR51          | Site PR51 includes Spring Hill in the past has caused flooding in parts of Yarnton, suggesting that this area is not suitable for development.  |
| PR-B-1004 | Stephen N        | Skinner  |               | General      |                         | PR51          | Objection is based on GB. This rep. has referred to points in the NPPF regarding GB purpose. Oxford City's intentions become clear when you review the extent of research and planning for areas A and B, which is detailed in CDC Summary Leaflet of November 2016. It is also in-line with the City's stated strategic direction of growth as detailed in the document 'Investing in Oxford's Future – Deciding Strategic Growth Options'; but this intent, is wholly counter to the first four statements made on GB in the NPPF. We stand to lose walks and countryside views. The loss of irreplaceable historical connections, Shakespeare's Way and Frogwelldown Lane famous from Charles 1 in 1644 when fleeing Oxford to escape Oliver Cromwell's troops. Site PR51 captures all of this and it is not acceptable to build here. GB's intention is a permanent fixture and the alleged housing crisis can not be allowed to sway this. |
| PR-B-1004 | Stephen N        | Skinner  |               | General      |                         | PR51          | Objection is based on flooding this is a regular event around Begbroke and Yarnton. Have been affected by this three times with a significant amount of damage caused. It only takes one heavy downpour for the roads to flood and to create extreme damp conditions on the pathways between Yarnton and Begbroke. This is also evident on the higher levels of Spring Hill. To build extensive numbers of houses and access roads will not only exacerbate the problem, it will hugely increase the cost of potential development. The areas referred to here are of course also encapsulated within PR51.   |
| PR-B-1083 | Susan            | Knox     |               | General      |                         | PR51          | Am particularly concerned about Site PR51 which is agricultural land needed for food production.  |
| PR-B-1191 | Simon            | Eaton    |               | General      |                         | PR51          | Development on site PR51 has considerable flood risk. During heavy rain water runs off the field and causes flooding in the village and Cassington Lane.  |
| PR-B-1253 | Jon and Michelle | Mason    |               | General      |                         | PR51          | Site PR51 is a specific concern. The site is on a hill and development here would be considered an eye sore effecting views from many view points. Many residents gardens back onto this site too.. Rutten Lane is already busy and is used as a cut through from the A44 to the Cassington Road. Traffic here would increase along this quiet residential road. The site is adjacent to the primary school, old people's home, play park and playing fields. With the increased traffic along Rutten Lane, pedestrians and the vulnerable will be at risk. Chose to live in Yarnton due to the access to the open countryside, allowing us to utilise the walks for leisure and fitness activities, this would be lost if development goes ahead. Yarnton is a small, historic, characterful, Bronze Age village. This character and identity would undoubtedly be spoilt by a large, modern housing development.                              |
| PR-B-1265 | Kathleen         | Hayes    |               | General      |                         | PR51          | Site PR51 is important for the health and wellbeing of local residents. It contains historic pathways and unique views of the local landscape. Spring Hill within PR51 has natural springs which cause flooding when there is heavy rain, any development would increase this risk.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname            | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-1091 | Mark               | Bailey             |  | General      |                         | PR51, PR48, PR20, PR24, PR74, PR118, PR126, PR34  | Object to the proposed planning around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke which will have a major effect on the small village communities of Begbroke and Yarnton. It disregards the GB and breaches the reasons it has been put in place such as restricting urban sprawl and preserving historical settings. The road infrastructure can't cope with current demands before adding a further 5000 cars and schools and doctors surgeries are at capacity. Spring Hill is an area of outstanding beauty and provides a full 360 degree view of the country, admired by many people from far and wide. At Spring Hill Road the fields are flooded on a regular basis and the road is submerged. This is the same at Begbroke. This rep has provided photos to illustrate the flooding.  |
| PR-B-1205 | Karen              | Jackson            |  | General      |                         | PR51, PR75  | Sites PR51 and PR75 are havens for walkers and wildlife, used by city dwellers and residents alike. Exceptional circumstances to use GB, which provides the historical setting for villages, is not apparent. PR51 has extensive flooding after heavy rain which Yarnton village feels the impact of. Extensive building would exacerbate this problem.   |
| PR-B-0678 | Mrs H G            | Kibby              |  | General      |                         | PR51, PR75, PR20, PR34, PR126, PR94, PR92, PR24, PR195, PR194, PR27, PR14, PR178, PR125 | These sites are of particular concern as Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington would become one sprawl and lose their identities. Open countryside would be lost with walks and wildlife. There are otters and water voles in the canal and River Cherwell. There would be an impact on flooding, drainage and local roads.  |
| PR-B-1028 | Amanda and Michael | Roberts and Graham |  | General      |                         | PR55  | Site PR55 is inappropriate to the village and would significantly extend its current boundaries. This is mentioned in the conservation area document as being of vital importance to the external views of the village.   |
| PR-B-1180 | RA                 | Humphreys          | Humphreys and Co Solicitors on behalf of Oxford Programs Ltd | General      |                         | PR75  | Very concerned to preserve the historic setting of the Grade II* listed Yarnton Manor and its Grade II listed historic gardens which border site PR75. The development of the site would infill the existing open area between Yarnton Manor and Yarnton itself. The Manor House and gardens would effectively be subsumed within the built-up area of the village. this would cause substantial harm to these heritage assets. Development would also severely prejudice the effective operation of the educational campus, which itself plays a significant role in supporting the educational and research functions of the City. There are also flooding issues in the locality.  |
| PR-B-1191 | Simon              | Eaton              |  | General      |                         | PR75  | Site PR75 in Yarnton has a public footpath and building on this field will deny villagers the amenity and pleasure of walking. The field also abuts onto a listed building so development would spoil the setting.  |
| PR-B-1331 | Fred               | Jones              |  | General      |                         | PR75  | Have considerable concerns with the overall proposal in particular with the number of dwellings and the integrity of the supposed shortfall. As a Yarnton resident have serious concerns with site PR75 off Church Lane and all the potential sites. It is most inappropriate and poorly thought out. Church Lane is not suitable for access to Cassington Road, it is only one vehicle wide, with no passing places or a footpath, this would be fraught with danger. The junction to access the Cassington Road is already congested as it is used as a rat run between the A40 and A44. Developments on site PR75 could generate 200-300 extra vehicle movements a day, in addition to the granted planning permission at the rear of Charlett's Tyres. Cassington Road and the linking Rutten Lane bear the majority of daily traffic in the village, both roads can barely cope with the existing volume of traffic. To increase this volume would seriously compromise the safety of drivers and pedestrians alike and should be discouraged at every opportunity. Strongly oppose the proposal at site PR75. |
| PR-B-0645 | Stephanie          | White              |  | General      |                         | PR91  | If development were to go ahead am keen to defend site PR91 which is a haven for wildlife and routinely floods.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                   | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| PR-B-0779 | David C    | Hinde       | Hinde Law Ltd   | General      |                         | PR91                            | Site PR91 lies wholly within GB part of which is considered brownfield. Local Plan Policy ESD 14 seeks to encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Access to the A44 from this site totally inadequate, highly dangerous, and the danger can only be exacerbated if further development were to be allowed.  |
| PR-B-1285 | Jeffrey    | Wright      |   | General      |                         | PR91                            | This consultation is about Oxford's unmet housing need. Why has site PR91, as an example, been included and promoted for employment? This is a site of special scientific interest and the limits of expansion along the Oxford canal had previously been agreed.   |
| PR-B-0909 | Mark       | Lowen       |   | General      |                         | PR91, PR194, PR195              | Sites PR91, PR194 and PR195 would be better used for commercial development to reduce traffic travelling into Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0159 | Jon        | Waite       | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Sheehan Group of Companies | General      |                         | PR92                            | Client is promoting Knightsbridge Farm as a suitable housing allocation with associated services and facilities. Due to the site's proximity to Oxford and excellent transport links it is considered to offer a perfect opportunity to help meet Oxford's unmet housing need. Client is however, concerned about a number of inaccuracies in CDC's assessment of the site. This rep addresses these inaccuracies and provides CDC with further information about the site.   |
| PR-B-0973 | Jonathan   | Harbottle   | Land and Partners Ltd                                 | General      |                         | PR94, PR95                      | Land and Partners (LandP) is in contact with the owners of this site who are willing to bring forward the land for residential development.   |
| PR-B-1285 | Jeffrey    | Wright      |   | General      |                         | PR-A-074                        | Information has been made very difficult to find some of which has major implications for villages such as Begbroke. An example of this is The Begbroke Master Plan PR-A-074 JPPC Oxford University The Tripartite. People are amazed when informed of the detail such as a Park and Ride and railway station.  |
| PR-B-0758 | Stephen    | Anderson    |   | General      |                         | Previous LP2-A_174 [sec], PR164 | This rep. provides a detailed and lengthy objection to site PR164/Rep ID LP2-A_174 [sec], land east of Sands Lane. Quoting Cherwell Local Plan for South Newington. Quoting South Newington Conservation Area. Quoting Site Submissions Form and Manual for Streets. Concerns over the lack of public transport as car transport is essential to living in the village. Will the sewage pumping station be able to cope with the increased population. A361 is a busy road, can it cope with increased traffic. Schools already close to capacity, where would they be educated? The site would extend the village beyond its existing built up limit, Historic settlements are not to be lost. |
| PR-B-0779 | David C    | Hinde       | Hinde Law Ltd   | General      |                         | RP75                            | Site PR75 lies wholly within GB. Local Plan Policy ESD 14 seeks to prevent urban sprawl and to safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Policy Villages 1 has Yarnton as a category A village. Only minor development, infilling and conversion allowed or alongside. Access to the site by a single track Church, which leads onto the traffic calmed Cassington Road.   |
| PR-B-1358 | Ian        | Lough-Scott | Upper Heyford Village Group                           | General      |                         | Upper Heyford                   | Wish to place on record the observations that were presented at a public enquiry held in 2002. These concerns still apply. The rep reproduces these observations which refer to the highway constraints and problems in the U Heyford area and surrounding parishes.  |
| PR-B-0037 | Clifford   | Jones       |   | General      |                         |                                 | The consultation has been poorly publicised, and technical language used in the documents inaccessible to the general public. GB should have been clearly marked on location plans.   |
| PR-B-0043 | Simon      | Dacombe     | Thames Valley Police                                  | General      |                         |                                 | No specific comments. Highlights that additional policing infrastructure requirements may be required to mitigate the impact of this growth.  |
| PR-B-0044 | Janet      | Moore       |   | General      |                         |                                 | Kidlington is already too big and increased traffic will cause standstill. We want to retain the countryside.   |
| PR-B-0075 | Philip V F | Kavanagh    |   | General      |                         |                                 | Strongly object to 4,400 homes in Oxford GB that could bring 8,000 cars to already congested roads. The medical facilities at Kidlington can't cope at present with the demand. You want more houses to obtain more council tax to waste on frivolous schemes. Incorrect assumptions have been made about the growth in jobs in Oxford. The proposed sites for employment and previously developed land in Oxford should be considered instead.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0076 | Melanie    | Green   |              | General      |                         |               | Recognise the need for housing and that some of that will need to be around Kidlington, however object to the plan of 10,400 houses. It means the majority of surrounding rural land, used by walkers and families will disappear. Pressure will increase on services and roads, and central parking will be limited by the proposed development of the Coop. should follow the model of some Scandinavian countries where business and retail developments have residential accommodation on top of them.   |
| PR-B-0077 | Mrs        | Patten  |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed housing in Begbroke and surrounding area. The character and form of each village will be destroyed and it will increase pressure on the infrastructure. Roads are already congested, schools oversubscribed and health services at capacity. It will cause irretrievable damage to the countryside and loss of habitat to wildlife. Ancient footpaths like Frogwelldown lane and bridleways for walkers, riders and cyclists will be lost. Encroachment on the GB defies CDC's own policy and plan agreed in 2015, where 76% of residents wanted to protect GB.   |
| PR-B-0119 | C A        | McCall  |              | General      |                         |               | Comments relate to Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0134 | V N        | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | As a resident and tax payer of Cherwell object to meeting any other Council's housing needs unless they agree to meet the full cost of the work and certain other conditions are accepted which must form an integral part of any approved plan.   |
| PR-B-0134 | V N        | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | There is already a commitment in the adopted local plan to build 22,800 new homes by 2031. If another 4,000 were to be added to the total the probable population increase is well over 60,000 people, a massive increase which will cause obvious problems.   |
| PR-B-0134 | V N        | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | Healthcare - The clear attempt to downgrade the Horton Hospital should be reversed immediately. There can be no excuse for sending local residents to any Oxford Hospital for minor procedures. Travelling is a serious issue and so is parking. The roads are already congested and journey times are increasing all the time. No doubt the planners have improvements in mind but action is needed now. The A34 to Oxford needs at least one more lane.  |
| PR-B-0134 | V N        | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | Education - In some places there is already a problem with school places. Sending pupils by bus can be expensive and some parents choose to drive further increasing traffic congestion and pollution. Parking is an issue almost everywhere. Employment - If Cherwell has to assist Oxford then Oxford should encourage firms to re-locate to Cherwell and occupy some of the vacant premises thus reducing commuting.  |
| PR-B-0134 | V N        | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | Climate change - Serious traffic congestion and more and more commuter journeys increases pollution which is supposed to be a national priority. Conclusion - Unless action starts to deal with the points raised and any other concerns noticed by planning staff the proposal to deal with Oxford's housing needs cannot be approved.  |
| PR-B-0147 | Carl G L   | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | Whilst acknowledging that Oxford City and government are pressing for housing outside the city boundaries, it had been envisaged in Oxford City and Cherwell that this would be marginally rounding off around the city and some parts of Kidlington and nearby villages. The level of development proposed would overwhelm the Kidlington area which already has over-stretched services and infrastructure. The congested road network will reach gridlock when the A40 to A4160 proposed link road is built. Already the A34 which links the ports in Southampton to the industrial midlands sees daily accidents. I hope CDC will resolve to protect the GB which prevents urban creep, contains high quality countryside with footpaths and has biodiversity proven by Chiltern Railways to come close to Port Meadow. Many of the sites are edging into flood plains and the land owners appear to be only interested in maximising profits by selling to developers. Oxfordshire's strategic economic plan forecast is flawed and need revising taking into account Brexit. If however this level of housing is required, increases should be considered in Banbury, Bicester and Upper Heyford |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0148 | Mrs J E           | Stedman |              | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to erecting 4,400 houses around Begbroke and Yarnton. GB will be lost, and pressure will increase on the infrastructure, schools and the health services. It is ill thought out.   |
| PR-B-0149 | Linda and Derek   | Foster  |              | General      |                         |               | As long standing residents of 80+ years object to new houses in and around Begbroke. New housing making it's way up Springhill road has already increased traffic on the single track road used by walkers, dogs and horses. Concerned for our footpaths, and the disruption of works traffic. Have lost our PO, 2 shops and the garage and Spring Hill supports much wildlife including a barn owl.   |
| PR-B-0150 | Patrick and Julia | Marcks  |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the conduct and timing of the Consultation process which has been poorly publicised. Cherwell have done little to raise public awareness of the possible loss of Green Belt and details of the consultation were difficult to find on your website.  |
| PR-B-0163 | Wendy and John    | Castle  |              | General      |                         |               | Horrified at the proposed building of 4,400 houses north of Oxford. The development is unsustainable, the infrastructure would be overwhelmed and we doubt that any improvements could or would be made to cope. The traffic problems would increase and schools, GP's and dental services swamped. Wholly oppose GB being eroded as it contravenes its five purposes stated by CDC. Definition between Kidlington and Oxford would be lost and spoiling what remains of the area around Oxford will make it a less attractive place to visit and live. It is much needed green lung giving respite from urban sprawl and allowing space for exercise and spiritual comfort.   |
| PR-B-0166 | Mark              | Webb    |              | General      |                         |               | Object to building more houses around Kidlington. The infrastructure at both Begbroke and Kidlington will not be able to cope, and the schools and medical centres are already at capacity.  |
| PR-B-0168 | Paula             | Staples |              | General      |                         |               | Concerns regarding the proposed housing at South Newington. There is no rail link to Oxford and a sparse bus service, no school, shops or medical services. Any development will therefore put additional pressure on the local narrow roads which are already degraded. The main road A361 through the village is already dangerous with current volumes of traffic and the proposed site will have poor access to this. Existing drainage is already overstrained and will not support a further 57 houses. The site will spoil a conservation area which has valuable footpaths, crayfish, newts, bats and buzzards.  |
| PR-B-0170 | Andrea            | Johnson |              | General      |                         |               | Protests most strongly to the proposed development in the Kidlington and Yarnton area. Traffic infrastructure can barely cope at present and this would get worse. School class sizes are already too large for effective learning and health provision is under pressure. These plans go against CDC's 2015 plan and residents wishes to protect the GB, which provide wildlife habitat and a space for people to thrive.   |
| PR-B-0172 | A                 | Platt   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed housing in Cherwell especially at Quarry End, Begbroke. There is a bronze age barrow in the said field, which along with Fernhill Road sometimes floods. I live in a bungalow and don't want two storey houses overlooking me and my neighbours.  |
| PR-B-0173 | Janet             | Persson |              | General      |                         |               | A number of possible sites are close to the Peartree and Kidlington roundabouts which are heavily congested bringing traffic from the A40, A44 and A4260. It would be better to locate new developments away from these bottlenecks. The 100 houses, limits site location as villages could accept smaller numbers while still maintain a good quality of life. There should be no development east of Kidlington to the river which should be preserved for people and wildlife. The airport would be better to remain a source of employment and Langford Lane is cut off from the town by the industrial estate. The chart shows a centre of employment in Headington, so the east of Headington would be better, has Buckingham CC been consulted? |
| PR-B-0175 | Mr D and Mrs S    | Rudd    |              | General      |                         |               | Feels that the consultation has been poorly publicised and that possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname          | Organisation           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0176 | Robert            | McGurrin         | Woodstock Action Group | General      |                         |               | Objects to the release of Green Belt land near Kidlington. They question the basis of SHMA calculations and assumptions of high economic growth and immigration. The existing infrastructure and services such as health, education, recreation/leisure, natural environment, etc., are all under strain and stretched. They will be impacted by such this proposal. They call for the deletion of modifications PR22 and PR25 from the Local Plan.  |
| PR-B-0177 | Nick              | McEwen           |                        | General      |                         |               | Grave concerns over the proposed building at Begbroke. The plans will not only ruin the character off the countryside and village but increase pressure on the fragile infrastructure including roads and schools. Brownfield sites should be explored before GB.  |
| PR-B-0178 | Craig and Melanie | Carter           |                        | General      |                         |               | Horrified at the possibility of housing decimating the GB, having lived in Begbroke for 30 years. This combined with the prospect of increased traffic congestion and pressure on our local health services is daunting.   |
| PR-B-0179 | Mr and Mrs        | Pickard          |                        | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed housing in Begbroke and surrounding area. The character and form of each village will be destroyed and it will increase pressure on the infrastructure. Roads are already congested, schools oversubscribed and health services at capacity. It will cause irretrievable damage to the countryside and loss of habitat to wildlife. Ancient footpaths like Frogwelldown lane and bridleways for walkers, riders and cyclists will be lost. Encroachment on the GB defies CDC's own policy and plan agreed in 2015, where 76% of residents wanted to protect GB. |
| PR-B-0181 | Diane and Darryl  | Bates-Brownsword |                        | General      |                         |               | Feel that the consultation has been poorly publicised and that possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-0184 | Roger             | Prince           |                        | General      |                         |               | The publicity given to the process was not handled very well and the public should have been made aware of this review to the Local Plan and the renewed and increased threat to the Green Belt. The Cherwell website is not easy to navigate or read and there was no quick link to the consultation details. The timing of the consultation period in Kidlington, over the Christmas period couldn't have been at a worse time to engage the residents in the process.   |
| PR-B-0194 | Philip            | Hine             |                        | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the proposed 4,400 homes as so much is on GB land. With regards to Kidlington, the GB which is designed to check unrestricted sprawl and safeguard the countryside, will disappear along with Kidlington as it becomes a suburb of Oxford. Oxford City is proposing to build business parks on their available land rather than address their housing needs.  |
| PR-B-0196 | Christopher       | Jarvis           |                        | General      |                         |               | Although recognise the need for housing, object to the proposed scale in Kidlington. Roads are already congested, pollution will increase and pressure on facilities and services would be immense. The green space around the village is special to many residents and wildlife. I conduct surveys along the river Cherwell for the British Trust for Ornithology and have recorded a decline in species, a scheme like this would wipe even more out. With Oxford Parkway making London an hour away it is unlikely that the development will help the local housing situation.      |
| PR-B-0197 | Dr Margaret       | Barrett          |                        | General      |                         |               | Greatly concerned about plans to build in Oxford's GB. Have lived in north Oxford for over 60 years, and part of that joy is access to the countryside. The increased pressure on facilities bought about by more residents and access to the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabout is a worry.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname     | Organisation              | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|-------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0198 | Trevor       | Cusi        |                           | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Rat running and commuter traffic locally will only get worse.   |
| PR-B-0199 | Anne         | Davies      | Piddington Parish Council | General      |                         |               | <b>Traffic congestion</b> - The Parish Council would ask that any significant development around Bicester also make provision for adequate infrastructure as they would not like to see any worsening of the current traffic congestion in the area.<br><b>Health</b> - It is also concerned that proposals to increase the size of Banbury and Bicester will put even more pressure on local health services, and would like an assurance that the needs of Horton General Hospital to respond to the needs of this increased population is being appropriately discussed and planned.  |
| PR-B-0201 | Dr Catherine | Grebenik    |                           | General      |                         |               | Feel that the consultation has been poorly publicised and that possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-0202 | Ian          | Gordon      |                           | General      |                         |               | Oppose the proposed destruction of GB around Begbroke and Yarnton. The continuing expansion of homes will result in urban sprawl and destroy rural communities which make this area so attractive. We shouldn't have to make this sacrifice for Oxford City's housing needs, where landowners and builders make sizeable profits whilst only providing minimal affordable houses.  |
| PR-B-0206 | Andrew       | McCallum    |                           | General      |                         |               | The figures for housing growth are based on spurious figures for jobs growth in Oxford and new houses may be used by London commuters. Much of the proposed new employment could be directed to other parts of the country where there is high unemployment and brownfield sites are available. New housing within Oxford could be built to higher densities, such as good quality flats, thus reducing the need to encroach beyond the existing boundaries. Improvements to transport infrastructure in particular the railway will enable workers to commute from further afield reducing the need for housing. Do not build on GB.  |
| PR-B-0207 | Susan        | Robertson   |                           | General      |                         |               | It is questionable whether it is a sustainable option for Cherwell to help meet Oxford's housing need by building 4400 homes in Cherwell, which already has many developments in the pipeline. Councils need to look at the level of affordable housing by increasing the percentage that developers include in sites and taking into account local salaries. A full transport assessment needs to be undertaken to understand the impact of building 4400 houses, for example the car park built at Banbury railway station has increased congestion in the area. There would be an additional burden on schools, doctors and hospitals and the potential downgrading of the Horton Hospital will increase traffic going to Oxford for treatment. If additional houses are built pressure is needed to retain the Horton and they must be affordable. |
| PR-B-0208 | David        | Wintersgill |                           | General      |                         |               | Oppose the plans for building in the GB which goes against the agreed plan for 2015. Should not have to provide houses for Oxford, the colleges have land within the city without using GB around Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton. Chose to live in the countryside and can see no benefit to villagers. The present infrastructure is gridlocked morning and night and the new bus routes 500 and 7 which give access to Oxford Parkway and the hospitals go through Kidlington but overlook Begbroke and Yarnton.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0209 | Patrick and Julia | Jennings  |              | General      |                         |               | The case for the total housing requirement has not been substantiated, and houses would be better placed near key area of employment - Cowley and Headington. The selection criteria disregards the national policy for protecting GB, and the assessment tests for sites, does not capture the impact on the environment and the landscape.  |
| PR-B-0210 | Catherine         | Henderson |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed 4,400 homes on GB at Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton. Begbroke already has traffic problems at rush hour with delays at the A44 and A40. My children use the S3 bus and have to cross the dual carriageway without a pedestrian crossing, so any increase in traffic will endanger those using public transport. If we lose all our open spaces we will become an Oxford urban sprawl, and change a historic town and world heritage site. Businesses in Kidlington and Woodstock would suffer as roads become too congested to use. Schools and medical services are already at capacity and any population increase would put a strain on services. This area have seen much development in recent years and we are significantly devastating the natural habitats of many plants and animals |
| PR-B-0213 | Linda             | Browning  |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation was poorly publicised, as a property owner in Yarnton would expect some communication and the possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-0222 | Malcolm           | Axtell    |              | General      |                         |               | Am grateful to Kidlington Development Watch for alerting me to these proposals as there was little raising of public awareness from CDC with regards to loss of GB. It was difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they were long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-0223 | P M               | Vandermin |              | General      |                         |               | Objects to the proposed building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford, these figures are unrealistically high and should be challenged by CDC. It is unsustainable, traffic problems would become worse and schools and health services would be overstretched. Walks and views would be lost, and natural habitats of local importance destroyed. Object strongly to development on GB which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0231 | Mr and Mrs        | Nutbrown  |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed 4,400 new houses around Yarnton, Kidlington and Begbroke which will destroy the character of each village. The roads are already congested and schools and health services at capacity.  |
| PR-B-0232 | Mrs Marjorie      | Kilby     |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the building of 4,000 houses in the fields around Kidlington and eroding the countryside. GP surgeries are already under pressure and traffic a problem. Kidlington would lose its identity as a separate community and be a much less pleasant place to live.   |
| PR-B-0235 | Bruce             | Tremayne  |              | General      |                         |               | With regards to the proposed location plans for areas A and B, Kidlington and the surrounding area. With the exception of sites PR22 and PR25, all 33 sites are in GB. CDC's 2015 plan, policy ESD14 aims to protect Oxford GB and prevent urban sprawl. GB is one of the most intelligent, farsighted and successful land management policies any nation has devised and must be maintained. It shelters wildlife, transpires oxygen, sequesters carbon and pollutants, grows food, provides space for walking and adds tranquillity to the landscape.   |
| PR-B-0236 | R                 | Hearn     |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed housing in Yarnton and the surrounding area. I recognise the need for affordable housing but Yarnton has incorporated 170 new houses in the last ten years. It has very few green spaces left and the school is having to be enlarged. The increase in traffic would be on roads that are in need of repair. The GB should be respected, this is a rural area.   |
| PR-B-0237 | J A               | Burt      |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the building of 4,400 houses on GB to meet Oxford's needs, it is not sustainable. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing. GB is a permanent designation and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name              | Surname          | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0239 | Mrs P R                 | Buls             |              | General      |                         |               | Object to new housing in Yarnton which has already had houses added to the outskirts. It will spoil this ancient village. We have seen the impact of construction traffic on Cassington Road when Wolvercote works were underway with damage to properties.  |
| PR-B-0240 | Mrs Carole              | Walton           |              | General      |                         |               | Why does CDC need to build this amount of homes when SODC have not agreed a quota. It would be better to spread the number of houses across some other villages so as not to destroy GB. Choosing Christmas as a consultation period has perhaps reduced the number of people who would of objected.   |
| PR-B-0241 | Richard                 | Walton           |              | General      |                         |               | Why does CDC need to build this amount of homes when SODC have not agreed a quota. It would be better to spread the number of houses across some other villages so as not to destroy GB. Choosing Christmas as a consultation period has perhaps reduced the number of people who would of objected.   |
| PR-B-0259 | Andrew and Andrea       | West             |              | General      |                         |               | Wish to express concern over proposed plans within the parish of Begbroke. CDC adopted a plan in 2015 which was sensitive to GB so why under pressure from Oxford City has this changed? CDC should resist and plans rejected. Nearly 80% of county residents want GB retained and it goes against government advice. Development would remove GB, damage natural habitats and allow urban sprawl between Oxford and Woodstock. Levels of traffic on the A44, A34 and local roads would increase, as would pressure on the already struggling services. Schools are currently oversubscribed and health services struggling . Begbroke is a tiny village with 783 residents and plans would quadruple it's size. It would change beyond recognition, losing its character, identity and ancient, historical settings. The local scenery, walks and countryside we moved here for would go forever. |
| PR-B-0260 | Chris                   | Pack             |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been very poorly publicised, if were not for local groups in Kidlington raising awareness, many people would have been unaware. It was difficult to follow the consultation details on the website and hard to understand. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-0264 | Prof Adrian and Mrs Pat | Sutton and White |              | General      |                         |               | Many of the options do little to meet the strategic aims, indeed they add to the exiting problems. The volume of traffic approaching Oxford form the north is heavy with delays. £9 million and 18 months of disruption refurbishing Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts have had little successful. Therefore increasing the population between Oxford and Kidlington will cause an unacceptable increase in traffic, and pollution. Although Oxford Parkway is a success, houses there will attract London commuters and affordable houses for people working in Oxford will not be met. Whilst we understand the need for more housing GB must be a last resort and paragraphs 79 and 81 of the NPPF adhered to. The design of any development must consider the impact on quality of life for both new and existing residents.   |
| PR-B-0265 | Susan                   | Ganter           |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford, these figures are unrealistically high and should be challenged by CDC. It is unsustainable, traffic problems would become worse and schools and health services would be overstretched. Walks and views would be lost, and natural habitats of local importance destroyed. Object strongly to development on GB which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0266 | J M        | Titchmarsh    |              | General      |                         |               | The plan to build 4,400 houses in GB surrounding Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke opposes the purpose of GB. It is there to safeguard the countryside, historic towns and village and check urban sprawl. The need for more houses is not sufficient reason for destroying it. There is already traffic problems accessing Oxford from the north on the A34, A40 and A44, any building would add to this congestion, and Oxford City refuses to introduce congestion charges. The Rapid Transit Lines plan will not have the capacity to cope and doesn't pass through the areas around Kidlington. Any development is unlikely to solve the housing shortage as Oxford Parkway caters for London commuters and has increased house prices in the area. CDC should protect our interests as South Oxfordshire have done and press for Oxford City to export jobs into the county if it can't find homes within the city. |
| PR-B-0267 | Carole     | Pack          |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation procedure was poorly publicised and where it not for local people raising awareness it would have been unknown. Kidlington despite being the area most affected was last to have the exhibition which was badly organised. The time to respond was very short and over the Christmas period when people were on holiday.  |
| PR-B-0284 | Marilyn    | Marshall      |              | General      |                         |               | Am concerned at the potential of 4,400 new homes in Kidlington and that this could be to justify the new station at Water Eaton and house London commuters. Kidlington has a need for affordable houses and so a large percentage of any new housing needs to be for our young people and families. Do not believe there is enough demand to justify the need to develop on GB. These places are wildlife habitats and for the enjoyment and health of residents. Kidlington is a special place for a large number of people and is being disregarded by developers.   |
| PR-B-0285 | Michael    | De Selincourt |              | General      |                         |               | As there is not enough employment development planned in Kidlington, can only assume that the village is being used to some extent to house London commuters using Oxford Parkway. It would make sense to build at least some houses nearer employment areas in Cowley and Headington. The roads around Kidlington are already congested and this will only increase if Kidlington nearly doubles in size. There are many empty and derelict houses and wasted spaces within Oxford before we build on GB. Our countryside is important for the health and wellbeing of many, and crucial for our wildlife and children.   |
| PR-B-0286 | A          | Mayes-Baker   |              | General      |                         |               | Both options A and B involve the destruction of GB, an amenity that is important to residents of Kidlington and surrounding villages. GB is amongst other things supposed to protect over-urbanisation and the coalescence of individual communities. If CDC permits this development it is in breach of its own policies to protect it. The number of proposed house is disproportionate to existing numbers in Kidlington and would change the character of the present community and its surrounding villages. New houses should be positioned to the east and south of Oxford where employment is, and not the north where the infrastructure is saturated.  |
| PR-B-0289 | David      | Wells         |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the building of 4,400 houses at Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington as the villages will lose their identity and destroy the GB. The road infrastructure is not in place to cope with existing traffic and major improvements are needed. The ring road around Oxford at Cutteslowe park needs completing, widening of the A34 between M40 and M4, widening of A40 with slip roads taking traffic onto A34 before Wolvercote roundabout. Finally widening of dual carriage between Yarnton and Peartree roundabout. I believe any development should be north of the A34 until areas are used inside around Oxford Parkway station.   |
| PR-B-0445 | V          | Truby         |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the plans to build at Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke as additional traffic will increase pollution and congestion, particularly on the A44. School places are already limited and it is not clear from the plans where the site entrances will be, which is a concern.   |
| PR-B-0446 | M          | Truby         |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the plans to build at Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke as additional traffic will increase pollution and congestion, particularly on the A44. School places are already limited and it is not clear from the plans where the site entrances will be, which is a concern.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | General      |                         |               | Strong objection to build on precious GB surrounding Kidlington. GB is there to prevent expansion of towns and cities, providing valuable amenity for those in the cities. GB should be permanently protected from development as in section 9 of the National Planning Policy Framework. Oxford's Labour council may want GB to be developed if outside their own boundaries but Conservative Cherwell need to remember the Conservations government's 2015 election pledge to protect GB. Brownfield sites in Oxford City and Cherwell district have these been considered rather than destroy Kidlington's GB. Ref to para.3.7 of Cherwell D.C.'s Kidlington Framework Master Plan SPD, March 2016).   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | General      |                         |               | The countryside that extends from behind The Moors towards the River Cherwell is not only GB but also described in the Inspector's Report of 1991 as "an area of High Landscape Value". The area is enormous value to Kidlington's residents, with walking and exceptional views. The Oxfordshire Wildlife and Landscape Study declared these meadows and woodland to be national priority habitats for nature conservation. Protected habitats for badgers, the great crested newt and much more wildlife that would become in decline if their habitat were destroyed.  |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | General      |                         |               | District Council is basing its housing needs and projections on the SHMA report. How can this be "objectively addressed needs", as the Council claims when the SHMA was produced by a team led by property consultants, with obvious close connections to the development sector. The figures are far in excess for the district and are widely regarded as grossly inflated.   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | General      |                         |               | Oxford's unmet housing need would be taken more seriously if Oxford City were not prioritising building business parks and employment led sites, such as 8,000 jobs at the Northern Gateway. Unemployment is not an issue in this area, so is there a need for the developments and putting pressure to Kidlington's GB to only satisfy Oxford's perceived housing needs. Kidlington's village character would be destroyed and a 70% increase to the population. The green gap between Kidlington and Oxford would be lost and become a suburb. Kidlington would merge with Yarnton and Begbroke in one urban sprawl.  |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | General      |                         |               | Increase to population would give rise to infrastructure problems in Kidlington. Health service and schools are already stretched. Aggravated traffic problems do not bear thinking about, the traffic congestion is already an issue on the main roads through Cherwell. Kidlington's residential roads are used as "rat runs", with the increase in housing this would produce intolerable congestion on the roads and in the vicinity of any large housing development. A case for The Moors described in the Kidlington Framework Master Plan, "an attractive leafy street" (42.2, 4d) This would be destroyed by the large volume of traffic. Benmead Road would become a thoroughfare to connect The Moors to Banbury Road.   |
| PR-B-0447 | Laura, John, Benito | Wainwright |              | General      |                         |               | Appendix B of the Kidlington Framework Master Plan. Such sites land north to The Moors, Stratfield and Gosford Farm, have been mentioned as potential for housing development. This is out of the question, even if exceptional circumstances due to GB protection. It would be devastating to the residents of Kidlington if the countryside, wildlife, views and footpaths were destroyed. The lose of its village character and the threat to the rural environment. What value has GB if it can be ignored. The reasons that lay behind the establishment of GB in the 1947 Town and Country Planning Act, far from having been superseded by other factors in the intervening 60 years, are more valid than ever, given the relentless expansion of our towns and the urbanization of our countryside since then. Once rural land is built upon it is lost forever, we do not have that much of it, so it is our duty to preserve what we have for our descendants. CDC has always defended the inviolability of Kidlington's GB and it has a duty to Kidlington's residents to continue to do so if their environment is not to be irredeemably ruined. |
| PR-B-0478 | B                   | Seymour    |              | General      |                         |               | This rep contained a map provided by Kidlington Development Watch which has an area of objection marked.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0627 | Charles        | Isles    |              | General      |                         |               | Object as 4,400 homes is not an appropriate requirement and unrealistically high. Local infrastructure and services are already stretched, in particular schools and the health services. GB which is enjoyed by many for its walks and views will be sacrificed. It's habitats are of great local importance and it protects the historic city of Oxford from overdevelopment. The government's promise and Cherwell's policy to protect GB should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0628 | Anna           | Isles    |              | General      |                         |               | Object as 4,400 homes is not an appropriate requirement and unrealistically high. Local infrastructure and services are already stretched, in particular schools and the health services. GB which is enjoyed by many for its walks and views will be sacrificed. It's habitats are of great local importance and it protects the historic city of Oxford from overdevelopment. The government's promise and Cherwell's policy to protect GB should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0634 | Graham         | Hillsdon |              | General      |                         |               | Object as 4,400 homes is not an appropriate requirement and unrealistically high. Local infrastructure and services are already stretched, in particular schools and the health services. GB which is enjoyed by many for its walks and views will be sacrificed. It's habitats are of great local importance and it protects the historic city of Oxford from overdevelopment. The government's promise and Cherwell's policy to protect GB should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0635 | Julie          | Hillsdon |              | General      |                         |               | Object as 4,400 homes is not an appropriate requirement and unrealistically high. Local infrastructure and services are already stretched, in particular schools and the health services. GB which is enjoyed by many for its walks and views will be sacrificed. It's habitats are of great local importance and it protects the historic city of Oxford from overdevelopment. The government's promise and Cherwell's policy to protect GB should be upheld.  |
| PR-B-0637 | Prof Martin LG | Oldfield |              | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to the proposals and the inadequate publicity and consultation period. The local infrastructure is already at breaking point with congested roads and schools and GP's oversubscribed. Oxford city has approved many Science Parks without planning to house workers, and so should now explore brownfield sites within the city. Much of the proposed housing would be used by London commuters using Oxford Parkway. The GB is open beautiful countryside, enjoyed by many and CDC is committed to defend it. It should not be destroyed. |
| PR-B-0638 | HA             | Downie   |              | General      |                         |               | Wish to protest strongly to the proposal to build on GB north of Oxford. Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton would merge together and lose their separate identities and GB is intended to stop this urban sprawl. A lot of the land is agricultural and certainly around Begbroke used to grow crops. Traffic conditions are already bad and local services under pressure. Am particularly concerned about flooding as some residents in Begbroke have flooding problems.  |
| PR-B-0639 | Diane          | Downie   |              | General      |                         |               | Wish to protest strongly to the proposal to build on GB north of Oxford. Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton would merge together and lose their separate identities and GB is intended to stop this urban sprawl. A lot of the land is agricultural and certainly around Begbroke used to grow crops. Traffic conditions are already bad and local services under pressure. Particularly concerned about flooding as some residents in Begbroke have flooding problems.   |
| PR-B-0640 | Walter E       | Game     |              | General      |                         |               | Whilst agreeing there is a necessity for some housing, feel 4,400 on GB land around Kidlington is unrealistic and unsustainable. This number would impact greatly on the infrastructure and change the character of the area. Alarmed that some of the areas of search are within the "green lungs" so vital to the health and well-being of residents and any future ones. The GB is a precious amenity where nature flourishes and has always been part of your policy in the Cherwell Local Plan, and successive governments to protect it.              |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0645 | Stephanie      | White   |              | General      |                         |               | Do not object on principle to development as realise new houses are needed. However strongly object to the scale of the proposal that would increase Oxford sprawl and swallow the villages of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington, along with their identities. Current circumstances are not exceptional to justify building on GB as stated in Government policy. Councils should use their local plan drawing on NPPF protection to safeguard the green lungs. Footpaths, some of which have historical significance are used by a huge number of people and offer beautiful views. The area is a haven for wildlife and the risk of flooding will increase. The roads are already congested around Oxford and extensive roadwork's to the north have done little to improve the situation. Many bus routes have been discontinued, cycle lanes are in poor condition and the planned garden village at Eynsham will increase traffic and pollution. There is a lack of affordable houses within the proposals and it is likely that London commuters will buy the houses given the proximity of Oxford Parkway. It would be better to increase designated key worker houses within Oxford city. |
| PR-B-0646 | Ruth M         | Sargent |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the proposed building of 4,400 houses on GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington in additional to those in the Cherwell 2015 plan. There would be unacceptable destruction of GB with its walks, scenery and wildlife habitats. The ancient villages of Begbroke and Yarnton both mentioned in the Domesday Book, would lose their identities as they become one urban sprawl with Kidlington. Pressure will increase on local infrastructure including schools and GP surgeries, and there will be a greater risk of flooding. There will be little provision of affordable houses as we become a dormitory town for London commuters. Do not feel there was a proper consultation as residents were not informed of the plans by CDC.   |
| PR-B-0647 | Prof IL        | Sargent |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the proposed building of 4,400 houses on GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington in additional to those in the Cherwell 2015 plan. There would be unacceptable destruction of GB with its walks, scenery and wildlife habitats. The ancient villages of Begbroke and Yarnton both mentioned in the Domesday Book, would lose their identities as they become one urban sprawl with Kidlington. Pressure will increase on local infrastructure including schools and GP surgeries, and there will be a greater risk of flooding. There will be little provision of affordable houses as we become a dormitory town for London commuters. Do not feel there was a proper consultation as residents were not informed of the plans by CDC.   |
| PR-B-0648 | Patricia       | Perisi  |              | General      |                         |               | Have lived in Kidlington for nearly 80 years. Object strongly to the proposed development of 4400 new houses in the Green Belt. Green Belt should be protected forever. The development will destroy the countryside, wildlife, dog walking routes and will bring chaos to the area. Traffic is horrendous. Surgery is always full. Will never agree that Kidlington will join Oxford and lose it's unique character.   |
| PR-B-0651 | JL             | Hall    |              | General      |                         |               | Concerned over the proposed plans to build in Kidlington. It seems to be a far larger number than the infrastructure, schools, doctors and roads can cope with. My property borders one of the GB areas where there are two ponds, and the pond at Croxford Gardens when surveyed was found to contain great crested newts. An area such as this should be protected in line with the law.  |
| PR-B-0655 | Christina Mary | Shirley |              | General      |                         |               | Don't want urban sprawl and all it entails  |
| PR-B-0656 | Mary G         | Shirley |              | General      |                         |               | Villages should be kept as villages and not merged. We do not need more flooded areas, or more cars.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0658 | Susan           | Oldfield  |              | General      |                         |               | CDC already has a plan and pressure from Oxford City to alter this will destroy GB, a loss for Oxford and locals, desired by neither. CDC needs to resist pressure as South Oxfordshire has done. Object strongly to building around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke destroying their identities and the green space and GB around them. GB exists to protect villages from urban sprawl and provide space to breathe. Much of the land is agricultural and at Begbroke produces sustainable energy. The proposed figures are questionable and any housing is likely to be bought by London commuters anyway. Infrastructure is already struggling with congested roads and schools and health services at capacity. Flooding would increase. |
| PR-B-0659 | P K             | Cove      |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the plans to build houses on the GB around Begbroke and Yarnton. Oxford has over 4000 unoccupied properties and 2000 homes are already being built around us, therefore there is no justification to build on GB. This land is used by many for walks, history and enjoyment. The roads are already congested and health services stretched, CDC needs to attend to the needs of the existing communities first. Any development would create a dormitory town for London commuters using Oxford Parkway.  |
| PR-B-0660 | Denise          | Mckillop  |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the new proposed development around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington and building on GB which goes against CDC's 2015 policy. Informed that there are 4,400 empty properties in Oxford so there are no exceptional circumstances. Any building is unlikely to benefit the local community as new residents would probably be London commuters. The spirit and identity of Yarnton village and its history would be lost as it would become one urban sprawl joining Oxford and Woodstock. There are existing congestion and parking problems at Rutten Lane primary school with conflict between residents and drivers, the infrastructure cannot cope with any further increase in population. Medical services are also stretched. |
| PR-B-0663 | K D             | Liversage |              | General      |                         |               | Dismayed at the plans by CDC to promote the development of land around Kidlington, much of which is on GB. It would destroy the identity of the village as it would merge with Yarnton, Begbroke and Oxford and have adverse effects on services.  |
| PR-B-0664 | Maxine          | House     |              | General      |                         |               | Dismayed at the plans by CDC to promote the development of land around Kidlington, much of which is on GB. It would destroy the identity of the village as it would merge with Yarnton, Begbroke and Oxford and have adverse effects on services.  |
| PR-B-0665 | M               | Thorne    |              | General      |                         |               | Dismayed at the plans by CDC to promote the development of land around Kidlington, much of which is on GB. It would destroy the identity of the village as it would merge with Yarnton, Begbroke and Oxford and have adverse effects on services.  |
| PR-B-0666 | Ann             | Chandler  |              | General      |                         |               | Dismayed at the plans by CDC to promote the development of land around Kidlington, much of which is on GB. It would destroy the identity of the village as it would merge with Yarnton, Begbroke and Oxford and have adverse effects on services.  |
| PR-B-0667 | Mrs P           | Webb      |              | General      |                         |               | Dismayed at the plans by CDC to promote the development of land around Kidlington, much of which is on GB. It would destroy the identity of the village as it would merge with Yarnton, Begbroke and Oxford and have adverse effects on services.  |
| PR-B-0668 | BJ and W        | Bower     |              | General      |                         |               | Dismayed at the plans by CDC to promote the development of land around Kidlington, much of which is on GB. It would destroy the identity of the village as it would merge with Yarnton, Begbroke and Oxford and have adverse effects on services.  |
| PR-B-0669 | John and Marion | Dennis    |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the proposal to build so many new houses at Kidlington. Some of these new and disproportionately large developments appear to back close to the retirement properties in The Moors. This would mean a loss of habitat for wild deer and give a hemmed in appearance for the residents of Moorside Place.  |
| PR-B-0672 | Grace MM        | Kurn      |              | General      |                         |               | Dismayed at the plans by CDC to promote the development of land around Kidlington, much of which is on GB. It would destroy the identity of the village as it would merge with Yarnton, Begbroke and Oxford and have adverse effects on services.  |
| PR-B-0674 | Rita E          | Ahern     |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the plans to destroy the GB between Yarnton and Oxford, moved to Yarnton to enjoy the peace and beauty of the countryside. More time must be given to consider other options and consult on this, before losing this environmentally valuable area.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0675 | Elaine     | Titchmarsh |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the building of houses around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke to meet Oxford's needs. Don't believe there are exceptional circumstances to release GB on this scale, and thought CDC supported its protection. The disturbing and non-reversible loss of fields, plants and animals will deprive people of walks and nature. Parkland, golf courses and open land within the city should be considered for development and housing should take priority over building places of work. Chose to live in the village of Yarnton rather than an urban environment and the proposals will merge Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington into an urban sprawl losing their identities and character. More housing will put pressure on local infrastructure, health services and schools, local roads are already busy. Any development near Oxford Parkway is likely to attract London Commuters rather than Oxford city workers.   |
| PR-B-0676 | John F     | Morris     |              | General      |                         |               | The decision to hold the public exhibition in Kidlington was poorly timed and not easy to follow. There are so many sites and justification for the numbers was unclear.  |
| PR-B-0677 | Lesley E   | Sims       |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the way Kidlington is being treated by Oxford in their bid to expand enterprise without incurring costs, sharing benefits and with disregard for the GB. Building houses on GB close to Oxford Parkway brings in London commuters so will not provide affordable housing for Oxfordshire. It will only make money for landowners and developers. Investment in Park and Ride has reduced rural bus services, they should be sited further out to reduce congestion and serve the people who can't afford to live within the city. Oxford should consider using grants to relocate large employers to places like Bicester rather than turn villages into dormitories which is not acceptable. There is a need for affordable housing to the east of the city to serve the hospital, building on the GB in the Kidlington gap is on the wrong side of the city. Object to development around beautiful Spring Hill and on the valued walks between Mill End and Thrupp.  |
| PR-B-0677 | Lesley E   | Sims       |              | General      |                         |               | There was no consultation prior to the frantic scramble over Christmas for a closing date of 9th January. This does not promote trust in an open debate. CDC had its plan and Oxford City Council now appears to be putting pressure to help deliver while rejecting plans within its own boundaries.   |
| PR-B-0678 | Mrs H G    | Kibby      |              | General      |                         |               | The proposal to develop in GB is based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. Previously developed land and proposed employment sites within Oxford, along with brownfield sites like the cement works at Shipton should be considered. It is not reasonable to use GB that is there to protect villages and towns from sprawl. Traffic is already a problem on the A44, A34 and A4260 and congestion, noise and pollution which affects health, will increase. Is there a plan for extra infrastructure as schools and GP surgeries are only just coping. What type of housing is being proposed as there is a need for affordable and smaller housing. Would the many footpaths, used by many and with a right of way, be protected.  |
| PR-B-0682 | Felicity   | Peacock    |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and CDC should have raised awareness to the possible loss of GB. The consultation details were difficult to find on the website, were long and difficult to read, and holding the public exhibition over the Christmas period was unreasonable.   |
| PR-B-0683 | Robert     | Perry      |              | General      |                         |               | Object to 4,400 new houses being built around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke as they are in addition to those already planned by CDC to meet its own needs. It will destroy the GB around the villages which in 2015 CDC promised to uphold. Brownfield sites in Oxford need to be considered before GB. Flooding has already occurred in the three villages due to building on the flood plain. If development goes ahead will CDC and developers be prepared to compensate new and existing homeowners in the event of flooding. Full consideration needs to be given to the amount of infrastructure required i.e. schools and health services which would not cope. The development is unlikely to solve housing needs as they would be bought by London commuters. This will inevitably cause more traffic problems on the A34, and A40. Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke will lose their identities, ancient points of interest and history as well as walks and scenery. |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0684 | Rosemary A    | Phelps  |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to building 4,400 houses in Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. It would be unforgivable to destroy GB which is necessary to prevent urban sprawl and protect wildlife already in decline. It would remove forever a space to have exercise, fresh air, peace and pleasure. Each village has an identity and history which would be lost. Traffic is already heavy and schools and doctors surgeries at capacity. In wet weather water pours down Spring Hill resulting in flooding near the roundabout which would get worse.   |
| PR-B-0685 | Peter G       | Phelps  |              | General      |                         |               | Completely opposed to the infringement of the GB around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke and Oxford City's pressure. It seems that local politics and vested interests are the predominant factors. What has happened to the government's plan to expand and develop the North of England?   |
| PR-B-0686 | Chris H       | Adams   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposals to build 4,400 houses on various sites around Kidlington. Am concerned that there is no mention of the harm to the purposes of GB and that it is a permanent designation. There is no assessment of the impact on Kidlington only Cherwell and Oxford. Traffic congestion and air pollution would increase.  |
| PR-B-0688 | Barbara       | Perry   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to 4,400 new houses being built around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke as they are in addition to those already planned by CDC to meet its own needs. It will destroy the GB around the villages which in 2015 CDC promised to uphold. Brownfield sites in Oxford need to be considered before GB. Flooding has already occurred in the three villages due to building on the flood plain. If development goes ahead will CDC and developers be prepared to compensate new and existing homeowners in the event of flooding. Full consideration needs to be given to the amount of infrastructure required i.e. schools and health services which would not cope. The development is unlikely to solve housing needs as they would be bought by London commuters. This will inevitably cause more traffic problems on the A34, and A40. Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke will lose their identities, ancient points of interest and history as well as walks, and scenery. |
| PR-B-0689 | Bernard E     | Braley  |              | General      |                         |               | It is morally wrong and contrary to government policy to build on GB in Kidlington. The development will be unsustainable unless great care is taken in the planning of roads, schools, health services, water and power. The development which presently threatens the character of Kidlington should not take place.   |
| PR-B-0695 | Mark          | Bale    |              | General      |                         |               | It is widely recognised that the south of England, particularly the Thames Valley is extremely crowded and the traffic heavy. Therefore object to the massive scale of the proposed development.   |
| PR-B-0699 | Andrew        | Clark   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the any further development in North Oxford particularly around Yarnton. The infrastructure isn't sufficient to cope with an increase in traffic, even with recent renovations to Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts. Much of the predicted job growth is in the south more traffic travelling north to south will increase pollution and decrease safety. GB is meant to be protected, it allows wildlife to thrive and move, and stops urban sprawl so villages don't lose their identity. The government should look at brownfield sites as they are doing elsewhere in the country.   |
| PR-B-0701 | Ray and Janet | Phipps  |              | General      |                         |               | Already lost large portion of parish to Longford Park and 2 further approved developments at Blossom Fields. Bodicote already had its quota of housing, therefore should not be expected to satisfy Oxford's unmet housing needs. Existing developments need time to establish, and the communities cohesion is important and is threatened by continual new developments.   |
| PR-B-0702 | Nigel         | Clark   |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the proposed 4,400 new houses in North Oxford in particular to the existing GB land around Yarnton. Oxford housing targets are based on speculation and discredited analysis. City Council need to look at existing areas and vacant properties within the City.  |
| PR-B-0702 | Nigel         | Clark   |              | General      |                         |               | More houses would increased the number of cars onto the already congested roads around North Oxford. It takes me up to an hour to get to Oxford when using my car. Cycling is dangerous on these roads, have been knocked off bicycle, which ended up with a trip to A and E. More traffic increases danger on our roads and adds to air pollution.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname     | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|-------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0702 | Nigel          | Clark       |   | General      |                         |               | This area and other areas in North Oxford should be protected, as this is not exceptional circumstances to assume that housing is needed. Empty houses in Oxfordshire need to be used first. Job growth in Oxfordshire, if this is the case, the jobs need to go to people in the area so that they do not move away, other wise the houses will be brought by commuters. Removal of GB is wholly not acceptable and provides no benefits. It's CDC policy and duty to protect the GB.  |
| PR-B-0704 | J              | Kershaw     | Wright Hassall Solicitors LLP on behalf of Mr J Kershaw | General      |                         |               | Criticism of the consultation period. It was not advertised well enough at the start. Kidlington exhibition did not take place until 19 December which was very late in the day and left insufficient time to respond with sufficient detail.   |
| PR-B-0707 | Susan          | Blackshaw   |   | General      |                         |               | Objection to the proposal for large scale of housing. Concerned for Begbroke, Yarnton and the Kidlington area. Would all agree that affordable housing is need, the numbers being considered would blast this area so greatly, that it will be turned into a metropolis [sic]. Contest statements about job and economy growth. Oppose the plan, as it adds extra pressure on already overstretched local infrastructure, schools and health services. Congestion sprawl, which could end up servicing London's housing needs. Gross affectation of the rural countryside and the loss of GB.     |
| PR-B-0708 | Robin Stafford | Allen       |   | General      |                         |               | Long time resident of Weston on the Green, views on the development sites around Weston, Wendlebury and Heathfield. Housing needs to be affordable and located where employment is a priority. Oxford is an historic city, which attracts tourists and brings in revenue. The development in green areas will detract from the city. Good planning to preserve villages identity like Weston which is close to the city as detailed in the Neighbourhood Plan which was submitted to CDC.   |
| PR-B-0708 | Robin Stafford | Allen       |   | General      |                         |               | In particular large developments on the edge of villages will destroy their individual character. There is a requirement for appropriate infrastructure; transport, medical facilities, schools, Weston on the Green has none of these. Traffic in and around Oxford is an issue, as the roads into Oxford are already overcrowded. Weston on the Green is used as a "rat run" due to daily traffic issues on the A34 and M40. Development will increase the traffic on the B430 and between Weston and Bletchingdon.   |
| PR-B-0709 | Dr E J         | Williamson  |   | General      |                         |               | It seems that most of the 4,400 homes that Cherwell has been asked to provide are proposed to be built on the GB between Oxford and Kidlington. The GB was set up to prevent the urban sprawl of Oxford City and protect the smaller out - lying communities from being absorbed in to the city. The GB is protected by law and can only be released in 'exceptional circumstances'. Do not regard this as an exceptional circumstance.   |
| PR-B-0709 | Dr E J         | Williamson  |   | General      |                         |               | Kidlington has been chosen as being near to Oxford. However, since the new Oxford Parkway station opened house prices in North Oxford and Kidlington have soared. Oxford wants 'affordable housing'. With easy access to London new houses will be sought by London commuters as well as people who work in Oxford. 4,400 houses would nearly double the size of Kidlington. This will put an enormous strain on schools, health services, and transport.   |
| PR-B-0722 | A              | Mayes-Baker |   | General      |                         |               | The number of new homes proposed is disproportionate with the existing number in Kidlington. Such development would change the character and community. The impact on surrounding and smaller village communities presents rape of the GB. GB supposed to be protected against over-urbanisation and coalescence. If permitted CDC are in breach of their own policies. Adverse effects to surface water and flooding. If required to support employment growth in Oxford City, who has control to keep it local. Do not build on the North of the city were infrastructure is already saturated. |
| PR-B-0725 | Andrew         | Cove        |   | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to build houses around Begbroke and Yarnton. The land is GB used and enjoyed by locals who live and have moved to this area to enjoy the environment and discover the ancient history. This will be lost forever and become part of the urban sprawl and a suburb to Oxford, it is not acceptable.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0728 | Verity           | Westgate |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more. Difficult to find the consultation details and the paperwork is long and challenging. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-0731 | Ioana            | Davies   |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism on the timing and poor publicity especially Kidlington's before the Christmas period. The Cherwell Link magazine provided a cursory mention of the proposals. Criticism on how the local plan was written and if you do not have the internet it's hard to access the information, preventing all of the community being involved.   |
| PR-B-0732 | Tony             | Lowe     |              | General      |                         |               | Studied potential sites in and around Deddington, only estimate this number to be 1,500+. Who will purchase these and where will they come from, certainly not young local families? How will the primary school and health centre cope with the increased population? Strain on the infrastructure, roads, parking etc. Tip of the iceberg, other areas alongside Hempton Road being potential.   |
| PR-B-0734 | David A          | Homer    |              | General      |                         |               | Residents for 34 years in Begbroke, chose to live here for its peace and quiet. The GB needs to be retained as villages need their own identity to prevent urban sprawl and to protect the rural way of life. Roads leading into Oxford would become congested effecting the local communities like Begbroke and Yarnton. Adding 4,400 houses increase cars on the road, this is not allowed to happen. Developers will promise new schools and doctors surgeries. Do not allow Oxford City dictate to CDC where to build. |
| PR-B-0736 | Kieran           | Ward     |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism on the timing and poorly publicised consultations, especially Kidlington's before Christmas. The Cherwell Link magazine hid the information and didn't provide the scale of the proposal's. Appalling that CDC think it can push through the consultation in such a rapid timescale.   |
| PR-B-0737 | Paul             | Clarke   |              | General      |                         |               | In general do not agree with the disproportionate proposal outside of Oxford. The "Oxford Context" doesn't provide an explanation to why the City has a small contribution and placing a burden on rural areas of Oxfordshire. Has Oxford considered flats and identified sites as part of their development, an example of which is Abbey Road. Oxford City needs to press for smaller, affordable housing and take on a greater proportion of the required development   |
| PR-B-0738 | Martin           | Smail    |              | General      |                         |               | Highly concerned Cherwell being asked to consider more housing, after already catering for 22,840 on the Local Plan. Banbury's existing infrastructure unable to cope, Oxfords unmet need should be considered elsewhere.  |
| PR-B-0739 | G                | Gelder   |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more. Difficult to find the consultation details and the paperwork is long and challenging. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-0741 | Jane             | Jackson  |              | General      |                         |               | Objections to large number of houses considered in Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Congestion already on the roads. The villages would change, losing their historic character and identity by becoming a suburb of Oxford. Great loss and damage to the countryside. Added pressure on schools and the health service. Area can not cope, please do not build near Begbroke.  |
| PR-B-0742 | Keith and Hilary | Prince   |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism on the presentation of the proposals. A very lengthy document that was hard to interpret within the consultation timeframe which was over the Christmas period was totally unreasonable.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname     | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0744 | Geoff         | Herbert     |              | General      |                         |               | Additional housing will mean more cars using the roads without any modifications to existing roads. Concerns regarding cheap housing and landlords buying these. Problems currently in Oxford are: Overcrowding, parking issues due to the lack of control on houses of multiple occupation. Poor levels of maintenance to the houses which lead to whole areas looking run down. Will there be any limits on allowing H.M.O's in any of the new housing? Will any of the new housing be dedicated for older residents, or social housing? Will schools and health services be able to cope with the increased capacity. Business need to locate northwards where already large number of houses built that are unoccupied.   |
| PR-B-0747 | George A      | Doucas      |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. All the roads around Oxford are already congested. Infrastructure development must come before any building. |
| PR-B-0748 | Marcus        | Bunning     |              | General      |                         |               | Objections to the proposal, concerns with extra traffic on the already existing roads. Lack of infrastructure. Schools not having enough space and becoming overstretched. A shortage of doctors and appointments. Urban sprawl.  |
| PR-B-0750 | Niels         | van Kuijk   |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should of done more. Difficult to find the consultation details and the paperwork is long and challenging. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.   |
| PR-B-0752 | Keeley        | Middleditch |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that CDC should have done more. Difficult to find the consultation details and the paperwork is long and challenging. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-0753 | Laura         | Claridge    |              | General      |                         |               | Long time resident of Yarnton and strongly object to the building of 4,400 homes in the Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington area. Already dire traffic in Oxfordshire namely around Peartree and Kidlington roundabout. Long waiting times for a appointments with doctors. Schools can not cope as it is as seen with the Cresswell Close and Hayday Close developments. These issues need to be resolved before any consideration into building 4,400 houses. Keep Yarnton and Begbroke the small and peaceful villages as they have always been.  |
| PR-B-0754 | Philippa Jane | Nelson      |              | General      |                         |               | Consultation papers difficult to find and the documentation is very long and difficult. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-0757 | Martin        | Palmer      |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding the poorly advertised proposals along with the timeline of lodging the objections not being ideal as over the Christmas period.   |
| PR-B-0760 | Dr K N        | Robinson    |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding the documents and the consultation held in Cutteslowe Park in December. Support a carefully planned and diffused housing development across Cherwell, however do not support the partial review.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname    | Organisation    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0760 | Dr K N           | Robinson   |                 | General      |                         |               | Unmet housing figure is based on far too many assumptions regarding strong economic growth due to decision to leave the EU, the figure needs to be reduced. Suggestions that increased housing will be due to increased employment, not the approach to be taken. Affordable housing needs to be clarified due to the prevailing housing market in Oxford. New homes occupied by London commuters. No restriction to the dwellings per site, as higher development may be desired in other areas. Unacceptable to build on GB, brownfield sites within Oxford City require utilisation first. Concerns to flooding risk. Kidlington will come under strain, roads at capacity, rail link does not serve employment areas. Explanation to these areas needed. |
| PR-B-0761 | Nick             | Trendell   |                 | General      |                         |               | The whole area will become yet another "estate" and have not moved to the area to suffer this. Schools etc. will not be able to cope.  |
| PR-B-0763 | Giles and Rachel | Woodforde  |                 | General      |                         |               | A total ban on further housing in Kidlington is reasonable. Smaller infill sites could be designed with not having a significant impact on the GB. The necessary additions to transport and support services which needn't be prohibitively expensive. Proportionate development of this sort could be positive for local shops. However attempts by Oxford City to build over the GB separating Oxford and Kidlington should be resisted. Do not want to become a suburb like Headington, like to be separate.  |
| PR-B-0763 | Giles and Rachel | Woodforde  |                 | General      |                         |               | Refers to current proposals and the earlier Kidlington development plan prepared by Alan Baxter Associates. A site north of The Moors is listed in the current proposal but not ruled out in the Alan Baxter document. In general CDC seriously failing with its obligations to Kidlington's council taxpayers, over this matter as to not questioning Oxford's demands over this matter.  |
| PR-B-0766 |                  | Hutchinson |                 | General      |                         |               | Kidlington does not have the infrastructure to cope with extra houses, people and cars. Still waiting for shops and a new school that was promised with the building of Groveland's. Struggle even now with doctors, schools etc. 4,400 new houses means the same amount of extra cars on the roads. Has anyone from the council tried to get to work, school or the hospital on the A34 in the rush hour, or when there are road works or an accident?  |
| PR-B-0767 | Sian             | Robbins    | Kilner Planning | General      |                         |               | Objection to build up to 4,400 new dwellings on the GB and land in and around Kidlington. GB north of Oxford a valuable function over the last 50 years. GB put in place to prevent urban sprawl and the coalescence of settlements. These objectives continue to be valid, there is no justification to set them aside. The area is well used and valued by residents in Oxford and surrounding villages. It would be deeply damaging to merge Kidlington and Oxford into one large urban sprawl and to lose the attractive local landscape and valuable wildlife and local habitats.   |
| PR-B-0767 | Sian             | Robbins    | Kilner Planning | General      |                         |               | Infrastructure and services in and around Oxford already under great strain and beyond capacity. Along with schools, healthcare, hospitals and roads. No capacity for this development and the proposed developments are unacceptable.   |
| PR-B-0768 | Jane             | Leech      |                 | General      |                         |               | Objections to development of GB affecting Kidlington, Yarnton, Begbroke, Bladon and Woodstock. Creation of huge urbanisation of these villages, which would merge into one and lose their village identities which have existed for hundreds of years. GB is there to prevent this scenario. GB should be preserved and not eroded, to protect the beautiful and historic City of Oxford. Developments will destroy the countryside forever.   |
| PR-B-0768 | Jane             | Leech      |                 | General      |                         |               | Concerns with severely congested roads into Oxford and the proposed link road from the A40 to A34 may help with the A40 congestion but moves the problem to Yarnton and Kidlington. Increased number of cars on the roads is madness. Concerns over the air quality in Oxford during the summer months, this should not be exacerbated, people's health will be adversely affected.  |
| PR-B-0768 | Jane             | Leech      |                 | General      |                         |               | Local services will be stretched beyond their original capacity. GP surgeries would not be able to cope with the extra residents. They are already overstretched, and how the John Radcliffe, and the Churchill will cope is questionable.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0771 | Mr G R and Mrs J E | Thompson |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to building 4,400 houses in Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton areas. Criticism regarding the notice given for the meeting in Kidlington. Concerns to increased doctor waiting times and that Kidlington only has one dentist. Manic roads around Kidlington at school times and already a badly maintained infrastructure. Schools not being able to cope with extra children. Survey in the past shows, if all the house that are not lived in were repaired then there's no need for new houses to be built. Why should Oxford be able to say that Kidlington have to have the over spill here. We don't want to be a town as this will mean more expense for the local government to spend on the unnecessary expense of having this when it could be spent on better infrastructure. |
| PR-B-0772 | Roger              | Howes    |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the proposal. Kidlington is a village, consideration needs to be taken with proposals to keep it in line as a village and not a town. The figure needs to be remodelled as it was calculated when in the EU. The decision to build these houses was made some time ago without the consent of Kidlington's residents. Building on the Co-op car park is crazy if the proposals go through.   |
| PR-B-0772 | Roger              | Howes    |              | General      |                         |               | No requirement for industry in Oxford and Kidlington. Building on Peartree Park and Ride is not required, this would attract people to come looking for housing. If built upon it would push the Park and Ride further with the City boundary moving. Always was sceptical about the reasons for calling Kidlington railway station "Oxford Parkway" and Kidlington Airport "Oxford, London Airport" now know why, boundary changes.  |
| PR-B-0772 | Roger              | Howes    |              | General      |                         |               | The A40 is already at full capacity, with unfortunate fatal and large accidents. Traffic congestion and queues are normal. Many people leave the A34 southbound into Kidlington. Issues with the rush hour traffic into Oxford even with the new Banbury Road roundabout. Difficult to get to the JR2 now, will be worse with new housing at Barton. Increased pollution with the amount of standing traffic. Parking is a premium in Kidlington  |
| PR-B-0772 | Roger              | Howes    |              | General      |                         |               | Extra strain on hospitals, doctors, schools etc. No places in Kidlington for more dental patients. Kidlington residents have the right to quality of life, this needs to be considered with the proposed monumental change to our lives.  |
| PR-B-0772 | Roger              | Howes    |              | General      |                         |               | Already built 1,000's of houses on the GB which is there to prevent urban sprawl, GB land is used for relaxing walks as no parks. Houses are required for the young but not on this scale. The charm and beauty of these towns is being destroyed creating traffic congestion and over population. The meeting at Exeter Hall showed the residents of Kidlington's concerns. Building this amount of "not needed" housing is something that is irreversible and will have long lasting effects on our village its people and that of the surrounding villages.  |
| PR-B-0773 | Annabelle          | Cummings |              | General      |                         |               | Objections to building 4,400 houses around Begbroke. GB land needs to be preserved, it's vital for the environment, bio-diversity and the well-being of people. Begbroke is a small village, if the building goes ahead it will become a small town and lose its unique character. Parts of this village are very old and have historic significance. Flooding is a concern with Rowel Brook and Springhill Road building in these areas will make the situation worse. Roads are already busy and building these houses will overload these roads. Schools and doctor surgeries are already overstretched.   |
| PR-B-0775 | Yasmin             | Ramzan   |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to building of 4,400 houses in Kidlington. We have lived here for 14 years and have seen how much the village has already changed and grown in that time. Building these houses at Kidlington we will have further issues and the character of the village will be lost forever. Traffic will only get worse, sacrificing our countryside and walks will have a detrimental effect on the nature and wildlife in the area.  |
| PR-B-0776 | Anthony            | East     |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism on how the consultation has been published. Difficult to find the consultation details on line. The consultation papers are long and difficult. Council does have discretion on the timing of a public consultation. Choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname   | Organisation                    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0777 | Mark            | Longworth | Ambrosden Parish Council        | General      |                         |               | The development capacity of St David's Barracks and the MOD staff housing at Ambrosden, totalling 270 houses, should be taken into consideration in producing local plan review as this land and existing houses will become available for development within the timescale of the local plan up to 2031.  |
| PR-B-0778 | Alan            | Brown     |                                 | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website difficult to navigate. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and over the Christmas period is not reasonable along with the length of time given to respond.  |
| PR-B-0780 | Paula           | Hastings  |                                 | General      |                         |               | Views regarding the development on GB around Begbroke, Yarnton, Kidlington and Woodstock. Countryside already given up, the Government is pushing for the use of GB land. GB policy for controlling urban growth also preventing urban sprawl and keeping land permanently open. This proposal is clearly going against this. Health and wellbeing of the population its important to keeping green open spaces available. Increasing urbanisation on green belts there will be more pressure on Oxford City to protect its conservation areas. Local wildlife and their habitats will be lost, they are being pushed into smaller areas. No consideration to field boundaries and hedgerows which are essential for the protected species like the door mice. |
| PR-B-0780 | Paula           | Hastings  |                                 | General      |                         |               | Development will merge Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington into one MASSIVE development, causing MAJOR strain on the local services, schools and healthcare. Local roads will basically be at standstill during rush hours and public transport will struggle to cope. Local GPs are already struggling to cope with the demand around here which will cause more problems. Concerns regarding parking which is also a problem when going to the local shops etc. 4,400 new homes with a minimum of one car at each will cause the surrounding areas to be affected also. Villages will lose their character and identity becoming one big complex which is a great shame.  |
| PR-B-0781 | Lindsay         | Gregory   |                                 | General      |                         |               | Overriding your own local plan with reference to GB, who benefits from building on GB. Added pressure to schools and health services who are struggling now. Roads currently can not cope, they will become gridlock from 06:30. What about the clean air carbon footprint policy. Lose our character and become one urban sprawl with the joining of Oxford to Woodstock. Cherwell has to throw out these plans.  |
| PR-B-0782 | Andrew and Emma | Mundy     |                                 | General      |                         |               | CDC has agreed to protect the GB, this policy completely defies your promise. Roads around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke overused already at peak times , increasing houses would make the situation intolerable. Love my rural setting, building these houses would lose our village identities forever. Schools, doctors and dentists already overstretched adding to this would be chaotic.  |
| PR-B-0784 | Rosie           | Cotterill | Turley on behalf of Bovis Homes | General      |                         |               | Overall it is considered that at a strategic level the unmet need of Oxford City (22,000 homes) is not being fully met, and even the level identified to be provided (15,000) will not be met as the apportionment has not been agreed by all parties within the HMA. The level of housing to be provided in Cherwell is therefore not considered to be sufficient and additional housing should be provided. Alternatively a mechanism should be put in place within the Plan to allow for it to be reviewed should additional housing needs in the HMA be identified.  |
| PR-B-0784 | Rosie           | Cotterill | Turley on behalf of Bovis Homes | General      |                         |               | With regard to the growth location 'options' it would appear that the Council have already selected their preferred options based predominantly on two interim evidence base documents. The Council should not preclude the findings of their own future evidence base and assessment work in determining the best locations for growth. The Council should first look to allocate non-GB sites over GB sites and should not overlook the requirement for 'exceptional circumstances' to be demonstrated in order for GB boundaries to be revised  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation                    | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0784 | Rosie            | Cotterill | Turley on behalf of Bovis Homes | General      |                         |               | A holistic approach to identifying suitable growth locations should be taken, considering both the sustainability and suitability of the proposed locations to accommodate growth in accordance with the Council's own spatial strategy, as well as impacts on GB and harm associated with locating large scale growth within it.   |
| PR-B-0784 | Rosie            | Cotterill | Turley on behalf of Bovis Homes | General      |                         |               | The Council should reconsider the opportunities to locate additional growth in Banbury. A location which is proven to be sustainable through the Council's own spatial strategy and a location which is well connected to Oxford via public transport.  |
| PR-B-0784 | Rosie            | Cotterill | Turley on behalf of Bovis Homes | General      |                         |               | The Council should ensure that they incorporate any housing requirement numbers for Oxford in to their overall requirements and should not 'ring fence' Oxford's numbers for the purpose of calculating 5 year housing land supply. The Council should also ensure that the monitoring of housing land supply commences at the point of adoption of the Plan. The LPPR will not be found 'sound' if the Council are unable to demonstrate a 5 year supply of housing land at the point of adoption.   |
| PR-B-0792 | Christine        | Lea       |                                 | General      |                         |               | 4,400 houses north of Oxford is totally unsustainable. City needs this due to future employment growth, how do we know that this will happen? North of the city is already congested, proposed Northern Gateway will seriously exacerbate this. Extra traffic would create more air pollution, journey times would increase with the building of these new homes. Additional demands on the infrastructure. GB sacrificed and countryside lost resulting in habitats being destroyed. Appropriate site with good transport links is the area south of Oxford Parkway station.         |
| PR-B-0795 | David and Sonia  | Simmons   |                                 | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding confusion of the dates for the submission, it is too short a time for a response to this mater.   |
| PR-B-0795 | David and Sonia  | Simmons   |                                 | General      |                         |               | GB designed to stop urban sprawl, development would spoil the essence of the villages and surrounding countryside. Population increases the land will be lost, how do we feed the extra population. Extra demand on schools and health care. Extinction of wildlife and increased air pollution. Flooding is overlooked and building on ancient flood plans causes problems further a field, like Botley. Traffic and transport would increase , which is already overloaded. Money to be made should be by local authority. City need to look inside their town and not other areas. |
| PR-B-0799 | Ian              | Sheppard  |                                 | General      |                         |               | Very poor consultation and notice to the local areas effected   |
| PR-B-0801 | Janet            | Stott     |                                 | General      |                         |               | Concerns at the poor level of consultation with Cutteslowe residents prior to the plans being developed. Object to the form of this consultation, extremely unfriendly to canvassing the views of the average homeowner, favouring developers. Sad to see the character of the area change irreversibly.  |
| PR-B-0803 | Andy             | Carey     |                                 | General      |                         |               | Support housing. Oxford City and its environs is the least affordable region of the UK based on cost of housing divided by local incomes. So more housing is needed, and it would be great if height restrictions could be liberalised too.   |
| PR-B-0804 | Barrie and Linda | Teasdale  |                                 | General      |                         |               | Criticism of the failure to engage with the residents of Water Eaton Lane, there was no public advertising in the local press or leaflet drops. Extremely concerned about the manner of the process. This was exacerbated at a recent public meeting attended by both CDC councillors and executive from the planning department. It was made clear that the agreement by CDC to accept 4,400 dwellings in Cherwell was not likely to be changed, and that comments could only be made over the suggested locations of these dwellings.   |
| PR-B-0804 | Barrie and Linda | Teasdale  |                                 | General      |                         |               | The dwellings are to meet Oxford's housing need of which only 550 have been agreed. The closure of Peartree Park and Ride would free land that could be used for housing as the impact on GB is minimal. The proposed sites are on GB land between Cutteslowe, Oxford Parkway Park and Ride site development would join Oxford with Gosford, Water Eaton, and Kidlington to form one larger conurbation.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0804 | Barrie and Linda | Teasdale  |              | General      |                         |               | The requirement is to accommodate workers in Oxford. Oxford has tried to develop land adjacent to Grenoble Road but has been refused by SODC. This is a sensible site as close to hospitals and science park but its GB land. If housing is provided in Kidlington this will exacerbate road and public transport problems.   |
| PR-B-0805 | Tamara           | Frishberg |              | General      |                         |               | Little public notification of the consultation. The period of response was inconvenient. The consultation documents were very overwhelming  |
| PR-B-0810 | Jane E           | Curran    |              | General      |                         |               | Disapprove most vehemently of the 4,400 dwellings being built between Cutteslowe Park and Kidlington. There is no actual need for such development. The developments would be brought by people moving out of London but still travelling to work there. GB land to stop urban sprawl and provides a lung for towns. Damage to the environment will be enormous and irreversible.   |
| PR-B-0810 | Jane E           | Curran    |              | General      |                         |               | Cutteslowe Park will be utterly spoilt, it is a great amenity for people living in the already crowded areas of Summertown, Sunnymead and Cuttleslowe, to exercise and enjoy nature in quiet.   |
| PR-B-0810 | Jane E           | Curran    |              | General      |                         |               | Traffic congestion would increase. Already Bicester, Kidlington and Witney roads towards the Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts are already blocked at peak hours, this would only exacerbate the problem. Oxford Parkway has added to the difficulties. May I also remind you of the Northern Gateway plan, and the increases in housing being suggested for Eynsham and Woodstock. Increase to air and noise pollution which are already high in the area.   |
| PR-B-0811 | Laurence         | Carey     |              | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to the proposal of building 57 houses on land east of South Lane. Development would have a disastrous effect on the landscape. Proposed access is on a narrow road. The land borders onto the South Newington Conservation Area. The land will affect the setting of a listed building "The Deans" (formerly known as the "Dun Cow") in Moor Lane. No shop, no school or medical facilities. School and medical facilities in nearby villages are already overstretched. Negative impact on the quality and character of a much valued rural village. |
| PR-B-0812 | Tim              | Stott     |              | General      |                         |               | Attended consultation in Cutteslowe Park, spoke to a very helpful council officer who explained the proposed plans. Do have concerns about these proposals.   |
| PR-B-0812 | Tim              | Stott     |              | General      |                         |               | Concerns at the poor level of consultation with Cutteslowe residents prior to the plans being developed. Object to the form of this consultation, extremely unfriendly to canvassing the views of the average homeowner, favouring developers. Sad to see the character of the area change irreversibly.  |
| PR-B-0814 | Andrew           | Evans     |              | General      |                         |               | Points raised highlighting why the addition of large quantity of houses to Sibford Ferris would not be appropriate. Within the parish there are no state schools. There is a post office and general store which is incredibly small, no room to expand and cope with increase of footfall. There is no supermarket or doctors surgery, this is shared with other parishes.   |
| PR-B-0814 | Andrew           | Evans     |              | General      |                         |               | The roads through the villages are congested, with several pinch points caused by increased on-street parking. Homes on the land west of the Hook Norton road would put the village between the 100+ new homes and Banbury where the nearest rail station is located and also the nearest major motorway junction. Believes the road through the village would be unable to cope with the expected volume of traffic during peak hours.   |
| PR-B-0814 | Andrew           | Evans     |              | General      |                         |               | Limited number of pedestrian pavements, impossible to walk to the post office without walking on the road. Current traffic conditions already make this a risky endeavour, a significant increase in traffic through the village would simply make it unsafe. Buses to Oxford are not sufficient for commuting to work for normal working hours.  |
| PR-B-0815 | Daniel           | Whitley   |              | General      |                         |               | Support for some proposed building around the Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington area. Local area in dire need of extra housing.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0815 | Daniel           | Whitley |              | General      |                         |               | Local area is in dire need of extra housing, building extra houses near to Oxford is a key strategy. Oxford is facing increasing problems with recruiting teachers, medical staff and many other vital careers. Building additional housing stock near the demand points would both minimise infrastructure costs and maximise capacity of the existing infrastructure. This is the key reason why I support building in the Yarnton/Begbroke/Kidlington area as opposed to proposed sites further north within Cherwell's territory. |
| PR-B-0815 | Daniel           | Whitley |              | General      |                         |               | Additional development increases the perception of urban sprawl. No housing constructed on land south of Yarnton and Kidlington. Concerns regarding flooding. Planning Policy Team to consider raising any potential percentage of Affordable Housing within any new development within Cherwell. Supply of Affordable Housing is vital to Oxfordshire's growing economy and to keep the vital public services running as smoothly and efficiently as we are currently used to.   |
| PR-B-0816 | Lynne            | Whitley |              | General      |                         |               | Write in support of Yarnton PC response which has been submitted to CDC. The response references the respective planning policies in force which are there specifically to prevent the sort of encroachment and abuse of the GB which this government has said it will protect:   |
| PR-B-0816 | Lynne            | Whitley |              | General      |                         |               | This rep has quoted polices ESD 14 and ESD13. Exceptional circumstances to allow development in the GB cannot be demonstrated. Infrastructure will also be inadequate as roads are already clogged at peak times. Reconsider where you put these houses along with the number.  |
| PR-B-0821 | Alan and Suzanne | Mclvor  |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism of the failure to engage with the residents of Wolvercote Ward reference to the exhibition held in Cutteslowe Park. Consultation not easy to respond to. A mass of documents online that are full of jargon.  |
| PR-B-0822 | Nikki            | Lewis   |              | General      |                         |               | This rep provides a detailed objection to development in the GB. The arguments made are based around the purposes of the GB as set out in the NPPF.   |
| PR-B-0822 | Nikki            | Lewis   |              | General      |                         |               | Yarnton has 5,000 years of history including a historic manor house, church and a history society devoted to learning more about the area. Begbroke is mentioned in the Domesday Book, and its historic centre, with its Norman church is a conservation area and is overlooked by an Iron Age fort. Erosion of the GB, Oxford will become like any other sprawling industrial city with none of the character and ancient, historical settings.  |
| PR-B-0822 | Nikki            | Lewis   |              | General      |                         |               | The Framework encourages the recycling of derelict and other urban land. There are plenty of brownfield sites available not our GB. 4,400 vacant homes in Oxfordshire, including 55 in Oxford itself. Oxfordshire is the South East's most rural county so let's help it to stay that way.  |
| PR-B-0822 | Nikki            | Lewis   |              | General      |                         |               | If the plans go ahead then more pressure on local infrastructure. Local roads regularly jammed, schools oversubscribed and health services that are struggling. Getting a doctors appointment in either Woodstock or Yarnton can take weeks.  |
| PR-B-0822 | Nikki            | Lewis   |              | General      |                         |               | These housing targets are built on aspirations, not 'unmet needs'. The houses will be brought by people who work in London, not Oxford, people who are exploiting Oxford Parkway station. Overcrowding of trains to Marylebone every morning. Reality we will become one big, expensive dormitory town for London commuters using the new Oxford Parkway station.   |
| PR-B-0822 | Nikki            | Lewis   |              | General      |                         |               | Cherwell District Council planning department has always been rigorous with planning applications that might damage the GB and rightly so. Have always respected that rigour and felt that our countryside is safe in your hands. A feature of the GB policy after all is its permanence. Your own local plan published in 2015 was sensitive to the Green Belt, so know it's important to you too, because it's important to the residents you serve. Please do not let us down now at this crucial time.                            |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0824 | Judith     | Skipp      |              | General      |                         |               | As a resident of Begbroke wish to object the partial review to meet Oxford City's unmet housing need. Know there is a need in Oxfordshire for affordable housing and in Oxford City's case social housing. However concerns regarding the areas submitted in the current consultation documents. Areas of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke would lose their individual identities, merging into each other. Walking to Spring Hill enjoying the 360 degree views across Oxford, Cassington, Bladon and beyond. The areas shown on the consultation map encroach into this historic and beautiful space, which also includes part of the long distance walk The Shakespeare Way.  |
| PR-B-0824 | Judith     | Skipp      |              | General      |                         |               | Building in such large numbers in the area would put enormous pressures on the local health practices of all three villages, which are already under intense pressures. Not to mention the primary schools and the 2 secondary schools into which these feed. Disappointment for some villagers who have siblings can no longer gain places at Woodstock Primary School, which had been guaranteed a place in the 40+ years that I have lived here. Public transport has been provided, those no longer able to gain entry have to be taken independently putting strain on the parents lives.   |
| PR-B-0824 | Judith     | Skipp      |              | General      |                         |               | Traffic is another major problem when trying to access Oxford. Excellent Park and Ride facilities at Peartree and Water Eaton, not unusual to sit for considerable time in queues to use these facilities. What infrastructure will be put into place prior to any additional house building?  |
| PR-B-0824 | Judith     | Skipp      |              | General      |                         |               | Not addressed the destruction of GB in the area. Understand both the Government and CDC have both recently given a commitment to preserving this. Also understand that exceptional circumstances have to be displayed to allow house building on such designated land. Are there no other areas outside of the GB. Has it been definitely proven that this need for additional housing in such vast numbers really exists.   |
| PR-B-0824 | Judith     | Skipp      |              | General      |                         |               | Opening of the Oxford Parkway Station results in people from London seeking to live in a more rural setting and commute to work. In summary please look carefully at the proposals and seriously consider the concerns of the many local residents.  |
| PR-B-0827 | Paul       | Staniforth |              | General      |                         |               | Travel into Oxford on the A44 via Peartree roundabout is already a nightmare during rush hours. There is periodically a death of someone trying to cross the busy A44 at Begbroke.   |
| PR-B-0834 | Eleanor    | Williamson |              | General      |                         |               | Vehemently oppose the plan to site 4,400 new homes around Kidlington – on GB land on behalf of Oxford City. Kidlington would nearly double in size. Its village identity, character and amenity would be irretrievably destroyed.  |
| PR-B-0834 | Eleanor    | Williamson |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism about the conduct of this consultation. GB minimally publicised, Cherwell should have done more. Kidlington's exhibition was held very late in the same week as Christmas. Kidlington Councillors were not included of the allocation of houses within the GB.   |
| PR-B-0835 | EJ         | Williamson |              | General      |                         |               | Plan to provide additional housing up to 15,000 by Oxford City. Most of the 4,400 homes that Cherwell have been asked to provide are to be built on GB between Oxford and Kidlington. GB there to prevent urban sprawl of Oxford City, protecting smaller out-lying communities from being absorbed like Cutteslowe, Headington, Marston, Cowley, Islip, Wolvercote, etc. GB protected by law, only being released in exceptional circumstances. I do not regard this as an exceptional circumstance. Oxford wants affordable housing, this is not likely to happen. 4,400 homes would double the size of Kidlington. Enormous strain would be put on schools, health service and transport, increasing the serious traffic congestion in the Banbury Road. The new Cutteslowe roundabout designed to improve the situation would once again be swamped. Kidlington is a large village with GB, to destroy this would remove these benefits of village life for ever. Oxford agreed to provide only 500 new homes compared with Killington's 4,400 and the other District Councils' allocations. Yet the Northern Gateway area, in Oxford's domain is scheduled for industrial development.. This will surely aggravate the housing situation rather than help it. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation                           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0836 | Alan       | Graham  |  | General      |                         |               | Page 18 steers to three specific sites for the 4,400 dwellings. Inappropriate as the document gives a clear indication of travel prior to consultation of a submission document before a number of studies relevant to that stage have been completed. Published documents by Oxford City give similar indication to preferred locations for housing in a number of locations close to the City that is inappropriate when it does not form part of a Local Plan document preparation.                      |
| PR-B-0836 | Alan       | Graham  |  | General      |                         |               | Scant regard to the necessity to address GB issues as required in the NPPF, the consultation gives the indication that development in the GB appears a certainty. Two of the sites quoted on page 18 ( 2.37) between Kidlington and Oxford are in the GB, development would destroy GB and not avoid coalescence.   |
| PR-B-0836 | Alan       | Graham  |  | General      |                         |               | Oxford and Cherwell have failed over a number of years to achieve the local housing target figures. With the proposed figures is this deliverable as past failures provide little confidence and this should not be allocated.  |
| PR-B-0836 | Alan       | Graham  |  | General      |                         |               | The 2014 SHMA needs updating to reflect changing circumstances. It should be commissioned by the local authorities and not by the Oxfordshire LEP which is using employment figures that are inappropriate that would have ensured the brief for preparation of the previous SHMA was slanted.  |
| PR-B-0836 | Alan       | Graham  |  | General      |                         |               | Oxford's housing market is unique in the county and the factors associated with this imply that that extra demand for housing is within Oxford rather than the surrounding District Councils. Further assessments are required to look at land within Oxford. If the need is outside Oxford it needs to be areas with employment.   |
| PR-B-0836 | Alan       | Graham  |  | General      |                         |               | Extra development in the Kidlington area would need to be addressed over and above existing S106 payments and CIL contributions to make up for the existing infrastructure deficit. Improvements required to transport as the existing road network is over congested, including improving substantially the time taken to get from Kidlington to central Oxford by public transport. Investment to the retail potential in Kidlington rather than seeing the movement into Oxford.                         |
| PR-B-0836 | Alan       | Graham  |  | General      |                         |               | Oxford City's policy for affordable housing is 50% and Cherwell's for Kidlington is 35%, how are policies reconciled, when the objective is to meet Oxford's housing needs with Cherwell? An update of the SHLA is required along with a re-appraisal of the economic forecasts for job creation. Government emphasis on developing technology between Oxford and Cambridge, with the improvement to transport links . Upper Heyford also requires additional development providing broader sustainability. |
| PR-B-0839 | Mark       | Rose    | Define on behalf of William Davies Ltd | General      |                         |               | A district wide approach that reflects the adopted local plan strategy and complemented by the release of sites in the GB should be taken. As part of this strategy Bloxham, and in particular land to the east of S Newington Road should be considered as appropriate site specific options.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0843 | Chris      | Skinner |              | General      |                         |               | If the level of house building identified is required within CDC, which am not convinced, I have some comments on the suggestions on how that may be achieved. Developments in Cherwell must be inclusive of infrastructure and improved transport links. Believe Heyford would be a bad location, most would be obliged to drive for work, leisure, shopping etc. Any development should be self-supporting as possible but linked to existing transport and access routes. If improved cycle and walking routes into Oxford, to the stations between Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. Then develop the area between these villages to unify them. Believe it is better to encroach on GB around the A34 than spreading further Kidlington to the North and North East. Development on this side of Kidlington would increase load on the heavily congested route through the village unless access were made directly towards the Islip/Bicester road/A34 which would essentially isolate any new development. Some point better to close GB through Cutteslowe and Gosford, accept that Kidlington integrates into the City, not ideal but better than GB around the Banbury Road around Oxford Parkway at the expense of a continuing creep North and North East as any development there would further load the creaking transport links. No easy options but - fill in the gaps - do not spread. |
| PR-B-0846 | James C    | Bridon  |              | General      |                         |               | Proposal to build 4,400 additional homes to the north of Oxford must be refused and then opposed to the last ditch. The draft version with its focus on Area A, its proximity to the city is unrealistic without unimaginable investment in transport links. Destruction of GB, merging of villages into urban sprawl.  |
| PR-B-0846 | James C    | Bridon  |              | General      |                         |               | Acceptance of the 4,400 target is justifiable only if Oxford City's housing demand and land supply figures are proven and land usage truly maximised. City should first commit to large-scale medium-rise apartments in the eastern half of the city, with target of tens of thousands. CDC should only strive to meet City's needs if capacity of the other adjacent Districts is fully and fairly assessed. Do not agree with excluding small sites from consideration. Small (<100) infill options vital to assist max protection of GB.   |
| PR-B-0850 | Wendy      | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the proposed development of GB land surrounding the villages of Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Infrastructure already overstretched. A44 at peak times unable to cope despite recent improvements. More housing increases resident numbers, higher volume of traffic, pollution and environmental damage. Schools would suffer.   |
| PR-B-0850 | Wendy      | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke blessed with much wildlife which would suffer as a result.   |
| PR-B-0850 | Wendy      | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | This rep refers to detailed reference made to the CDC Environmental Strategy and Local Agenda 21. Ref to the Government Site protecting GB paragraphs 79, 80 and 89. The proposed development undoubtedly goes against every promise made in both the Council and every GB aim set out by the Government statements. It would appear that the enormity of the proposed development would be in complete contradiction to every point made.  |
| PR-B-0850 | Wendy      | Smith   |              | General      |                         |               | All three villages would ultimately loose their unique individuality. Oxford City should consider its own vacant office buildings and houses before sacrificing GB areas and village lifestyles.  |
| PR-B-0853 | Lorna      | Bennett |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the proposed 4,400 new houses proposed for the north of Oxford and namely in the vicinity of Yarnton and Begbroke. Pride ourselves on being villages and each has their own identities and facilities.   |
| PR-B-0853 | Lorna      | Bennett |              | General      |                         |               | The infrastructure is very much inadequate at the best of times and can not cope with the current traffic. Funding for repairing seems non-existent. Adding another 4,400 houses will add to the amount of vehicles on these already congested roads.   |
| PR-B-0853 | Lorna      | Bennett |              | General      |                         |               | Doctors surgeries present in Yarnton and Woodstock, it can take up to 2-3 weeks to get a non-urgent appointment. Patient lists would increase with the additional houses. Has a new doctors surgery been considered with the proposals.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname            | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0853 | Lorna            | Bennett            |              | General      |                         |               | Schools in Yarnton and Woodstock would pose a problem. Difficulty in recruitment of good teachers now. The schools would have to be extended to cater for the extra pupils. The traffic with its current pupils is horrendous and parking is a joke. Do not have the facilities of any police, community police or traffic warden, this puts both children and adults in danger of an accident. If the intake of pupils were to increase dramatically this would again accentuate the problem.  |
| PR-B-0853 | Lorna            | Bennett            |              | General      |                         |               | Recreational areas, there are many public footpaths which have historical vale and interest. The fields between each village and surrounding areas are vital for wellbeing and security. I was sure that as recently as 2015 CDC indeed signed up to protect our "green belt" which these fields and pathways make up.  |
| PR-B-0853 | Lorna            | Bennett            |              | General      |                         |               | Flooding is a concern as Yarnton and Begbroke already flood. The more these areas are built upon increase the chances of flooding here and other areas suffering too.   |
| PR-B-0853 | Lorna            | Bennett            |              | General      |                         |               | Would there not be a more suitable site for the amount of houses to be built. This is effectively a new town, more beneficial for its location to be close to the M40, as some infrastructure is in place. The new train station already a lot of people from London are buying properties in this area and commuting back to London.   |
| PR-B-0856 | David            | Smith              |              | General      |                         |               | Surprised that you do not have an on-line pro-forma response. General observations are that the meeting at Kidlington repeatedly referred to as Oxford City's unmet housing need. Local affordable housing is a national problem, failure of local authorities to re-invest. Oxford city has its own unique problems related to it's historical development and geography. The Universities are part of the problem and should be contributing to resolve the solution. Stop further commercial development in the city and on its borders, this exacerbates the housing shortage. A re-appraisal of the Northern Gateway proposals to reduce the area for commercial development and increase the amount of housing to enable the City to make a greater contribution to its own projected need. Cherwell Plan only looked at. The Oxfordshire Growth Board has a very important role to play with the wider view of developments across the district council borders. |
| PR-B-0858 | John and Barbara | Redfern and Burton |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to build 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. The number is not an appropriate requirement, it is too high and Cherwell should challenge this. It's unsustainable, traffic problems increase and schools and health services become further stretched. Present problems with John Radcliffe and Horton Hospital make matters worse. It's already difficult to recruit GP's and nurses etc. Beds being closed when there will be a need doesn't make sense.   |
| PR-B-0858 | John and Barbara | Redfern and Burton |              | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to areas of search that involve the GB and areas that flood. Open countryside in the GB to be sacrificed, walks and views lost. GB is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It protects the historic city of Oxford from over development. GB is a permanent designation. Government's promise and Cherwell's policy to protect GB should be upheld. Areas of search considered on GB are not reasonable. All the local sites losing agricultural land, locally grown food becomes unavailable.   |
| PR-B-0860 | David W          | Stewart            |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to build 4,400 houses north of Oxford due to wholly inadequate provision of additional infrastructure for schools, healthcare, roads and transport links. Currently the roads in and out of central Oxford during rush hour via the Cutteslowe and Peartree roundabouts are extremely busy with traffic jams. New houses will be brought by London commuters using Oxford Parkway.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0861 | Tim             | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | General      |                         |               | The majority of the Parish is within the GB which comprises the gap between Kidlington/Gosford and Oxford. The Parish area includes a large number of the sites put forward in this consultation and would be dramatically affected by these developments and others in the surrounding area. Extremely concerned by the huge volume of complex new reports issued for consultation over the Christmas period. The forward work programme suggests that there will be minimal time for fair and genuine review of all relevant issues, and the Council and local residents are very concerned that this momentous decision is being rushed to the detriment of sound decision making.  |
| PR-B-0861 | Tim             | Perkins    | TMP Planning Ltd on behalf of Gosford and Water Eaton PC | General      |                         |               | The timing of this set of Options is particularly confusing given the very recent adoption of the Kidlington Masterplan SPD. It emphasises the permanency of the GB, the strengthening of Kidlington's character of a 'village set in landscape" the need to protect and enhance Kidlington's landscape and biodiversity assets. The 2015 Green Belt Study assesses the contribution local GB land makes to meeting the NPPF criteria. Plans 4.1-4.5 in that document confirm that all GB land lying between Kidlington/Gosford and Oxford is important in fulfilling these criteria.  |
| PR-B-0863 | David and Dawn  | White      |  | General      |                         |               | Objection to build 4,400 houses north of Oxford . Increased traffic problems causing gridlock around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. Schools and health services would not be able to cope. Green fields and GB would be sacrificed. Walks and views lost. GB is a permanent designation and promises to protect it needs to be upheld. Area from St Mary's Church to the A4260 subject to flooding, putting the properties along The Moors and Church Street at risk. Traffic along The Moors is already heavy and fast moving to avoid the main Banbury Road through Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0864 | Clive and Annie | Bristow    |  | General      |                         |               | Has Oxford City utilised empty property and brownfield sites within the ring road? Has CDC fully considered the massive impact on road infrastructure and considered the degradation of the flood plain. If the answer to these is no, then to build in one area would be utter madness, creating traffic congestion and gridlock. If there is a need and all options have been exhausted, spread development around the ring road and still maintain the green lungs of Oxford. Strongly urge you to reconsider.  |
| PR-B-0865 | J and D         | Burford    |  | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to the imposition of yet more housing in the GB around Oxford contrary to the agreed Cherwell Local Plan. Criticism of the consultation . Oxford City unable to commit to housing target placed upon it as it see's soft targets in Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. This has been based on assumed growth rates, needs to be challenged and ignore Brexit realities. Brownfield sites are not unattractive to developers build on these so as to prevent urban sprawl, preventing villages becoming sprawling suburbs of Oxford. Many parts of Yarnton are unsightly and unkempt as a result of loosing planning requirements and oversight. Spend on the current infrastructure before any development is required. |
| PR-B-0866 | Matt            | Todd       |  | General      |                         |               | Criticism to the way the consultation has been managed. Little publicity, short period of time to complete the documents over the Christmas period.  |
| PR-B-0868 | Jennifer        | McFadden   |  | General      |                         |               | Criticism to the way the consultation has been managed over the Christmas period. Poor publicity. Oxford City didn't draw it to local residents attention. Living in North Oxford I do not read the Cherwell website. System favours developers who are well prepared to complete documents. Summary documentation is good but the 157 page document is very lengthy and hard to understand.   |
| PR-B-0869 | Peter           | Hainsworth |  | General      |                         |               | Criticism with the documentation and the content for the consultation.   |
| PR-B-0872 | Pat and Nigel   | Waters     |  | General      |                         |               | Criticism to the late awareness of the review to attend Begbroke Village Hall public meeting. Poor publicity, resulting in insufficient time to consider the implications and the timing of consultation over the Christmas period.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname | Organisation              | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|---------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0872 | Pat and Nigel | Waters  |                           | General      |                         |               | Obvious from the plan that proposed developments will subsume historic Begbroke. Life will change here for ever. Surrounding countryside, scenery, local walks, wildlife. Begbroke is privileged to over thirty birds species, like the Skylarks which are on the conversation red-list, their habitats will be lost or diminished forever.  |
| PR-B-0872 | Pat and Nigel | Waters  |                           | General      |                         |               | GB is a permanent designation and Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason to building on the GB only in exceptional circumstances. The Government's manifesto promise and CDC's existing policy to protect the Green Belt must be upheld. If allowed then this would end the GB status anywhere as this would have set a precedent.   |
| PR-B-0872 | Pat and Nigel | Waters  |                           | General      |                         |               | Why can't the land allocated to Northern Gateway be used entirely for houses? Surely this would go a long way to help Oxford City's apparent unmet housing. 4,000+ homes surrounding Begbroke and infilling from here to Kidlington, Yarnton and towards Woodstock is unrealistic. Extra homes at Woodstock, Long Hanborough and the garden village at Eynsham. Witney continually expanding. Commercial and industrial units planned for Begbroke Science Park along with a Park and Ride close to Begbroke. Traffic diverted from A40 to the A44 to ease congestion on the A40.  |
| PR-B-0872 | Pat and Nigel | Waters  |                           | General      |                         |               | How many extra vehicles will use the A44? At peak times this will cause bottle-necks, there are already problems during the working week. Increases to noise, air and light pollution, which could adversely affect people's health. The A34 is also unable to cope with the amount of traffic which has a knock on effect to the A44. The roads are in a bad state of repair now which takes time to resolve. Closure of GP surgeries waiting times to see a GP are 2 - 3 weeks. Closure of A and E units a reduction in beds. Social care is more or less zero, care homes are closing and schools are overstretched. Unless and until existing problems with infrastructure are fully addressed, surely NO consideration should be given to any of the development put forward for this area. Thames Water publication to the awareness of the use of water, concerns about the water usage.                                      |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane          | Olds    | Wendlebury Parish Council | General      |                         |               | Consultation time frame: Eight weeks is an inadequate time to respond to a detailed and comprehensive document expecting comments on 24 issues.  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane          | Olds    | Wendlebury Parish Council | General      |                         |               | Duty to Co-operate: Acknowledges Duty to co-operate on cross boundary issues, however concerned that the duty rests with an unelected "Quango," the Oxfordshire Growth Board. It considers that although there is an agreement amongst the leaders of the Councils on Oxfordshire Memorandum Co-operation, the matter of providing additional housing is a matter for each individual district through its own local plan process.<br>The Parish would like to know why Cherwell District has decided to go ahead with proposals to meet Oxford's unmet demand when there is no legal requirement for it?  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane          | Olds    | Wendlebury Parish Council | General      |                         |               | Challenging the assumptions: The parish questions the assumptions of the 2014 SHMA and its assessment of to conclude that the County is in reality one strategic housing market area. This is further evidenced by the DCLG 2014 household projections that have a different starting point. The Parish is strongly concerned if the identified suitable sites meet Cherwell or Oxford 'housing need' as it will be determined by the potential occupier.<br>The market will determine housing needs, not artificial number based proposals that are causing considerable concern to this rural community. The Parish questions, 'What would be the impact on the County as one strategic market if Cherwell failed to meet its own Local Plan requirements? We have already noted that South Oxfordshire has not supported the proposals. Paragraph B95 of the local plan makes it clear that Cherwell's needs must take precedent. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation              | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|---------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council | General      |                         |               | New Evidence: The Parish considers that given the recent announcements on Garden Village at Eynsham, Govt. consultation paper Jan 2017, New rail link between Bicester and Bedford, A34 Expressway (Oxford to Cambridge) all these would provide new opportunities for both housing and economic growth to help reduce some of the pressures on Oxford.<br>The Parish hopes that the scarce resources at Cherwell should concentrate on the employment potential this opportunity provides rather than chasing housing numbers. It also hopes that this will lead to rethink and the current set of proposals being deferred or dropped.   |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council | General      |                         |               | Specific comments on Partial Review: Wendlebury is a Category C village and developments should be for infill or conversions only  |
| PR-B-0878 | Jane       | Olds       | Wendlebury Parish Council | General      |                         |               | The Parish Council attached a separate letter to Cherwell as there were a number of questions that the parish meeting on 5 Jan 2017 which the Parish was unable to address through the consultation questions. This letter was sent to the Chief Executive, Councillors and Victoria Prentis MP. The key issues are:<br>1. Why is Cherwell rushing ahead with these proposals when other District Councils are not currently considering their allocation?<br>2. Has this divergence from Local Plan Part 1 been driven, not by sound planning policy, but from the need to maximise the income from the new homes bonus currently £9,000?<br>3. As these proposals are being generated by Oxford, what level of financial support is expected from Oxford for infrastructure and associated works? Or will the cost fall on the Cherwell Council tax payer?<br>4. Does the Oxford Growth Board have legal power to spend Council Tax payers' money commissioning reports and paying members' fees to attend meetings?<br>5. Has the effect of "Brexit" been taken into consideration in forecasting employment outcomes?<br>6. Has the transport assessment taken into account the loss of transport subsidies?<br>The Parish Council would be grateful if this letter, and the Council's reply could be part of the Parish Council's response to the Partial Review. |
| PR-B-0885 | Margaret C | Williamson |                           | General      |                         |               | CDC needs to reconsider their approach. All suggested sites around Kidlington show a disregard for GB and a lack of respect for those who worked so hard to put it in place. Development between Kidlington and the City boundary leads to urban sprawl leading to the loss of Kidlington's individual identity, this gap provides valuable space for recreational use. Houses between Cutteslowe and the Marylebone line would not be affordable, therefore attracting London commuters. Other areas within Cherwell are to be considered, the effect of additional traffic needs to be addressed through Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0893 | Louis      | Borucki    |                           | General      |                         |               | Objection to the proposed development of 4,400 additional homes when Oxford's allocation of 550 is unacceptably low, considering the need arises from their own growth plan. This rep provides a list of suggested sites closer to the city and therefore more suitable than Kidlington. Development on the scale proposed will change the nature of the village and remove large areas of meadow, mature trees, well used footpaths and wildlife habitats. The pond at The Moors is home to a Great Crested Newt, a protected species. Kidlington should not have to sacrifice its green spaces when Oxford has an abundance of such sites. Road congestion and parking are already a problem and services at Oxford Parkway are becoming stretched. Local services and amenities are just about coping with the current population. Any development would require infrastructure improvements first. Land prices, and the developers need to maximise their returns means houses are unlikely to be affordable. The Governments manifesto promise to protect the GB should be upheld.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0894 | Wendy            | Price    |              | General      |                         |               | The proposed area is entirely within the GB. GB was designated to restrain development pressures, which could damage the character of Oxford City. Planned expansion of the City GB is needed. With Kidlington's and Bicester's expansion I do not accept that there are exceptional circumstances to warrant the development in Islip. It is not sustainable, bus services have been withdrawn and there are limited train services at Islip. All journeys would have to be made by car adding to the existing traffic problems and air pollution adding to the high number of cars that already use the narrow roads, which Oxfordshire County Council are aware of.   |
| PR-B-0897 | Rob              | Lawrence |              | General      |                         |               | There has been insufficient time allowed and guidance given by CDC for people to review the Sustainability Appraisal as well as the extensive main options paper.  |
| PR-B-0898 | Trevor and Helen | Langrish |              | General      |                         |               | Appalled at the proposals to build 4,400 homes on GB is vandalism, on land between Kidlington, Yarnton and North Oxford. Residents of North Oxford are also not happy due to the added traffic this brings to the area. Little consideration has been given to this especially during rush hour. As a commuter by bicycle into the centre of Oxford I regular see the roads around Kidlington at gridlock, making it dangerous for all road users, development would make it worse. The A34 and A40 are both over their capacity and would become worse.   |
| PR-B-0898 | Trevor and Helen | Langrish |              | General      |                         |               | Building around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke would alter the size of the village and alter the character. Concerns to flooding for existing and new houses. Current GB is used by many for activities and adds to individuals well-being and health. More houses would mean more people requiring health care, places in schools and a need for extra bus routes. The current infrastructure is already over stretched. The cost of housing in Kidlington is high, concerns that the new houses will not sell due to people not being able to afford to live here. Justification for these is questionable.  |
| PR-B-0898 | Trevor and Helen | Langrish |              | General      |                         |               | The meeting that I attended , it was mentioned by someone that Banbury and Bicester have already accepted their share as part of CDC's plan to help Oxford and that they might not be impressed if Kidlington do not accept their share. I have seen these new developments. However unlike Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke, they do not have a city the size of Oxford on their doorstep seeking, if not openly then by the back door whenever it can, to absorb Kidlington (and Yarnton and possibly Begbroke) within its boundaries, to which we are very much opposed. Accept the need to build some new houses in Kidlington but the plans are excessive and need reconsideration. The consultation was poor and the plans were not well advertised. |
| PR-B-0899 | Julia            | Cameron  |              | General      |                         |               | As a resident of Kidlington want to defend it from changes which would be difficult to sustain. Already the low spec houses in the area and Bicester has shown that more is needed to bricks and mortar to build communities. Large estates are 15-20 years look shabby. Significant profit for developers need to think about the long term regarding schools, churches, surgeries and the countryside for walks.   |
| PR-B-0899 | Julia            | Cameron  |              | General      |                         |               | No. Extra 4,400 houses north of the city is not sustainable. Traffic problems increase. Schools and health services become more stretched. GB sacrificed, walks, views and habitats lost. Quality of life will suffer, air, noise and light pollution will increase. 4,400 is based on dubious calculations . They rely on assumptions of very high growth in jobs around Oxford requiring many people to move into the county.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0899 | Julia      | Cameron |              | General      |                         |               | It is unwise and short-sighted to development in the Oxford GB. The GB around Kidlington has unspoilt countryside, footpaths and green spaces, enjoyed by local residents. It protects historic Oxford from the effects of over development. GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for building in the GB. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld if we are to be responsible to what we hand onto those who follow. Consideration to relocation to the new science park to the north west where real investment would greatly benefit depressed areas. To place it there and assume it can be supported with a huge wave of house-building seems a little short-sighted.  |
| PR-B-0900 | Rachel     | Woods   |              | General      |                         |               | Writing in response to building 4,400 homes on the GB around the rural villages of Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Recognise that there is a need for housing but have objections and concerns to the CDC proposal. Moved to Yarnton for the rural and community life and invested into our home. Cherwell's local plan to preserve the GB was supported by 76% of Oxfordshire residents. There is already considerable pressure on local infrastructure within these villages. The A40 and A34 are often blocked and at standstill during the rush hour, additional houses will only add to this. Schools are over subscribed, as a teacher and resident my concerns are about more pressure on existing provision which will affect the quality of the services and the access to them. Health services in the three villages are already overwhelmed. Three weeks on average to see a GP or nurse. Residents quality of life will be compromised with the urbanisation of the rural villages.   |
| PR-B-0900 | Rachel     | Woods   |              | General      |                         |               | This area of Oxfordshire is known for its microclimate and interaction with pollution in the atmosphere causing respiratory problems. Increasing air and noise pollution will potentially affect residents health and wellbeing putting more stress on healthcare. The areas around Oxford are green lungs for the city. Providing access to the countryside for walks and views, providing respite from urban dwellings. Wildlife ecosystems, farmland etc. will become affected which affect the larger ecosystems which increase the imbalance in the natural environment. What consideration has been taken to preserve this balanced ecosystem. We would become an expensive dormitory town for London commuters, houses prices are then out of the reach of Oxfordshire based workers. Many people who work in services have to live in Bicester or Swindon. Bicester's encroaching developments have had an effect on infrastructure, making it a difficult and stressful place to live due to the rapid developments, without the infrastructure in place. Object to the proposals and trust you will consider our objections and take our concerns seriously. |
| PR-B-0901 | Caroline   | Steel   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the plans to build 4,000 houses in the GB around the villages of Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. I enjoy the rural aspect of Yarnton especially the footpaths in neighbouring fields which could be lost or reduced. Last year Cherwell adopted a local plan to preserve GB, 76% of Oxfordshire resident support this plan. Residents of Yarnton and Begbroke's quality of life will be severely compromised. Increased pressure on local infrastructure like roads, schools and health services. Farming and wildlife habitats will be reduced.   |
| PR-B-0902 | Vanessa    | Pinder  |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism on the difficulty in finding the consultation details and the paperwork is long and challenging. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name           | Surname | Organisation                         | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------------|---------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0903 | Josephine            | Allen   | Upper Heyford Parish Council         | General      |                         |               | Upper Heyford Parish includes Heyford Park Local people accept that there is need for some housing, but want to see the right type of housing in the right place, with the supporting infrastructure. The Parish is seriously concerned at the sheer amount of housing that is being put forward for the District and the huge effect upon the transport network (rural roads) which is already over-capacity, use by HGV's and 'rat running'.<br>Concerned about the lack of leisure space and a cemetery at Heyford Park. The Parish Council reiterates all the points raised in Oct 2014 consultation. The Parish supports the need for additional housing at Heyford Park, but no more than 1,600 with appropriate infrastructure in place concurrently with the housing development. Traffic worries are a major concern for residents. Greenfield land should be preserved as far as possible and the rural character of Upper Heyford protected. |
| PR-B-0904 | Jill                 | Grain   |                                      | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should of done more. Difficult to find the consultation details and the paperwork is long and challenging. The timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-0911 | Andrew               | Smith   | Hampton Gay and Poyle Parish Meeting | General      |                         |               | Concerned that the levy is set at a high level for private housing which may discourage such development. The levy should be critically reviewed to achieve a balance to deliver required level of infrastructure. It is also concerned that it is not included in the areas of search around Kidlington, excluded from Levy funds. The concern is that a massive development around Kidlington would further increase rat run through the Parish. The Parish should be able to access funds for mitigation measures as a result of this planned development. Parish has significant concerns on the scale of development and trust that the plan would be amended to reflect a more modest, sustainable scale of development in the Kidlington area.   |
| PR-B-0915 | Michelle and Anthony | Tallack |                                      | General      |                         |               | Islip residents objections to encroachment on GB. Limited public transport. Unsuitable access roads that already have substantial traffic problems.   |
| PR-B-0916 | Helen                | Newman  |                                      | General      |                         |               | Wish to register opposition to the destruction to the GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington. GB designed to protect the countryside from urban sprawl. If approved Yarnton and Begbroke would disappear as separate entities. Green spaces and footpaths would be lost forever. It's important to preserve GB for future generations as development on this scale would damage to the environment and cause issues in the future. Is the size really necessary, would it provide affordable housing for local's or is it an opportunity for developers to provide a dormitory town for London. Development adjacent to Woodstock was recently rejected due to the infrastructure in the area not being able to support a development of that size, this is a quarter of what is now being proposed around Begbroke and Yarnton.  |
| PR-B-0916 | Helen                | Newman  |                                      | General      |                         |               | The roads would not be able to cope with the proposed developments. The A44 is used already as an alternative route into Oxford to avoid congestion on the A40, this is likely to get worse once the new garden village at Eynsham is built. A44 is the only route out of the village of Begbroke, which at peak times is difficult to get out onto. Peartree roundabout is frequently jammed at congested during rush hour and their are long queues into Kidlington. A34 has accidents and incidents which adds to traffic chaos to other roads. The rep. has concerns regarding flooding and has provided a list of the areas that now are subject to this and which would have issues if the developments were approved.  |
| PR-B-0917 | Omattage G Kumar     | Perera  |                                      | General      |                         |               | The impact of the proposed development would take away the footpaths from Water Eaton Lane through the GB fields which are used for walking and leisure. The green fields are important to the health which would be impacted and lost, there would be an increase of pollution from the A34. Flooding is a concern with Water Eaton Land and Bicester Road, additional housing will only increase the risk in the area. Increased traffic congestion on the Bicester Road affecting schools and residents. Strongly feel that the houses will attract London commuters and not those who work in Oxford or within the Cherwell district.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0920 | Audrey      | Fairgrieve |              | General      |                         |               | Kidlington already suffers from congestion most mornings . The doctors cannot cope with the number of people wanting appointments and car parking is often a nightmare! These extra houses will make things worse and the cost of houses is bad enough around here.  |
| PR-B-0921 | Paul        | Weston     |              | General      |                         |               | Strong objection to any options in Banbury having to meet Oxford's housing needs. The distance from central Oxford to Banbury is 21 miles, equivalent for providing houses from Banbury to Towcester, this is not sensible when there are options in the intended target. Public transport is not tenable. Trains from Banbury to Oxford are good but the links to Banbury station are poor so you would choose to travel by car on the already congested roads. The south of Banbury has already seen a large number of developments to meet Banbury's needs, 3,500 houses between the canal and the Broughton Road.  |
| PR-B-0926 | Dr Eric     | Sidebottom |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism of the way the consultation has been conducted along with the documentation that seems to favour developers and professionals. The Christmas period is not reasonable. Separate consultation to Northern Gateway these both have a huge impact on one another. Main areas of employment are in the centre, this is where the affordable housing is needed. Built on GB will exacerbate traffic. Development close to Oxford Parkway will only attract London commuters. Employment is better situated outside Oxford City.   |
| PR-B-0941 | Valerie     | Wells      |              | General      |                         |               | Wish to object to the proposal to build 4,400 new houses to the North of Oxford, Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Each village would lose its separate historic identities and merge into one urban sprawl, joining Woodstock to Oxford. The protected GB is in the plan, which CDC have undertaken to protect. Our future generations will not be able to afford to live in this area, there is not enough affordable housing in the plan. London commuters will be attracted to the area. Affecting the availability and affordability of houses for our children, teachers, nurses etc. The road infrastructure is not in place to be able to cope with the extra cars. Schools have limited numbers and can not cope. Doctors surgeries and hospitals will also suffer with the growing population. There is nothing in the plans to address this.  |
| PR-B-0941 | Valerie     | Wells      |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Roads and infrastructure are not in place. There is not enough affordable housing. There would be the destruction of the GB and three villages would lose their identity. |
| PR-B-0942 | Freda       | Horne      |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly against the proposal to build 40,000 [sic] houses in Kidlington. The schools and doctors surgery's are over crowded. The Gb will be taken and the roads will be blocked 24 seven. It is questionable who can afford a mortgage or rent.   |
| PR-B-0943 | Christopher | Perry      |              | General      |                         |               | Am aware of the planning to build extensive housing in the area around Begbroke, Kidlington and Woodstock. Am horrified at the extent of the planned development. Understand that more housing is needed but not to this extent. This will destroy the quality of life for current and new residents. No consideration has been given to the impacts on transport, schooling and the environment. Please reduce the number of houses.  |
| PR-B-0944 | David       | Stone      |              | General      |                         |               | Dismayed at the timing and handling of the consultation and the limited manner the details were made available. It does little to inspire confidence in the Planning process and that CDC is seriously interested, or will indeed listen or alter it's plans in the light of local residents' considered views.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname         | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0945 | Helen          | Manias          |              | General      |                         |               | Have serious concerns about the development and oppose in the strongest possible terms to the proposed site which is farmland north of The Moors in Kidlington. The fields are part of the GB and should be protected. There are many footpaths here that are used by the public who benefit from both physical and mental health by escaping from the urban areas into the open fields which is an asset for the residents of Kidlington. There would be a great loss to natural habitats and wildlife in the area and the local history would be lost to. To consider building near a river and flood plain is a poor choice. The river is prone to flooding which could flood the new homes and be expensive to fix, it is not just viable to consider building here. The Moors is an extremely narrow road and would cause access problems for construction vehicles and the extra cars on the road would cause significant problems in the area. |
| PR-B-0946 | Sarah          | Karatzios       |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding how CDC dealt with the acknowledgement of the comment cards. The main issue relating to the lack of affordable housing lies with the universities, they need to manage the number of students that they can actually cater for. The houses they use are only occupied during term times, if campuses were built just outside Oxford this would free up houses for those of need it. A shuttle bus could bring the students into Oxford. A small part of GB would be lost but not to the extent as shown in their plans. The villages surrounding Oxford should not be affected and become part of Oxford, GB is precious. Flooding would be a concern as houses would be built upon a flood plain, the excess water would run off into the canal which would then flood. Yarnton Road would not be able to cope with the increase in traffic.   |
| PR-B-0946 | Sarah          | Karatzios       |              | General      |                         |               | Recent developments on the Kidlington side of Bicester, residents from this area would use the A34 heading to and from areas of Oxford increasing the amount of traffic during the rush hours. It can take up to an hour to get into Oxford. All of this is before Bicester is fully developed which will make matters even worse. To consider building anywhere around Kidlington is not sensible. The recent improvements to the two roundabouts hasn't improved traffic flow, it is the sheer volume of traffic which is the issue. CDC do not know what the traffic is like during the rush hours from Kidlington to Woodstock and beyond. Building on GB will only add to this.  |
| PR-B-0947 | Norman         | Davies          |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the growth plans for Kidlington. Why put 4,400 homes in one area, spread them into a wider area of Cherwell, having less impact on the struggling infrastructure. We accept growth but not on this scale. GB needs to be kept as agreed in the Kidlington master plan along with the golf course, Oxford City could build on their own at Southfield. Schools, doctors and drains can not cope with the current size of Kidlington. Increased homes would require a larger high street, with extra parking not a reduction with the loss of Co-op site. Land behind The Moors is a narrow lane unable to cope with large and heavy traffic. Access should come out of the main Banbury Road with a bridge over the railway and canal. We do not want to be part of Oxford City, we enjoy Kidlington and CDC should maintain the gap.   |
| PR-B-0950 | Mr S and Mrs T | Lloyd and Atley |              | General      |                         |               | The total number suggested to meet Oxford's unmet need would be an unsustainable level of growth for the social and environmental impacts. Importance for economic growth, needs to be recognition that at some point Oxford and Oxfordshire will become less attractive to business if quality of the landscape, environment and infrastructure deteriorate. In the long term making this area a less desirable place to locate.   |
| PR-B-0950 | Mr S and Mrs T | Lloyd and Atley |              | General      |                         |               | Sad to see coalescence of Oxford with Kidlington, or the loss of the community feeling that Kidlington has. Feel strongly that GB around Kidlington meets the NPPF criteria. GB between these two places provides valid recreational space, a visual gap which protects their individual identities, preventing urban sprawl. The north of Kidlington retains its village character and sense of community, very sad to lose this and become a suburb of Oxford.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname         | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0950 | Mr S and Mrs T | Lloyd and Atley |              | General      |                         |               | Concerned with the increased residential pressure that will be put upon wildlife sites, habitats and species. The countryside around Kidlington is valuable for wildlife and recreation. Having good access to the countryside is recognised for physical and mental wellbeing. Development would therefore reduce the accessibility for all residents. Are full ecological impacts on all sites being assessed including indirect impacts on conservation sites. Potential impacts to Oxford Meadows SAC.  |
| PR-B-0950 | Mr S and Mrs T | Lloyd and Atley |              | General      |                         |               | Developers to provide infrastructure and service for the new residents, concerns that such provisions could be delivered in time, which results in insufficient services and facilities for all residents. Roads into Northern Oxford already busy in rush hour, further development in Kidlington would add to this pressure. This impacts car drivers and public transport users as the journeys a=become slower. With Rapid Transit Routes extra congestion would still slow these, causing a bottleneck for residents in other parts of Cherwell trying to access Oxford by bus or car.   |
| PR-B-0951 | Dennis         | Price           |              | General      |                         |               | The methodology used to obtain the extra housing needs is irregular, taking maximum figures for job growth and housing without due diligence. The dubious figures allow for destruction to Oxford's GB. Any development to GB should be minimal and only in exceptional circumstances, which is the governments policy. Oxford is a unique historic city. The expansion of Kidlington and Islip defies suggestions to maintain GB . GB for these villages acts as a vital green lung for walking, cycling and everyone's wellbeing, if these are destroyed what's been put in place to substitute these? The housing needs to be in the correct place. Oxford need to look within their city boundaries for redeployment of existing sites. There is plenty of scope for Bicester with its excellent transport connections with Oxford. Oxfordshire has an overwhelmed infrastructure with many fatal and serious accidents on these roads. Concerns for health with the increased air pollution as Islip has very narrow streets. Islip has no public transport, its bus service has been withdrawn, there are long waiting times at the railway station. Development should not be accepted in Islip. Has the effect of Brexit been taken into account for these requirements? Once the damage has been done it's impossible to repair. |
| PR-B-0962 | Dr Judith A    | Webb            |              | General      |                         |               | Do not agree with the revised Strategic Economic Plan for Oxfordshire. OXLEP needs to review the scale of development proposed for Oxfordshire. The growth targets are inflated and unrealistic. More account should be taken of potential environmental impacts. Growth on the scale suggested will result in great damage to the wildlife of Oxfordshire. Main interest is in the need to ensure the conservation of key environmental sites within Cherwell. The best way to protect sensitive wildlife sites is to keep any development away. and preserve wildlife corridors. Hydrological connectivity needs consideration and the rainwater catchment of Weston Fen SSSI should be calculated before considering development. This rep is a wildlife recorder in the county that submits records to TVERC, a Flora Guardian to rare plant species, and a member of the Floodplain Meadow Study Group within the ANHSO.   |
| PR-B-0963 | Mr and Mrs     | Shepherd        |              | General      |                         |               | There is a need for additional housing but to increase this to almost 4,500 houses in and around Kidlington in just not acceptable. The scheme needs to be revisited, possibly increasing to no more than 2,000 houses in small areas. However this figure would still require a serious look at the current facilities and amenities in Kidlington, such as schools, healthcare and leisure facilities etc. We are not against development but please reconsider these proposals. Please take into account the needs of the current residents of Kidlington, the existing traffic congestion, the need for open space and the added pressure that would be put upon the existing infrastructure.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation        | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|---------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0967 | Eileen     | Bloomer |                     | General      |                         |               | Find it unbelievable that Oxford City can not find and utilise suitable sites around its own perimeter, for example Greater Leys. How much land does the University have that is not utilised this needs to be questioned as they add to the lack of houses in Oxford. They need to build to accommodate the students. Students having to rent rooms in family homes which reduces the number of properties available for local people to buy or rent.   |
| PR-B-0967 | Eileen     | Bloomer |                     | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details and the paperwork is long and challenging. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.   |
| PR-B-0968 | Susan D    | Stock   |                     | General      |                         |               | Objection to the proposal to build 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. The figure is preposterous. This would lead to more traffic problems. Schools and health services would become further stretched. Will the younger generation starting out on the property ladder be able to afford these houses? The waiting times for an appointment to see your GP will increase, it's already taking up to three weeks to a month. The countryside would be sacrificed which is enjoyed by many for walking and the social impact to residents. Wildlife habitats would be lost and destroyed, where will the deer go to that are regular seen in the area. GB is enjoyed by many and it needs to be protected, building on GB is unreasonable and the figures need to be challenged by Cherwell. |
| PR-B-0970 | Ken        | Martin  | Noke Parish Meeting | General      |                         |               | State that, 'during a village meeting with MP John Howell, were surprised to learn that Oxford City did not have an up to date 'Local Plan' in place, validated by the Planning Inspector. Fail to see why Cherwell has taken on demands of Oxford City at face value whilst it is clear that they have not considered all the options and consulted their own constituents. This is further evidence that Oxford's housing needs have not been fully considered and any proposed numbers are speculative; therefore believe that the work on Partial Review is premature and should be postponed until Oxford have their own plan in place.   |
| PR-B-0974 | Belinda    | Skinner |                     | General      |                         |               | It seems more logical to develop towns rather than villages, as the village feel of Kidlington would be drastically changed by development. For example Bicester and Banbury. Oppose any development of north eastern Kidlington to the right of Banbury Road. This is a picturesque area used by many residents for walking and running. Building here would increase the traffic on the Banbury Road during rush hour. Support development near the train station as less cars would be on the roads. Also support development near A44 creating less traffic through Kidlington on the Banbury Road.  |
| PR-B-0977 | John       | Amor    |                     | General      |                         |               | Opposed to the building of so many houses on GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington. Already the local roads are overcrowded and hospitals are struggling to cope with current demand. GP's are overwhelmed, the schools are full to capacity and the facilities for the young are very limited. Hospitable beds are full of the elderly with nowhere for them to live when they are discharged.   |
| PR-B-0978 | JM         | Parker  |                     | General      |                         |               | Expresses strong concerns with the proposal of building 4,400 houses on GB around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Reasons being the loss of GB, walks, rural pathways, scenery and wildlife. Loss of village character and historical settings. A44 is busy already and difficult to cross this will only become worse.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0979 | Peter           | Finbow   |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the options to develop around Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton. 4,400 houses to allegedly help Oxford's unmet housing needs. GB vital asset in keeping Oxford separate from our villages, preventing urban sprawl and maintaining their individual identities. GB used for many recreational activities for promoting physical and mental wellbeing. The area would have increased traffic resulting in congestion, air and noise pollution. No evidence that these houses are needed, Oxford need to rethink its needs. Housing on brown land or building upwards. Would they be occupied by Oxford's residents. Infrastructure in the area is already overstretched, the Chiltern link to London is already crammed. CDC need to be robust and defend our green spaces which once lost are gone forever.    |
| PR-B-0980 | John and Pamela | Appleton |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed developments for Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington. The land is designated as GB, why develop when brown sites are available. Oxford need to consider using the large number of empty or unused properties in the city. Oxford and Woodstock would become one large urban sprawl, with insufficient infrastructure like schools and GP surgeries to name a few. Traffic already at a high density in the area particularly at Yarnton along the Cassington Road and Rutten Lane where the schools is situated, this would exacerbate the problem.  |
| PR-B-0981 | Joyce           | Ruiz     |              | General      |                         |               | Objections to this proposal. There is nothing substantial in the future projections on housing needs and employment to warrant this number of dwellings in and around Kidlington. A casual approach to encroaching on GB to provide for housing to which I strongly object to. GB has provided a long standing protection locally that needs to be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0981 | Joyce           | Ruiz     |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the increased traffic flow through and beyond Kidlington. A4165 is already a car park at park at peak times, which adds to increasing air pollution to the area. Good transport links at Water Eaton is causing more vehicles to come into the area. People drive to Parkway Station and P and R to use these facilities, more housing will seriously impact a road that currently cope.  |
| PR-B-0982 | Rosa            | Cadd     |              | General      |                         |               | As along time resident of Yarnton totally oppose the idea of planning for houses. We are villages not towns and can not turn into small towns. It would be nice if the houses were for locals to keep them in the area, not people from other areas of the country who do not adapt to country life. Leave our village alone.  |
| PR-B-0986 | Paul            | Robinson |              | General      |                         |               | Consider it totally inappropriate to build 4,400 houses in Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton. The village of Yarnton has over 5,000 years of living history and Begbroke also has its own village character that would be lost for ever if joined to Kidlington. All aware that there's a need for more housing in the county. It is the job of the council to find the appropriate places and to listen to residents. The current proposals have been poorly thought through, only looking at the fields close to Oxford to develop on. Infrastructure shortfalls have been ignored and promises will be forgotten or delayed which causes issues for new residents to travel to Oxford. Oxfordshire already has infrastructure problems, however it's a beautiful place to live with lots of greenery so lets keep it that way. |
| PR-B-0987 | Mr and Mrs      | Boyle    |              | General      |                         |               | Are extremely concerned with the proposals to the over development of the area between Kidlington and Cutteslowe roundabout. This goes totally against the efforts to keep spaces around Oxford pleasant and pollution free. The new Parkway Station is already very busy, traffic on the A44 and A40 would become worse and consideration into the roads needs to be taken.   |
| PR-B-0989 | Peter           | Jeffreys |              | General      |                         |               | From the public meeting attended on the 4th January the rep. has provided eight specific points that require answering. The rep. however does have concerns regarding Kidlington having another 4,400 houses. There would be extra vehicles on the roads during the rush hour increasing travelling times to places of work. Will the current roads be able to cope. Also concerns with recreation for the young, with safe areas to play, to be able to walk the dog.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0990 | Brenda            | Purves     |              | General      |                         |               | Objections to the proposed plans to drastically build in Kidlington. There would be a detrimental affect on the demographic of the community. Kidlington is a large village and our community is important and it works. With the large number of houses has there been any thought to schools and doctors, these are already over stretched. There would be a huge increase to traffic in the village and areas to travel to work places, this is being driven by developers for a profit.  |
| PR-B-0992 | Martin and Pamela | Palmer     |              | General      |                         |               | Further comments to submission form after attending the meeting at Exeter Hall. The decision seems to of been made that 4,400 homes will be coming to Kidlington, why has this not be included in the consultation and who made this decision. Oxford City continue to create office and business space without consultation with Cherwell and the development for a P & R at Begbroke is alarming, what are Cherwell doing about this. No objections to working together but Oxford need to address their own problems. Can they not build on Southfield Golf club, if they are desperate for land. Not convinced that the number of houses will actually be required.  |
| PR-B-0992 | Martin and Pamela | Palmer     |              | General      |                         |               | Cherwell confirmed that GB around Kidlington was incredibly important, Cherwell need to make sure that this is upheld. I have concerns with building in the area off Webb's Way, this is a useful floodplain. The residents of North Oxford are as concerned with the proposals for Kidlington and Oxford. GB land is sacrosanct which is important to the environment, but we are different areas which must retain their own identity for the quality of life of those living in them. Kidlington is already gridlocked so this puts added pressure on the area with public transport and car users.   |
| PR-B-0993 | Angela            | Kelly      |              | General      |                         |               | Alarmed at the number of houses proposed in the Kidlington area. Already the roads at peak times can not cope with the volume of traffic, it can take over an hour to get to Headington and Cowley. Even using the P and R hundreds of extra people will be on the roads. Infill is huge where I live. Bungalows have been replaced with flats and houses, how can the old drains and sewers cope with the extra housing. Schools and GP's are already overcrowded has consideration been taken to where these extra people will go. Will there be builders and are the houses affordable, these could be snapped up by But to Let landlords and the properties would not be looked after properly.  |
| PR-B-0994 | Jamie             | Smith      |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the proposal to build 4,4000 homes around Kidlington and the surrounding GB areas. Kidlington is poorly serviced for the amount of houses it currently has. It can take weeks to get a doctors appointment. Poor amenities for its size compared to Eynsham and Woodstock. Building on GB will cause more localised flooding to which Kidlington is prone. Bottlenecks with increased traffic in and around Oxford at the bridge crossing the A34. Even on a good day getting out of the Kidlington area is difficult due to congestion. The new train station is great but the planning into how it was accessed has not improved the traffic situation, never mind the new road layouts at Wolvercote and Summertown. Road traffic survey was done during the summer holidays when there is less traffic. Need to look at the issues already facing the residents, then perhaps the community would support this. |
| PR-B-0995 | Adam              | Brightmore |              | General      |                         |               | As a young first time buyer want to express my opinion for the younger generation. Criticism that the documents are busy and confusing. Regarding transport and the infrastructure its quicker for me to get to Northampton than to Cumnor Hill in Oxford from Kidlington. People like cars too much and therefore the rapid transit idea is useless, the residents of Oxford will stick with their cars. The A34 needs easing, so take advantage of the adjusted road near to the M40 for building. Why build close to Oxford and Kidlington what about land north of Sturdy's Castle, this would be a new village or town without encroaching onto villages. Build a few in Kidlington but not in a way that GB is lost and that we are joined to Oxford. Build near transport links. House prices in Cherwell are high due to its desirability, this will be lost or have a negative impact if built without infrastructure.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0996 | Lucy          | Smith    |              | General      |                         |               | Whilst welcoming some very good ideas for the improvement for Kidlington are majorly concerned with issues outlined in our responses to the questions that we have answered. The proposal mentions strengthening the identity of the village, but it seems as if we are all merging into one and just becoming a suburb of Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0998 | Lisa          | Coulling |              | General      |                         |               | Having seen new housing developments over the years in Kidlington I understand the need for new homes, but 4,400 is far too many for our village. This would be a 76% increase to the size of the village, the existing amenities and leisure facilities are already small for our community. Will more schools and doctors surgeries be built to cope with the extra demand. Children and teenagers have very little to do here, its great that they can meet at the new village shop the best thing that has happened to our village but more would be needed for them. No evidence that there are exceptional circumstances to build on GB. Strongly oppose Oxfords housing needs being placed on Kidlington and surrounding villages, please reconsider.   |
| PR-B-0999 | Steve         | McCurdy  |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to building 4,400 homes in the Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke areas. Traffic is already saturated and the problems will get worse, causing grid-lock and a rise in air pollution. The local schools and services can accommodate the present population, with an influx of new residents this will not be the case. Strongly object to GB areas being used for development. These areas should be kept to do what they are designed to.  |
| PR-B-1000 | Kim and Ann   | Martin   |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to use of land around Kidlington as this is GB , how is this considered to be very special circumstances. The rep. has objections and questions related to the development. This rep. has referred to points in the 2012 NPPF regarding GB purpose, opportunities and benefits. Is there a requirement for extra affordable housing and housing association houses. Stratfield Break is in a prime location but the houses would not be affordable. Croxford Gardens brought troubles, is there resources for extra police, fire, ambulance, social services, schools and medical centres. Concerned with Stratfield Break it has areas of conservation due to the Great Crested Newt will the council protect this area. Strongly object that Kidlington would lose its village status and identity and we would be controlled by Oxford City.  |
| PR-B-1001 | Margaret      | Draisey  |              | General      |                         |               | Taking time to consider the plans for the houses around Kidlington, some houses should be built but not the number suggested, as this would double the size of the village and this is not sustainable without new surgeries or schools. There would be a need for better retail outlets in Kidlington to. The Co-op site should be considered for retail spaces underneath the flats. The houses need to be affordable and only for Oxford's unmet housing need, not for London commuters or buy to let. Location is very important, towards Oxford is a no as people want separation from Oxford. Build on Stratfield Farm, behind The Moors but not near the flood plain. Some at Begbroke and Yarnton sider but only a few so that Kidlington remains separate.  |
| PR-B-1002 | Chris and Sue | Beach    |              | General      |                         |               | Comments are regarding the Land west of Hook Norton Road Sibford Ferris which has been offered by the landowner with Fisher German as the agent. 50 to 150 is an unworkable number. 50 would change the nature and character of the village. Cropredy and Finmere have turned down developments on this basis already so there is precedent. The main road is already congested, parked cars get damaged. The sewage treatment works are already at capacity. Comments on the submission form - "other supporting information" are misleading. There is only one fee paying school, is this appropriate for affordable housing or any new residents to the village. One small shop is the supermarket, post office and general store and not three separate shops. It has limited post office facilities and a small selection of goods. Limited bus services to Banbury and none direct to Oxford, the nearest train station is Banbury. South side of the field has a badger set which would be destroyed. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1004 | Stephen N  | Skinner |              | General      |                         |               | Object in the strongest terms to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs which are based on incorrect assumptions. This would be a gross and pernicious invasion of GB. The existing infrastructure is not fit for its purpose and would be overloaded. The creation of urban sprawl is not addressing the real need for affordable housing in Oxford City or other districts. No serious objections to the previously agreed Cherwell Local Plan Part 1. It is the proposed addendum to the Local Plan that must be critically reviewed.  |
| PR-B-1004 | Stephen N  | Skinner |              | General      |                         |               | Objection is based on Oxford's unmet housing need which is driven by the SHMA. Concerned with how and by whom the employment growth has been established. International migrating must be challenged due to Brexit. If the demand is for social housing this needs to be close to places of work. Affordable housing for keyworkers who have no desire to commute through growing bottlenecks. Oxford City needs to give priority to brownfield sites and derelict areas on the east before GB is eradicated forever, rather than offload to other districts. Both the SHMA and the unmet housing needs to be reviewed. the opposition in City Council have concluded that the unmet housing need does not accord with the facts.  |
| PR-B-1004 | Stephen N  | Skinner |              | General      |                         |               | Objection is based on infrastructure overload being roads, schools or GP surgeries. Currently the A40, A44 and A34 are grossly overused. The traffic during peak times crawls at Peartree and Wolvercote roundabouts, which are a known areas of congestion. Extra cars will only add to the problems and adding a bus lane is expected to help. The demands on schools and GP surgeries is immense. To get a routine visit from Woodstock is a three week wait which is not unusual. Little wonder A and E Departments are so regularly deluged.  |
| PR-B-1007 | Keith      | Watson  |              | General      |                         |               | Strong objection to the proposed new housing to be built in Kidlington.  |
| PR-B-1008 | Patricia   | Watson  |              | General      |                         |               | Strong objection to the proposed new build of housing in Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-1009 | Gillian    | Forrest |              | General      |                         |               | Concerned with the scale of the development. The number of houses proposed for North Kidlington are grossly exaggerated. Many new houses are already occupied by London commuters. As a resident of Bladon the proposal next to Woodstock along Upper Campsfield Road is ill placed, this site was rejected only a few months ago for development. The separation between Blandon and Woodstock would erode along with GB and changing the nature of the area. There would be a built up corridor from Wolvercote to Woodstock along the A44. The proposed development in Woodstock by WODC would create massive traffic problems along the A44 and A4096. The required infrastructure like schools, GP surgeries, parking etc. would have a detrimental impact on the rural nature of this area.  |
| PR-B-1010 | Richard    | Pye     |              | General      |                         |               | Do not agree with the figure of 4,400 houses. This figure was derived from the 2014 'SMHA' and having reviewed this document, it is clear that the methodology used to generate the housing figures for Oxfordshire are highly debateable. The SHMA detailed a number of scenarios that projected the future housing needs of Oxfordshire, yet the final conclusion draws upon only the most optimistic scenario with little evidence to justify this approach. I also have issues with how the methodology to calculate the future housing for Oxfordshire across the districts were used as it is clear these were not applied consistently. This rep goes on to outline in some detail why the methodology is flawed. This includes topics such as economic growth and house prices. In conclusion, the calculations that were used to derive the figure of 4,400 house for the Cherwell District to support the unmet housing need of Oxford are inaccurate and should urgently be re-evaluated. |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1010 | Richard    | Pye     |              | General      |                         |               | Location and relationship to Oxford - With regard to the location of the unmet housing need of Oxford, believe that there is no requirement for these to be located in the Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke area of the Cherwell District. It is clear from the options consultation and supporting reports that the majority of jobs and expected growth are located to the east and south of the city. Reference is made to the Interim Transport Assessment and the committed economic growth scenario. The road network around Kidlington is already congested and this would be exacerbated by 4,400 homes. Although Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton are well served by public transport, this service relies on the congested roads. Both the bus service and Oxford Parkway offer access to the city centre and not areas of employment. Locating new housing in the Kidlington area is likely to attract London commuters using Oxford Parkway and therefore not the people they are intended for. |
| PR-B-1010 | Richard    | Pye     |              | General      |                         |               | Use of the Oxford GB - Object to the possible destruction of GB in Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton area. This would contravene Policy ESD14 in CDC's Local Plan and the NPPF. The importance of the GB to the area is evident in the Kidlington Master Plan approved in December 2016. The SHLAA estimated a potential housing land supply for only 320 houses in Kidlington yet there is now an additional 4,400 houses which could only be delivered by destruction of the GB.   |
| PR-B-1010 | Richard    | Pye     |              | General      |                         |               | Transport and Infrastructure Limitations - Yarnton and Begbroke are close to a major road network which means roads in and around the villages are regularly, heavily congested. Bus services and Oxford Parkway do not provide direct access to areas of employment in the south and east of the city. Greater infrastructure to cope with existing demand is urgently required and additional housing would exacerbate the situation to breaking point. Reference is made to the ITA . Actual detail or timing of transport initiatives is lacking. If new jobs are to be created to the east and south of the city then development should be encouraged here to reduce the burden on the transport system. With regards to journey times in the ITA, I believe a soft target was selected and should be reviewed.   |
| PR-B-1010 | Richard    | Pye     |              | General      |                         |               | The handling of the consultation has been disgraceful. It was poorly advertised and the timeframe for responding was insufficient and did not take into account the time of year. There was confusion over the deadline that shames the democratic nature of the council. Finally, and also at the Kidlington Parish meeting on 4 January, the representative from CDC publicly stated that the figure of 4,400 was final. Yet this is the first question contained in the Options Consultation document. This contradictory statement calls into question whether Cherwell is truly representing all residents within the district.  |
| PR-B-1010 | Richard    | Pye     |              | General      |                         |               | In conclusion,vehemently object to the proposals for the various reasons outlined in this letter. Recognise that there will be need for some additional housing in Oxford but believe alternative solutions are open to Oxford City that would prevent the destruction of GB land, the merger of three historically important villages into an urban sprawl, and prevent adding further pressure on already overloaded transport systems, schools and local amenities. Look forward to hearing from CDC on the next steps required to stop these proposals from progressing any further.  |
| PR-B-1012 | Calum      | Miller  |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has highlighted that Oxfordshire County Council under the Park and Ride strategy issued in 27th May 2016, has proposed an expansion of the Oxford Park and Ride which is linked to the partial review. There is no proposal to create a slip road from the A34 to access the Park and Ride. There will be considerable congestion, urge you as part of this proposal to engage with Oxfordshire County Council to ensure this is changed. If not considered feasible due to cost, then consider installing a safe cycle route from Islip to North Oxford, allowing cyclist to avoid the additional traffic generated by the Park and Ride.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname            | Organisation                                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|--------------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1018 | Jon                | Waite              | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Woodstock Town Council | General      |                         |               | There are no specific comments on each question. However, response includes a report which sets out the strong objection to the level of housing proposed in the Plan in the Woodstock area. It questions the need; growth board estimates for housing and employment; SA assessment of the sites. It is also critical of not taking into account already approved 670 homes by West Oxfordshire DC; 2014 planning applications for 1,200 dwellings and their reasons for refusal; importance of World Heritage site and the impact of development on it. Almost doubling the size village, lack of infrastructure facilities, education, health, transport, in particular lack of sustainable transport measures such as buses and cycling.  |
| PR-B-1026 | Brian              | Simonds            |   | General      |                         |               | As a Begbroke resident object to the plans to build 4,400 houses North of Oxford. Where has Oxford City's figure come from. They can not expand on their GB but propose to build on ours instead. According to the national press Government Ministers are being urged to impose a ban on GB development until we have left the EU. Immigration would account for 37% for the demand for housing, if there is a reduction then the figure could be reduced to 1,600. According to an article in the Oxford Mail in November 4,400 homes are vacant in Oxfordshire. Begbroke, Fern Hill Road, A44 and Spring Hill all suffer with flooding this would be worse if built on the surrounding fields. The approved Eynsham village could have more than 2,000 homes has this been taken into account. This settlement would have a science and business park, so do this reduce the need for Oxford City. Local facilities, amenities, roads and transport are already at full capacity, these can not cope. Uphold the Government's policy and Cherwell's to protect the GB. |
| PR-B-1028 | Amanda and Michael | Roberts and Graham |   | General      |                         |               | Relating to Islip village. All proposed sites are GB. GB was established to prevent urban sprawl, inappropriate development and destruction of the countryside. Very careful consideration needs to be taken after all other possibilities have been exhausted. Islip has a defined conversation area which is to protect the historical features and buildings. CDC conversation area and appraisals document has Islip described as "special qualities which need to be preserved and enhanced." Section 18 of Management Plan states "The most serious threat to the character and appearance of Islip is the erosion of its rural character and open space." It also states that green space and surrounding fields are vital to the area.  |
| PR-B-1028 | Amanda and Michael | Roberts and Graham |   | General      |                         |               | Islip is a very small village, lacking in infrastructure, services and a significant traffic problem. The village is being used as a rat run to escape the congestion on the ring road or a short cut to the A40 and M40. The village and bridge were not designed to deal with this. The bridge is perilous to use but necessary for those on the south and in the main part of the village and adding more houses will increase the volume of traffic. Quote from CDC conversation area and appraisals document, "Despite road improvements to the north of Oxford, the centre of the village is still subject to an unfortunately high volume of through traffic. Further developments within or outside the conservation area would put pressure on the already congested roads. This detracts greatly from the tranquillity that this rural settlement would otherwise enjoy." The residents have to rely on cars, bus services have been reduced and the trains are very limited. The village shop is a community shop which has limited provisions.                |
| PR-B-1029 | Jane               | Verdon             |   | General      |                         |               | As a long term resident of Begbroke have grave concerns over the proposed plans to build 4,400 new homes around the village, incorporating Yarnton and Kidlington. Fully understand the need for more housing. If Green belt land is to be developed there must be a way to ensure it is for affordable housing, for local people. Under no circumstances should there be 4-5 bedroom houses for people moving out of London.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1031 | JF and MA  | Goodwin  |              | General      |                         |               | Concerns regarding the new housing around Begbroke and Yarnton. Living on Spring Hill Road this floods twice a year as the water runs off the fields like a river to where we live, by State Logic and the A44 roundabout. Building here would make matters worse. How will the A44 cope it take ages to cross the road to the bus stop now, this will get worse with the addition of more cars. Doctors are already busy how will they cope with extra patients. The wildlife and views from Spring Hill are exceptional and should not be lost.  |
| PR-B-1040 | Robert     | Dyson    |              | General      |                         |               | The Cherwell Local Plan 2011 – 2031 (Part 1) Partial Review, has details that are relevant only if the overall plan seemed sensible, and that tweaks were invited. Only know about this consultation because of the Kidlington Development Watch.  |
| PR-B-1041 | Debbie     | Payne    |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 homes on the GB around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Living in Enstone the A44 is the regular route taken for Oxford. There is already a serious traffic problem at rush hour like at Peartree which backs up to Yarnton. No alternative routes because Banbury Road through Kidlington and the A40 from Eynsham are the same. Only option is to travel cross country to avoid Yarnton and Woodstock.   |
| PR-B-1041 | Debbie     | Payne    |              | General      |                         |               | GB threat to Begbroke is significant. Kidlington is nearly a suburb of Oxford, the green spaces need to be maintained between Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke to prevent the urban sprawl of Oxford. The population would double with its scale and significantly alter the entire demographic of an historic area. My own business is feeling the effect after two roundabouts were enlarged this has not been an improvement, traffic is still an issue.  |
| PR-B-1041 | Debbie     | Payne    |              | General      |                         |               | Schools and medical centres are already at their capacity and the added influx in population will put an enormous strain on them. What proposals have been put in place to accommodate these children. Parking at the John Radcliffe is already an issue and there are long appointment times. Natural habitats are being destroyed pushing animals onto the A44. This area of Oxfordshire has already been developed enough, what with the new solar farm at the bottom of the A44, the Begbroke Science Park, the Airport and Motor Park all arriving in the last few years. There is no need for this many dwellings in this area.  |
| PR-B-1042 | Peter      | Robbins  |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to build houses on GB in and around Kidlington. GB designations were put in place for a reason, to precisely protect development that is being proposed now. The reasons for protecting GB are still valid, to merge Kidlington and Oxford into one large urban sprawl is not attractive. Roads, schools and supermarkets in and around Kidlington and Oxford currently can not cope. Access and parking at the John Radcliffe is already an issue and adds to stress that is not needed. This major piece of infrastructure is trying to cope with a far greater population than it was designed for, how will it cope with the influx of population to the area, it must not be subjected to this. |
| PR-B-1043 | Ruth       | Matthews |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 homes on the GB around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Living in Enstone the A44 is the regular route taken for Oxford. There is already a serious traffic problem at rush hour like at Peartree which backs up to Yarnton. No alternative routes because Banbury Road through Kidlington and the A40 from Eynsham are the same. Only option is to travel cross country to avoid Yarnton and Woodstock.   |
| PR-B-1043 | Ruth       | Matthews |              | General      |                         |               | GB threat to Begbroke is significant. Kidlington is nearly a suburb of Oxford, the green spaces need to be maintained between Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke to prevent the urban sprawl of Oxford. The population would double with its scale and significantly alter the entire demographic of an historic area. Own business is feeling the effect after two roundabouts were enlarged this has not been an improvement, traffic is still an issue.   |
| PR-B-1043 | Ruth       | Matthews |              | General      |                         |               | Schools and medical centres are already at their capacity and the added influx in population will put an enormous strain on them. What proposal have been put in place to accommodate these children. Parking at the John Radcliffe is already an issue and there are long appointment times. Natural habitats are being destroyed pushing animals onto the A44. This area of Oxfordshire has already been developed enough, what with the new solar farm at the bottom of the A44, the Begbroke Science Park, the Airport and Motor Park all arriving in the last few years. There is no need for this many dwellings in this area.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1045 | Nicole            | Evans     |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the consultation and the proposal for the large development(s) in and around Kidlington. The village can not sustain an influx of new residents and cars that it will inevitably bring. The current infrastructure can not support this growth. The GP surgery already struggles with appointments. This will add more stress to public services, including already over subscribed schools which are at capacity.   |
| PR-B-1048 | Wasim             | Mohammad  |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly oppose the application to build 4,400 new homes around the Kidlington area. The current infrastructure can not cope, the A34 is blocked every working day. It would take years to build this number of houses, resulting in misery for local residents and communities. Investment and people would be driven away from the local businesses and towns.  |
| PR-B-1049 | Maria             | Page      |              | General      |                         |               | Object wholeheartedly against the Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 where it shows intent to build its "whole" apportioned 4,400 new homes in the village of Kidlington. Have lived in the city of Oxford all my life and the past 17 years in Kidlington and have enjoyed the "atmosphere" of a village surrounded by open countryside protected by the green belt.  |
| PR-B-1050 | James             | Wright    |              | General      |                         |               | Wish to object to the provision of 4,400 houses to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs. We enjoy access to the open countryside. House and village borders GB and wish for this to be preserved in accordance with the five principals that the GB serves. To check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. Prevent towns merging. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. The roads are too busy and schools already over stretched with lack of places in Kidlington. Oxford's figure of 550 is inadequate. Oxford need to explore other options, like the speedway stadium at Crowley. Oxford has 300 empty properties, 59 of which have been empty for a number of years. Oxfordshire has 4,400 empty homes why build more. The homes will attract London commuters or from elsewhere, not meeting the local needs.     |
| PR-B-1052 | Andrew            | Mundy     |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. CDC have agreed to protect GB to renege this decision in unjust. Property is adjacent to a large field that regularly floods for up to half a mile. This land is unacceptable for development. |
| PR-B-1053 | David             | Hemingway |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should of done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.   |
| PR-B-1054 | Bharat and Jankee | Badiani   |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the housing proposals in Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-1056 | Simon             | Parker    |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable. The website is confusing and it is difficult to find the relevant information on how to respond. Poor publicity. Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness, rather than keep it from the public.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name                   | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1056 | Simon                        | Parker     |              | General      |                         |               | As a long time resident of Yarnton am absolutely appalled at the proposed development, which would join our village to others with the use of GB. It would take away paths and bridleways that have been used greatly over the years . Some have already been lost due to Yarnton Manor, have had to submit evidence forms to get these restored. Will these houses be affordable or suitable for the locals with children, who have had to move away due to house prices in the area. Seems that Oxford City would be the ones to benefit. Problems have already occurred with additional housing, drainage, excess water and blocked drains. The current infrastructure, road and transport needs to be sorted and improved. Rush hour traffic is an issue moving at a snails pace in and out of the city. On the A44 there's only one bus, while Kidlington has many that are not full. Divert some of these to the A44, so that Yarnton residents can access the shops, Oxford Parkway or Water Eaton P and R. Please carefully consider the terrible and detrimental effect this will have on the villagers who chose to live here. |
| PR-B-1057 | Julie                        | Walters    |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding the complicated process to object to the plans. Very difficult to find information as the plans on the website and the documents are very lengthy. This could put a lot of people off objecting.   |
| PR-B-1058 | Kim                          | Bennell    |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding the complicated process to object to the plans. Very difficult to find information as the plans on the website and the documents are very lengthy. This could put a lot of people off objecting.   |
| PR-B-1059 | Allan                        | Anderson   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposal for 4,400 new houses to the north of Oxford. It will unacceptably destroy the GB which CDC had committed to protect and which most Oxfordshire residents wish to retain. It will create urban sprawl with Oxford effectively joining with Woodstock and villages losing their ancient historical settings and identities. Adjoining countryside, scenery and rural pathways will be lost along with trees, hedgerows, ponds and the associated wildlife. There was a negative impact on Bats and Badgers with the creation of Begbroke science park. Local education and health services are already overstretched and roads congested. With the recent introduction of the rail link to Marylebone the new houses are likely to attract London commuters and so unlikely to meet local housing needs.  |
| PR-B-1061 | Eileen                       | Anderson   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposal of 4,400 new houses to the north of Oxford. It will unacceptably destroy the GB which CDC had committed to protect and which most Oxfordshire residents wish to retain. It will create urban sprawl with Oxford effectively joining with Woodstock and villages losing their ancient historical settings and identities. Adjoining countryside, scenery and rural pathways will be lost along with trees, hedgerows, ponds and the associated wildlife. There was a negative impact on Bats and Badgers with the creation of Begbroke science park. Local education and health services are already overstretched and roads congested. With the recent introduction of the rail link to Marylebone the new houses are likely to attract London commuters and so unlikely to meet local housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1062 | Danielle                     | Greenspan  |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the development of GB around Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton which is purposefully allocated to minimise urban sprawl and allow the preservation and integration of natural environments and habitats. Am aware of badger setts, bat colonies, Red Kites and lesser Spotted Woodpeckers, species of conservation concern. If the development of land is to make it financially productive then environmental technologies such as a wind or solar farm should be considered. The current infrastructure is barely sufficient despite recent improvements in North Oxford, and before the addition of 4,400 new houses.   |
| PR-B-1063 | Jeptha John Hammond<br>James | Rowan-Hull |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the housing proposal for Yarnton and Begbroke which will damage the beautiful English landscape. It will destroy our forefathers ridge and furrow landscape which has lasted for generations. It will also destroy an environment which is inhabited by a number of animals   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1066 | AR         | Currell   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed development around Kidlington which has had little publicity considering it will potentially have a big impact on our everyday living. Traffic will increase along with pollution, and health services and schools stretched further. GB with its walks will be lost and quality of life will suffer as air, light and noise pollution increases. A large village will become a town and question where the employment is coming from. CDC's existing policy along with the government's to protect the GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1067 | A          | Ioannides |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed plans for commercial and residential development on the GB between Yarnton and Begbroke. It would destroy the very little countryside left between these two villages already under stress due to lack of flood defences, health services and policing and the increasing pollution and traffic issues.  |
| PR-B-1069 | JP         | Lyes      |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to a consultation process that takes place after the key decisions have been made. The project is of profound importance to Kidlington and to be presented with a fait accompli in such a peremptory manner is insulting and indicative of unprofessional haste. The meeting appeared to be more about political ambition than resolving the pressing issue of affordable housing. No explanation has been offered as to why CDC is willing to solve Oxford City's unmet housing needs with a hefty cost to Cherwell ratepayers. The consultation is the least user friendly of any project I've seen and has all the hallmarks of ticking a box.   |
| PR-B-1070 | Darren     | Rea       |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the plans to develop on GB around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke and the five purposes that the GB serves should not be taken lightly by the council or disregarded. CDC have previously guaranteed to protect the GB. The preservation of the setting and special character of historic importance is being ignored. Spring Hill in Yarnton is of particular importance regarding King Charles removal from Oxford by Cromwell. There are pockets of GB that flood regularly and if at any point it affects us will hold CDC accountable. The road system is already stretched and adding 5800 more cars is unsustainable. Gaining entry to a nearby school is very difficult and there appears to be no forward planning with regards to school provision. There are many empty properties within Oxford, as many as 4,400 reported by the Oxford Mail, which should be used. Oxford City has forced the development needs onto CDC who should refuse its demands as SODC has done. |
| PR-B-1071 | Rachel     | Rea       |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposals to develop on land around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. The GB is one of the main reasons for choosing to live in the area and have concerns regarding flooding as a result of over-development. It cannot be feasible to create 4,400 new homes without infrastructure to support it. The roads are already congested and the introduction of another train station or tramline will impact on residential parking. There needs to be plans to accommodate all the additional children generated by these houses as schools are already at capacity.   |
| PR-B-1072 | Peter      | Gaskell   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed 4,400 homes around Kidlington, it is not sustainable and will increase pressure on local amenities and threaten the environment. Although new housing is needed in the UK thought needs to be given to the size and location. The local roads are already overcrowded and schools and health services insufficient to meet increased demand. GB designation is a permanent protection and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason to use GB. The government's manifesto promise and CDC's policy to protect GB must be upheld.   |
| PR-B-1074 | Donna      | Resek     |              | General      |                         |               | Object to plans to build 4,400 new houses in the Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington area. It would destroy walks, nature and wildlife. The roads are already congested and local flooding is a problem. The doctors are currently overstretched and the school in Yarnton oversubscribed.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1075 | Judith     | Kleinman   |              | General      |                         |               | How can Oxford City have less land available for development than Cherwell Council? Cherwell have spent years on their Local Plan and now have to accommodate 4,000 more houses. Bicester and the surrounding villages have already provided large amounts of farm and GB land. Oxford seem to prefer that other councils deal with the issue rather than use their own GB or brownfield sites. Bicester and Caversfield already suffer with the growing population and rapid expansion. Schools are over subscribed, there is a shortage of Doctors and medical facilities just to name a few.   |
| PR-B-1077 | Alyson     | Bateman    |              | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to the proposed building on GB surrounding Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. The road infrastructure would be overloaded as even now the A44 cannot cope when there are events at Blenheim Palace. There are fragile bat colonies around Begbroke Lane and a wide range of flora and fauna, typical of older land, Begbroke is mentioned in the Domesday book. CDC stated that 'Through our commitment to the Environmental Strategy and Local agenda 21 we aim to minimise the impact our activities have on the environment'. These aims cannot be achieved by adding 4,400 homes to a village of 345 houses. Begbroke Lane bridleway is used by many allowing access to the countryside. The three villages concerned do not want to become a suburb of Oxford but wish to maintain their own identities.  |
| PR-B-1080 | Mr and Mrs | Horne      |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-1081 | Lynn       | Pilgrim    |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and the possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable. CDC appears to be more concerned with following the process of consultation than considering the views of local residents and acting on what people are telling them.  |
| PR-B-1083 | Susan      | Knox       |              | General      |                         |               | Am opposed to plans to build 4,400 homes on GB around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. The government and CDC have both promised to maintain GB and the purpose it serves of checking urban sprawl, towns merging and preserving countryside and historic sites. Understand the need for more houses but are told there are 4,400 empty house within Oxford. These could be renovated and brownfield sites examined before encroaching on GB. Any development should follow the CDC plan, if South Oxfordshire can challenge the allocation so should CDC. This amount of houses would change the character of the village with its open spaces, birdsong, historical places and pathways. Local infrastructure is under extreme pressure with roads congested and doctors at capacity. Oxford Parkway is good but could create a big expensive dormitory town for London. |
| PR-B-1086 | Clare      | Boddington |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the building of 4,400 homes in GB to the north of Oxford, it will swamp Kidlington which will become an urban sprawl annexed to Oxford. The roads will not be able to cope with the increased traffic as they are already at capacity as are the schools and other services. There needs to be infrastructure plans in place. There appears to be no exceptional circumstances to justify developing on GB and the government and CDC's policy promises to protect it. The consultation process was inadequate as it was not well publicised and held over the Christmas period. At a meeting in January in Kidlington we were told the figure of 4,400 is final and likely to go ahead regardless of objections received.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1086 | Clare             | Boddington |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Do not destroy the GB which is of great importance and the government promised to protect.  |
| PR-B-1087 | Colin             | Homans     |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the building of 4,400 houses in the area of North Oxford and the villages of Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. There has been no explanation for the numbers required or an indication that all brownfield sites have been fully examined. What housing numbers have been allocated to greenfield sites within the city and other districts? Consideration needs to be given to the impact of the UK leaving the EU and how affordable housing will be achieved. Why have Plans for the Northern Gateway and scientific and industrial parks been granted if housing is required? The GB is an amenity for all, designed to prevent urban sprawl and preserve communities, it should only be built on in exceptional circumstances. The roads are very busy and Oxford Parkway has added to this. Any increase in traffic will increase levels of air pollution. What has happened to the plans for the new station for Kidlington at Flatford Place? Extra land will need allocating for the additional services and facilities that will be required for such a development. A plan as significant as this should not have been presented to local people in the month leading up to Christmas allowing little time for consideration and comment. |
| PR-B-1088 | Bryan             | Rugg       |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and that possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |
| PR-B-1090 | Richard and Karen | Walecki    |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the development of 4,400 homes being proposed for Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. These are areas of natural beauty and historical countryside enjoyed by many for recreation. The scheme goes against the GB policy that CDC agreed to in 2015. The local roads would not be able to cope with an increase in traffic and the bus services have been reduced. The local school and doctors surgeries are already at capacity and there is a flood risk in Begbroke. The proposed houses will create a dormitory town for London commuters as house prices are not balanced against wages.   |
| PR-B-1091 | Mark              | Bailey     |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. The main roads A34, A40 and A44 are already heavily congested and could not cope with additional traffic. The valuable countryside used for recreation should not be lost.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1093 | Christine        | Arthur   |              | General      |                         |               | Serious concerns regarding the proposed development around Begbroke and Yarnton in GB. The perceived housing needs are questionable and it's doubtful that developers would deliver houses for those who need it most, in particular key workers. Encroachment on GB contradicts CDC's own policy agreed in 2015 and the wishes of 76% of residents. Access to the sites would increase traffic considerably though the village and the A44 is already congested at peak times. The impact on local infrastructure would be negative, doctors and schools are already at capacity. Begbroke would lose its identity and become part of one sprawling expensive dormitory town for London commuters.  |
| PR-B-1093 | Christine        | Arthur   |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. There will be increased traffic on an already congested A44, threat to wildlife and loss of recreational facilities. The fields are unsuitable for development due to the flood risk. |
| PR-B-1098 | Michael          | Bott     |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website and the paperwork is long and challenging. The Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable. This rep. has sent a letter to his local MP Nicola Blackwood after attending the Kidlington Development Watch meeting at Exeter Hall. Object to the use of GB. The representatives from CDC were unable to address why they have accepted to look at Oxford City's shortfall. Criticism with the original survey and developers.  |
| PR-B-1102 | James and Kate   | Hamilton |              | General      |                         |               | There appears to be a lack of empathy for Kidlington from CDC. While other districts had time to reflect on the proposals, the exhibition at Kidlington was poorly timed at Christmas.   |
| PR-B-1103 | Margaret         | Homans   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the plans to build on the GB around Kidlington which should only be built on in exceptional circumstances.   |
| PR-B-1105 | Norman and Janet | Bates    |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the timing and conduct of the consultation which was poorly publicised. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.   |
| PR-B-1106 | Dr Anne          | Johnson  |              | General      |                         |               | Two heritage related objections to the proposal to build at the top of Noke Hill. The first on archaeological grounds as the whole area is an important historic landscape. It includes a Romano-Celtic temple complex and the site of Islip Roman villa and later prehistoric settlement. Both have been afforded protection by Historic England and until now the GB. My second objection is on literary and landscape grounds. Much has been written on the celebrated view from Noke Hill which probably inspired William Shakespeare and Lewis Carroll. Shakespeare may well have travelled through this area as the shortest route to London. It is also said that Carroll took inspiration from Noke Hill in his writing of Alice In Wonderland.  |
| PR-B-1107 | Susi             | Peace    |              | General      |                         |               | The impact of 100 houses in a small village such as Islip would be devastating. Small developments should be encouraged which have less impact, in particular the burden of additional traffic crossing the bridge.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1111 | Pat        | Clissold |  | General      |                         |               | Would like to make comments on CDC's local plan that identifies potential development sites in and around Weston on the Green, Wendlebury and Heathfield to assist Oxford's unmet housing need. The need for affordable housing is a concern for all however only where employment is a priority. Excessive development of GB will detract from the attractiveness of Oxford which currently attracts millions of tourists. Good planning should preserve the identity, beauty and peace of villages such as Weston on the Green, accommodating modest developments that don't require infrastructure changes or destroy their character. Traffic in and around Oxford is already a problem and the proposed developments will increase congestion and potential for accidents.  |
| PR-B-1117 | Georgina   | Tibbs    | Barton Wilmore on behalf of Bellway Homes Ltd and Archstone Projects Ltd | General      |                         |               | Bellway Homes Ltd and Archstone Projects Ltd submitted a full planning application (ref:16/02370/F) for 85 homes on land at Church Leys Farm, Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden in November 2016. We remain of the view that Ambrosden, and this site is a sustainable location to accommodate new housing to meeting the needs of the District, and the wider needs of the County.   |
| PR-B-1118 | Susan      | Doucas   |  | General      |                         |               | Have concerns over the local plans and invasion of GB. A lot of the houses would be sold to people from outside due to the railway link to London. The protection of agricultural land is essential to grow food. It provides clean air and is an asset to the city and surrounding villages. In the case of Spring Hill it is important historically and acts as a 'soak' during heavy rain. The roads cannot take any more traffic, Cassington Road is narrow and main roads are gridlocked in the mornings. Oxford should use every available space first including land for future commercial development.   |
| PR-B-1120 | Dr Ben     | Knighton |  | General      |                         |               | Support Yarnton PC's response to the consultation which makes clear some of the environmental consequences, particularly for flooding and destruction of the GB. Development would create an Oxford suburb and along with the Northern Gateway would create gridlock on the already congested roads. Take particular exception to the Sustainability Appraisal 8.22f. The plan would leave the three villages with little open space and there are not sufficient medical facilities. Schools provision also needs to be taken into consideration. If there is going to be a large development there needs to be a huge investment in infrastructure, funded by the profitable housing developers and Oxford City, not the taxpayers of CDC. Development is much more needed in other parts of England and Wales.  |
| PR-B-1120 | Dr Ben     | Knighton |  | General      |                         |               | If Oxford's housing needs have to be met then transport needs to be addressed. There must be a light railway system connecting North and South Oxford and two by-passes.   |
| PR-B-1125 | Bruce      | Cummings |  | General      |                         |               | Object to the building of 4,400 houses in and around Begbroke. The CDC consultation process has been woefully inadequate, the papers were lengthy and difficult to read and the loss of GB around Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington should have been highlighted. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable. GB land was designed to prevent erosion of the countryside and a space between villages and in 2015 CDC committed to preserve this. These villages are rich in history, culture and are part of the fabric of the county of Oxford. The proposals will create urban sprawl from Oxford to Woodstock, and do not want to live in a dormitory town for London or extension of Oxford. Land at the rear of Fernhill Road is prone to flooding. There would be an impact on residential roads that are quiet and narrow and could not cope with any significant increase. Oxford City should review its forecast following Brexit and review their contribution by looking at brownfield sites within their boundaries. |
| PR-B-1127 | David      | Betts    |  | General      |                         |               | Understand that the % of affordable housing required in Kidlington is 35% but in Oxford is 50%. Assume if sites are allocated in Cherwell for Oxford then the 50% figure will be adopted. Any development should be infrastructure led.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name           | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1128 | Tim                  | Edgington  |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the building of 4,400 houses around the GB area of Kidlington. Am not against new housing but the numbers need to reflect the present size of the village to prevent it from becoming a suburb of Oxford. The road network is already busy and will not be able to cope with any increase, neither will the school and doctors. GB should not be built on according to the NPPF unless there are exceptional circumstances.   |
| PR-B-1129 | Michael and Jo       | Collett    |              | General      |                         |               | Infrastructure in this area could not cope as the A34 and A44 are regularly gridlocked even with the new traffic system at Wolvercote roundabout. Schools are already under pressure and doctors at capacity. Feel strongly that use should be made of previously developed land in Oxford and some of the proposed employment sites. There is plenty of space at Osney, perhaps the old Blue Circle Cement works could be developed to make a new Garden Village. CDC should uphold its existing policy to protect GB and not succumb to pressure form Oxford City.  |
| PR-B-1131 | Gillian              | Hopcroft   |              | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to Kidlington meeting Oxford's unmet housing and believe CDC should have contested the amount allocated. Not enough consultation or flexibility has been used to consider the impact on Kidlington with regards to infrastructure and additional pressure on already congested roads. The GB must be protected as well as 'the gap' which has been well documented in the recently agreed adopted master plan. It was never the vision for Oxford to sprawl into Kidlington. It is disturbing that North Oxford Golf Club is a site being considered when Oxford City haven't considered Southfield Golf Course within the city. It is a recreational facility used by many and would not be easy to replace. Oxford City needs to look at providing more housing before employment for example the Northern Gateway. Pear tree Park and Ride would be a perfect site for housing if it is relocated as planned.  |
| PR-B-1134 | Neil                 | McKendrick |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and the possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. Given the importance of the partial review there should have been a summary leaflet to all residents potentially affected. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.   |
| PR-B-1135 | Terence and Patricia | Moss       |              | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to the proposed building of 4,400 houses on GB around Kidlington. This goes against the government's manifesto and exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated to use GB.  |
| PR-B-1137 | Jill                 | Drake      |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the proposals to help Oxford meet its housing needs. Traffic is already congested and there will be increased pressure on the schools and health service. The loss of GB with natural habitats and recreational space would be irrevocable to current residents and future generations. The land was deemed to be GB and protected for a reason. Realise there is a housing crisis and some development is inevitable. The government has announced a £1.2 bn fund aimed at building starter homes on brownfield sites so this could be a vital way forward. Residents are likely to accept a small increase in council tax if this was to develop brownfield sites and protect the GB. If the GB and village identities are to be sacrificed it must be for affordable houses for local people and key workers and not London commuters. This is a situation being played out across the country, it must be possible to find a model which maintains a reasonable balance. |
| PR-B-1138 | Rhian                | Pye        |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the proposals to help Oxford meet its housing needs. Traffic is already congested and there will be increased pressure on the schools and health service. The loss of GB with natural habitats and recreational space would be irrevocable to current residents and future generations. The land was deemed to be GB and protected for a reason. Realise there is a housing crisis and some development is inevitable. The government has announced a £1.2 bn fund aimed at building starter homes on brownfield sites so this could be a vital way forward. Residents are likely to accept a small increase in council tax if this was to develop brownfield sites and protect the GB.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1139 | Ken         | Martin   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the plans to build 4,400 homes around Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton. The figure is based on flawed and biased analysis that was influenced by property developers. CDC should challenge the figure as SODC have done or demand an independent review. Oxford City should look within its own boundaries and use available land for housing rather than business. Appreciate some houses are needed and the number proposed in Cherwell Local Plan 2015 was reasonable. The GB is rich in wildlife, highly valued by residents and prevents urban sprawl. It is clear this proposal will contravene the government's manifesto promise, CDC's 2015 policy and there is no exceptional circumstance to justify it. The local and main roads are already congested and have to support the local bus service. Local schools and health services are under pressure and will not be able to cope with the expansion.   |
| PR-B-1141 | Christopher | Villiers |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposals which encroach on GB for the needs of Oxford. The consultation and publicity within Oxford was inadequate. The housing shortage in Oxford is of their own making as land that is available is allocated to employment exacerbating the problem. If the GB has prevented Oxford city from expanding then why does the same not apply to Cherwell. In CDC's Local Plan adopted in 2015 GB was designated to restrain development pressures and exceptional circumstances to override this have not been demonstrated. If development were to go ahead around Kidlington it would not solve the housing problem as they will attract London commuters.   |
| PR-B-1142 | Alan        | Lodwick  |              | General      |                         |               | While it is appreciated the time and resource constraints the Council may be under, these are not acceptable reasons to produce an unsatisfactory and damaging plan. The Council appears to be obsessed with process rather than substance and to be sacrificing the Green Belt in the interests of getting a plan submitted quickly. Holding the consultation over the Christmas period with little publicity was unacceptable. There is a lack of strategic coordination of planning in Oxfordshire. Employment generating developments are encouraged in different districts without any reference to each other or to their overall consequences. What strategic planning exists is being imposed on the local Councils without consultation by unelected bodies such as the LEP and its unrealistic Strategic Economic Plan while the consultants undertaking analysis are not independent and their work is not subject to independent verification. There is a need for an overarching and fully democratically accountable body to take responsibility for strategic planning and truly independent and thorough analysis of future needs. This might best be done by the restoration of strategic planning powers to the County Council or by a new Unitary Oxfordshire Authority. Only through properly resourced and co-ordinated strategic planning can a sound plan be established and delivered and sustainable development achieved. |
| PR-B-1143 | Dr Pamela   | Roberts  |              | General      |                         |               | CDC's policies ESD 10 Protection and Enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment and ESD13 Local Landscape Protection and Enhancement should both be protecting such places from development. Building on many of the sites will contravene these policies.   |
| PR-B-1147 | Joan        | Tossell  |              | General      |                         |               | This decision is too important to be rushed, the priority is to get it right.   |
| PR-B-1148 | Terry       | Tossell  |              | General      |                         |               | This decision is too important to be rushed, the priority is to get it right.   |
| PR-B-1149 | Charles     | King     |              | General      |                         |               | Object to building 4,400 homes in and around Kidlington. Main roads into Oxford and through Kidlington are already congested with no space to increase capacity, and services and amenities overloaded. GB provides the green space that makes life pleasant for all ages. If GB is to be compromised, to provide housing for Oxford, it would be better to build a new Garden Town close to the existing main roads with the necessary infrastructure. Land on each side of the M40 between junctions 8a and 9 would have good access.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation            | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|-------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1150 | Rob        | Ellis   |                         | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to the proposals and the number of issues not addressed by the document. The unmet housing needs are based on assumption and unfounded assessments on jobs that currently don't exist. There is no definition of exceptional circumstances with regards to GB or justification of how the current situation could be classified as exceptional. There will be an impact on wildlife, traffic noise, congestion and pollution. Local facilities and services are not mentioned and need addressing, and the sites are prone to flooding. The characters of historic Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington will change as the merge together. Increasing Yarnton to the north will mean residents crossing the A44 to access services and amenities. There are many brownfield sites which should be considered i.e. upper Heyford. Transport infrastructure is already overloaded in and around Oxford so there should be no development until a rapid green transport system is in place. |
| PR-B-1153 | Roger      | Carter  |                         | General      |                         |               | Object to the building of 4,400 new homes around Kidlington. GB is intended to prevent urban sprawl, stop towns merging together and preserve the setting and special character of historic towns and villages. An application to build a football stadium on GB by Water Eaton Park was rejected two years ago. This number of houses would almost double the size of Kidlington which is prone to flooding. The roads couldn't cope with the increase in traffic and doctors and schools are at capacity. Journey times would become unrealistic and houses would attract London commuters.  |
| PR-B-1155 | Jeffrey    | Wright  | Begbroke Parish Council | General      |                         |               | The Consultation has been poorly publicised. Cherwell should have done more - especially via a Cherwell Link article and all other means to raise public awareness of possible loss of Green Belt with this revised local plan. State that, it was very difficult to find consultation details on the council website. The information has to be carefully sought in order to challenge findings - not easy for any people. The hand-out information at the Consultation was very limited in scope. Strongly feel that the Council failed to hold consultation meetings in parishes such as Begbroke, which could be very affected by these plans.   |
| PR-B-1159 | Tamsin     | Leckie  |                         | General      |                         |               | Am concerned at how badly publicised the consultation has been in Gosford and Water Eaton. Unlike Kidlington had no separate, dedicated planning meeting and were given little opportunity to voice our concerns at the Kidlington meeting. There might be fewer residents in our parish but our rights and concerns are just as relevant and our area stands to be much more radically changed.   |
| PR-B-1161 | Janet      | Warren  |                         | General      |                         |               | Do not believe that Cherwell should be expected to provide 4,400 houses for Oxford. It is unacceptable that Oxford is planning for more jobs when it's unable to provide housing to go with it, and this in itself causes house prices to rise. The number should be reduced for current need and not projected need. It would make sense to create jobs elsewhere in the country where employment opportunities are scarce and there is unoccupied housing. The impact of Brexit needs considering as it may affect university research funding and therefore jobs. GB should be retained in line with current legislation. Do not support SO18 as the starting point for transport. As carbon-based transport becomes less sustainable the development of jobs and homes together to reduce transport will make more sense and become more attractive, for employers and businesses alike.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation           | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1162 | Roger      | Bellamy    | Hornton Parish Council | General      |                         |               | Conclusion: The Parish Council opposes the plan.<br>Assumptions are individually flawed and cumulatively undermine the presumption of both the need and desirability for continued heavy development in the county.<br>Question whether the current level of housing targets are customer and not developer led.<br>Moving more and more medical facilities from Banbury to Oxford and building additional housing which will travel to Oxford doesn't make sense. If Oxford is not capable of meeting its housing need then investment in the Horton Hospital should be included in the infrastructure requirements to create necessary first class medical facility for increased population numbers. A guarantee should be written into the plan that the Oxford University Trust increase spending on this site rather the current plan of a reduction in the Horton's facilities and capacity. Cherwell should not accept additional housing development. |
| PR-B-1164 | Ian        | Drury      |                        | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposal that CDC should assist Oxford with 4,400 homes. Am not totally opposed to giving help but am opposed to the extent particularly when Oxford's contribution is 550 homes. Not convinced that sufficient scrutiny has been given to identifying areas within Oxford's boundaries. The proposal would be catastrophic for Kidlington and Begbroke, increasing the population by 9,000 with no infrastructure proposals. Services are already stretched including schools and traffic problems would be increased. Also concerned that at some point CDC may have additional housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1168 | Gwyn       | Bevan      |                        | General      |                         |               | Object to the plans to build an extra 4,400 houses on GB north of Oxford. It is unacceptable to build on this scale, not only will it destroy the countryside as a buffer against the city but also the infrastructure and services are currently overstretched. The road system is on the edge of chaos and schools, doctors and hospitals are at capacity. This development would not ease the housing pressure as Oxford Parkway has made North Oxford an attractive place for London commuters.  |
| PR-B-1169 | Simon      | Clark      |                        | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the planning proposal to build 4,400 new homes in Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. Appreciate the pressure from the government to meet housing targets but this needs to be instigated in a manner that is supported by existing residents. An area needs to be found that will allow for the new infrastructure of roads, schools and health services that will be needed. Brownfields sites should be considered as they meet this requirement. The open countryside with its wealth of GB land provides walks and makes this area attractive.   |
| PR-B-1171 | Mark       | Rowan-Hull |                        | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to any plans to develop on land surrounding the village of Begbroke, especially the western side. It would have a disastrous impact on the beautiful ancient countryside with its rare and historic ridge and furrow landscape and species such as rare butterflies as identified by BBONT 2012. It would ruin the identity of the community and increase congestion and pressure on transport around the local area. The GB has been strongly protected by the council and government thus far.   |
| PR-B-1171 | Mark       | Rowan-Hull |                        | General      |                         |               | This second rep provides a more lengthy and detailed objection to development around Begbroke with regards to ecological concerns and a BBONT survey. Begbroke has ancient fields and trees which house a great variety of flora and fauna and its easy access from Oxford means it is regularly used and enjoyed by many. To build on this ancient ridge and furrow landscape around Western Begbroke would be disastrous both aesthetically and ecologically. I understand the dire need for housing and sympathetic to the need for affordable housing but believe there are far more suitable and less fragile areas that could accommodate houses..   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1172 | Atul K     | Patel     |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the planning proposal to build 4,400 new homes around Kidlington which would be swallowed up by Oxford city. Suggest spreading the load more widely rather than concentrating in such a small area. Yarnton school is oversubscribed and the surgery under resourced with long waiting times, more homes would make this worse. The A34 and A44 are congested and journey times getting longer, more housing will exacerbate the problem. Traffic jams in housing areas increases pollution which has health implications. Land around the A44/A34 junction is consistently flooded and building could have an impact on communities further downstream.   |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis      | Davies    |              | General      |                         |               | CDC failed to give enough prior notice or publicity to the consultation. There was no exhibition in Begbroke and Yarnton despite the villages being potentially most affected. The documents are lengthy and complex so need considerable time to read. The consultation period should therefore have been longer and not presented before Christmas. The Cherwell Link failed to give any communication to the real issues including loss of GB. The Cherwell website is complicated and poor in giving details of the consultation process. The Cherwell representative at the Kidlington office was not well versed about the consultation.  |
| PR-B-1174 | Ellis      | Davies    |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. There hasn't been any convincing evidence for GB to be used for housing. Property developers and agents appear to have more say than the general public. Oxford should develop sites by increasing heights of buildings. |
| PR-B-1175 | Clare      | Cooper    |              | General      |                         |               | Consideration needs to be given to schools, doctors, traffic and recreation facilities if Kidlington is doubled in size.  |
| PR-B-1176 | Laura      | Pritchard |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and that possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable. Consideration needs to be given to providing school places and improving the infrastructure including shops.  |
| PR-B-1178 | Bryony     | Thomas    |              | General      |                         |               | Am concerned over the planned additional housing in the Kidlington area which will almost double the number of houses. The infrastructure cannot withstand any additional traffic as despite work on the roundabouts at Cutteslowe and the Woodstock Road there is still congestion. There has been an increasing number of fatal accidents. Development would be better within the city where office blocks and industrial sites are planned or to the South with access to Cowley. Banbury could also be considered as a centre for employment. The proposed areas include GB which is a permanent designation and government guidance states that unmet housing is not a reason for building on it. The government's promise and CDC's existing policy to protect the Green Belt should be upheld. The many footpaths are well used for leisure and health.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1179 | Andrew     | Clark   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposal to build 4,000 houses in North Oxford particularly around Yarnton. The infrastructure around North Oxford even with recent renovations to Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts is not sufficient to cope with the increase from such a big development. Most of the predicted growth is around the Science Vale to the South and roads will not cope with this. Pollution will increase and road safety decrease. GB is meant to be protected it allows wildlife to thrive and move, stops urban sprawl and retains the identity of communities. Brownfield sites need to be considered, as is being done elsewhere.  |
| PR-B-1183 | Annie      | Kotak   |              | General      |                         |               | Am opposed to the plans to build 4,400 houses on the GB around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. A plan is needed to recycle, reuse and renew existing buildings to create new, environmentally efficient homes to meet demand. GB should not be destroyed, it prevents urban sprawl and is a natural habitat for wildlife. It provides walks and scenery for our well being and retains the character and identities of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington villages. Development would put us in danger of flooding and increase pollution which will have an impact on health, wildlife and the environment. There is insufficient infrastructure in place with roads already congested and medical facilities overloaded.  |
| PR-B-1184 | Noresh     | Kotak   |              | General      |                         |               | Am opposed to the plans to build 4,400 houses on the GB around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. A plan is needed to recycle, reuse and renew existing buildings to create new, environmentally efficient homes to meet demand. GB should not be destroyed, it prevents urban sprawl and is a natural habitat for wildlife. It provides walks and scenery for our well being and retains the character and identities of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington villages. Development would put us in danger of flooding and increase pollution which will have an impact on health, wildlife and the environment. There is insufficient infrastructure in place with roads already congested and medical facilities overloaded.  |
| PR-B-1186 | Christina  | Miskin  |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Object to the destruction of open countryside and damage to the environment, flora and fauna. The scale of the proposals will lead to the complete loss of all village identities. |
| PR-B-1187 | Nigel      | Homent  |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1189 | Bella      | Kotak       |              | General      |                         |               | Am opposed to the plans to build 4,400 houses on the GB around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. A plan is needed to recycle, reuse and renew existing buildings to create new, environmentally efficient homes to meet demand. GB should not be destroyed, it prevents urban sprawl and is a natural habitat for wildlife. It provides walks and scenery for our well being and retains the character and identities of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington villages. Development would put us in danger of flooding and increase pollution which will have an impact on health, wildlife and the environment. There is insufficient infrastructure in place with roads already congested and medical facilities overloaded.  |
| PR-B-1190 | Fiona      | Thomas      |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the proposed building of 4,400 houses around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. Speculative job creation, in an area which does not have an unemployment problem and will increase demand for housing does not justify building on GB. Infrastructure of roads, hospitals and schools will be stretched and there is criticism of the planning abilities to deliver a solution to this, based on the proposals. GB is a permanent designation and unmet housing needs is not a reason to destroy it, the government's manifesto promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld. Oxford City should not be building business parks and shopping centres if they need houses. Concerns regarding existing road congestion and health issues linked to pollution. The green space with its flora and fauna, ancient meadows and beautiful walks needs protecting. |
| PR-B-1191 | Simon      | Eaton       |              | General      |                         |               | Oxford has failed to manage its transport, economic development and housing stock. It has failed to redevelop its housing resources by working with the university and landowners and this should not be shouldered by the GB around Oxford. Building additional houses on the GB will increase the numbers commuting resulting in longer delays which impacts on costs for local and non-local business. Oxford needs to build more medium rise accommodation within the city for students and other residents. There needs to be consideration given to creating economical growth and jobs outside Oxford and a plan for education and transport.  |
| PR-B-1193 | Lucy       | McCurdy     |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed building around Kidlington, particularly to the loss of GB. Additional houses would increase traffic and pollution and overstretch schools and doctors. GB, which is a place of beauty, is used and enjoyed by many and a habitat for wildlife. It also provides a safe place for horse riding. The development is based on the possibility that housing will be required and not an immediate need.   |
| PR-B-1194 | John       | Woodward    |              | General      |                         |               | The planning consultation appears to contradict the local plan which stated that Begbroke and Yarnton should remain separated from Kidlington and Oxford. Understand the need for more houses but can't understand why GB around our villages should be destroyed. The Shipton-on-Cherwell cement works and quarry north of Kidlington should be considered. It is a brownfield site that is next to the main railway line which would reduce the impact on road traffic. The traffic on the A44 is busy and crossing to the bus stop almost impossible. Car speeds make the road dangerous as does the roundabout no longer fit for purpose.   |
| PR-B-1196 | Elaine     | Fullard MBE |              | General      |                         |               | Council urged to reconsider destroying the GB and instead focus on denser housing on brownfield sites. The thick hedges that are a habitat for smaller birds are non-existent with new houses.  |
| PR-B-1197 | George     | Purves      |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the proposed plans to use the GB which would not benefit Kidlington as it has very few green spaces.   |
| PR-B-1197 | George     | Purves      |              | General      |                         |               | Kidlington should not make up the short fall for Oxford's housing plans and be turned into a suburb. Colleges should be forced to build student accommodation within their grounds thus releasing rented properties in the city. Colleges also own vast amount of lands in and around the city. Oxford's need is questionable given the statistics and houses would not be generally affordable but provide developers with huge profits. The new development at Barton may mean there is no housing need   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1197 | George             | Purves    |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Kidlington should not take Oxford's overspill when there is vacant land and properties within its boundaries at Botley, Cowley and Headington.  |
| PR-B-1199 | Nick               | King      |              | General      |                         |               | Whilst appreciating the need for new housing there are numerous possibilities for brownfield development that won't cause such catastrophic and irreparable damage to the environment. Plans to build on land between Cutteslowe Park and the A34 will spoil the views, the GB, and impact on recreational facilities. There is insufficient infrastructure to support the homes proposed in particular roads.   |
| PR-B-1204 | Ruth               | Smith     |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to 4,400 homes being built in the GB around Kidlington and the surrounding area. Kidlington at present is poorly serviced with regards to infrastructure and facilities and if these were addressed the local community may be more receptive to proposals. The new road layouts at Wolvercote and Summertown have added to the congestion in Kidlington and the access to the new train station has not improved the traffic situation. Building on GB land will cause localised flooding as Kidlington is prone to flood.  |
| PR-B-1205 | Karen              | Jackson   |              | General      |                         |               | Strong objection to the proposal to build 4,400 houses in Yarnton and Begbroke over and above the already agreed building plans. The identity of the villages and GB would be lost to urban sprawl which CDC had promised to protect in 2015. The infrastructure cannot cope at present with roads heavily congested and a proposed bus lane unlikely to alleviate problems. Additional traffic will increase pollution affecting the wildlife and villagers health. House prices in Kidlington have increased since the completion of Oxford Parkway so the development is likely to create a dormitory town for London and unlikely to solve Oxford's housing needs.   |
| PR-B-1206 | Carol              | Broadbent |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposal to build on GB around Yarnton which would be unsustainable without more infrastructure. Doctors are at capacity and parking around the primary school is limited and dangerous at present. The village provides access to the countryside to get the exercise the government is encouraging to stay fit and healthy. It does not want to become part of Oxford and provide homes to London commuters. Appreciate there is a need for development which would be better as a new village with its own infrastructure.  |
| PR-B-1207 | Douglas and Louise | Lloyd     |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and the possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It was difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they were long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable.   |
| PR-B-1208 | Hilary             | Hastings  |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Whilst understand the need for development it would create an urban sprawl and take away GB which protects the character of villages. Local infrastructure is already struggling, as are schools, health services and wildlife. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1209 | Rupert     | Page      |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly disagree to building 4,000 houses in and around Kidlington which are not required. Traffic problems will increase, and schools and health services will be stretched. GB with walks and views will be lost, and natural habitats destroyed. Quality of life will suffer, with air, noise and light pollution increasing.   |
| PR-B-1209 | Rupert     | Page      |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to further development of Kidlington and the surrounding GB. The infrastructure is not available as schools, doctors and roads are already at capacity. The land is used for many leisure activities.   |
| PR-B-1210 | Tina       | Merry     |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposals to build 4,400 homes around Kidlington with little consultation and what appears to be little chance to review the plan. It is not viable for Kidlington to sustain this development as roads are congested, shops inadequate and schools and doctors full. The village of Kidlington surrounded by spectacular countryside will be turned into an overpopulated, under resourced concrete jungle with traffic congestion, air, noise and light pollution.  |
| PR-B-1210 | Tina       | Merry     |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-1211 | Natasha    | Smith     |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to the proposed development of GB around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington where infrastructure is already overloaded. The A44 is unable to cope with traffic volumes despite recent improvements and more housing would bring more pollution and environmental damage. Pressure would increase on GP's and schools and the service they offer would inevitably suffer. There would be an impact on the wildlife that can be seen in the surrounding fields. The proposed development goes against every promise made by CDC and the government regarding GB. All three villages would ultimately lose their individuality. This rep provides details taken from the government site that states the aims of GB, paragraphs 79 to 92. Attention is drawn to paragraph 89 that states the exceptions to building on GB. |
| PR-B-1212 | Penelope   | Henderson |              | General      |                         |               | Object to building 4,400 new homes in Kidlington and taking away the green space that makes the village an attractive place to live. The green space provides the fresh air and exercise that keeps people healthy and is home to many species of wildlife. The land is also prone to flooding when the river level is high and has reached gardens at The Moors.   |
| PR-B-1215 | Malini     | Perera    |              | General      |                         |               | Am distressed to learn CDC is considering a large housing scheme close to Gosford. This small GB area is valuable for leisure and exercise. Any increase in the population will add to the traffic congestion and noise pollution. Water Eaton Lane and the adjacent field is water logged during heavy rain and would get worse with any development. The newly built railway station attracts people from outside so most local people will not be able to afford the new houses.   |
| PR-B-1218 | Maureen    | Rosenberg |              | General      |                         |               | As a Lakeside resident have concerns about this project in particular the access to it from Linkside Avenue/Lakeside. Access from this area would increase noise pollution to an area that is already suffering from increased noise from the new train line. These quiet roads will no longer be safe areas of play and it will have a detrimental affect on the environment which needs protecting.   |
| PR-B-1219 | SP         | Weston    |              | General      |                         |               | Concerns regarding the proposed building under review for Kidlington and the surrounding area. The greenfield site at The Moors is well used by many for recreation and to enjoy the abundance of wildlife. Concerns for the school class sizes generated by the increase in numbers.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1220 | Heddwen    | Hewis    |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly oppose the development proposals at Spring Hill, Yarnton, which has the potential to cause serious flooding in the village. As the name suggests it is a source of numerous springs, and after heavy rain water rushes down the hill often flooding the road and some of the properties below. It is also an area of nature beauty with historic pathways and in the GB. Local roads are already congested, schools oversubscribed and the health service struggling.  |
| PR-B-1237 | Deborah    | Wright   |              | General      |                         |               | Wish to object to the provision of 4400 houses to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs. The Green Belt should be preserved, access to countryside should be enjoyed and do not wish to be joined to other settlements or to Oxford. Infrastructure is already overloaded, roads are too busy. Oxford could do far more to provide housing by exploring other options such as building on the old greyhound stadium. There are 4400 empty homes why build more? Oxford's own provision is inadequate, homes will be for commuters, consultation period was deliberately at a time of year when some people are away. Information has been difficult to find.  |
| PR-B-1246 | Christine  | Kennell  |              | General      |                         |               | Object to proposals to build 4,400 new houses north of Oxford based on assumptions of growth. Oxford City should make better use of existing areas within the city boundaries, particularly in the area of Cowley and Blackbird Leys where there are large employers. The site of Southfield golf course should be considered for houses and land around Pear Tree Park and Ride. Strongly object to development within the GB around Kidlington, which is pleasant and unspoilt, with footpaths and walks by the canal and river used and enjoyed by many. Developing north of Oxford will increase traffic problems and air, light and noise pollution. Public services will be overstretched resulting in increased crime rates. |
| PR-B-1247 | Mark       | Turner   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the number of houses being proposed for Kidlington village and the surrounding area. The infrastructure is not sufficient enough to meet the traffic needs and lacks the shops and amenities to cope with such a large housing development.   |
| PR-B-1248 | Christine  | Clark    |              | General      |                         |               | As residents of Yarnton are bewildered why Oxford City are being allowed to consider destroying our village. Yarnton and Begbroke have been here for centuries and our GB, history and way of life are precious. Our walks and historical settings are there to share with anyone who wants to enjoy the open spaces and beautiful scenery to get away from towns. There are many empty houses in and around Oxfordshire which should be refurbished as the infrastructure is already in place and would be quicker and cheaper. Most of any new houses are likely to be sold to people in London due to the proximity of Oxford Parkway creating an unwanted dormitory town. People should have choices how they live.             |
| PR-B-1249 | Andy       | Cove     |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to plans to build a significant number of houses around Begbroke and Yarnton. This land is GB, used by local people to enjoy the village environment and take advantage of the countryside for walks, discover the ancient history and local community activities. It is not acceptable to create one large urban sprawl joining Oxford to Woodstock. The roads are busy and the hospitals and surgeries are overwhelmed and cannot accommodate any more people.  |
| PR-B-1254 | Philip     | Redpath  |              | General      |                         |               | The figure of 4,400 is an addition to those recently adopted by the Cherwell Local Plan. The figures are based on an assumed requirement and are disproportionate to the actual needs of the area. The country is already over populated and cannot sustain the housing numbers that are set by the government. The areas favour developers, however increase pollution, a loss of landscape which causes concern for all local communities.  |
| PR-B-1255 | Kezia      | Sheppard |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism that it was difficult to understand the documentation, it was lengthy, confusing and full of jargon. This makes it very difficult to respond to what is an important issue. Will favour the developers in deterring people from expressing their views.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname             | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1260 | Elizabeth  | Sheppard            |              | General      |                         |               | You have made it extremely difficult for the public to respond to this consultation. The paperwork is long, confusing and the language is challenging. Due to this have not had the time or ability to respond to all of the questions. Am sure that many will be deterred from providing their views. Such an unfair advantage for the developers and other interested parties who will have the knowledge and resources to deal with this sort of obfuscation.  |
| PR-B-1264 | Drs        | Slater and Harrison |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. The timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable. Many concerned residents of Kidlington and the local area remain unaware of the plans. It was not reasonable to give such a short notice period for people to respond, considering that CDC have time to produce this. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and the paperwork is long and challenging.   |
| PR-B-1265 | Kathleen   | Hayes               |              | General      |                         |               | There has been no communication in Yarnton with regards to the proposals and residents have therefore been denied the opportunity to take part in the consultation. The time to respond was short and the documents difficult to access and understand. Am surprised that households in Yarnton and Begbroke were not informed of such a major development that will change the character of the villages and put pressure on local infrastructure, amenities and services. Acknowledge the need for affordable housing in Oxford and the need for county assistance where possible, but not the allocation. Priority should be given to approved Local Plan for Cherwell's needs before the additional 4,400 for Oxford's needs. |
| PR-B-1265 | Kathleen   | Hayes               |              | General      |                         |               | Destruction of the GB would be detrimental to the residents of both the city and district and CDC had undertaken to protect it. Development should only take place if it is beneficial to all parties and when there is no other option. The GB retains Begbroke and Yarnton's character and identity and provides walks and leisure for all to enjoy. The GB is largely farmed providing food and employment, both of which would be lost  |
| PR-B-1265 | Kathleen   | Hayes               |              | General      |                         |               | There is already considerable pressure on local services in the area which would be made worse by the proposals. Medical services are stretched in Yarnton and all other amenities are in Kidlington which are only accessible by car since the bus service was withdrawn. Any new development around the A44 would increase traffic problems and noise and air pollution. There is no bus service to Oxford Parkway or Water Eaton Park and Ride facility. If there were any benefits to implementing the current proposals they would be far outweighed by the devastation of the local area and reduced quality of life for all residents.   |
| PR-B-1266 | Linda      | Ward                |              | General      |                         |               | As a general point, the consideration of an extra 4,400 houses around the villages closest to Oxford's GB represents a major change of Cherwell strategic planning policy as set out in the current Local Plan. This was to focus growth in the towns, protect GB and spare villages from being swamped. Do not think it is reasonable to treat this as a partial review. This, in normal sane times would require a full review to consider sustainability / feasibility impacts across the District.  |
| PR-B-1266 | Linda      | Ward                |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the timing and conduct of the consultation process. Criticism regarding the procedure for consultation to destroy GB. Also criticism over the publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website and the paperwork is long and challenging. The Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable. The district and City Council need to co-ordinate a full public consultation on the retention of GB since this impacts us all.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1267 | Ian        | Hudspeth  |   | General      |                         |               | The key issue is that the demand is for Oxford City, therefore the houses should be located near there along with commercial developments to provide jobs. Acknowledge there is a demand for affordable housing especially for the young. The A44 and A4260 corridor has excellent public transport routes into Oxford and London, along with good connections to the A34, M40 and M4. The area is a good choice for development but need to protect individual communities and avoid coalescence of villages.   |
| PR-B-1267 | Ian        | Hudspeth  |   | General      |                         |               | GB has served us well, but now acts as a constraint which needs to be revised. Do not advocate building on all of the GB, but need to consider the land and see if it is serving its community. Should develop on green corridors which reach out to the countryside, so that we can develop excellent sustainable transport links such as quality cycle and footpaths. If GB land is released areas currently adjacent should be considered for inclusion into a revised GB and corridor, like Woodstock. Development near Woodstock can only be done if the entire required infrastructure is taken into account and is worked with WODC. GB land that isn't fit for purpose is land between the Science Park and the railway line. It is poor quality farmland with little value and would be good for development with no coalescence between Begbroke and Yarnton. Oxford Parkway station has land to the south east on GB which would be good for development of houses or world class sporting and recreational activities. The ice rink and stadium would allow for housing in these areas reducing the demand outside Oxford. To the north of Kidlington would encourage residents to use cars which adds to congestion. Potential in the area is great. A master plan needs to identify the infrastructure along with indications to the phasing of any development. Released GB must be replaced and communities' identities respected. |
| PR-B-1268 | Garry      | Lancaster |   | General      |                         |               | The consultation materials on the CDC website were lacking in brevity and quite difficult to follow. Was unable to find a map of Kidlington with all proposed sites marked. Please improve this aspect for any future consultations.   |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells     | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | General      |                         |               | The Parish Council is extremely concerned by the huge volume of complex new reports issued for consultation. It is also concerned about the tight timescales for the review. It is unreasonable to launch these proposals on the local community so late in the 2 year process. A detailed statement on the Green Belt, Oxfordshire Growth Board, and Kidlington Masterplan SPD is provided in paragraphs 1.01 to 1.18 of the representation.  |
| PR-B-1269 | Deirdre    | Wells     | Red Kite Development Consultancy on behalf of Kidlington Parish Council | General      |                         |               | Conclusions: The expectation that Cherwell has a capacity to provide 4,400 new homes to meet Oxford's needs is not well explained and that this should be urgently provided. The current position is that the principle of accommodating growth in Cherwell, and the scale, remains unconfirmed, and is subject to assessment as to whether it is compatible with other material considerations. The importance of the Green Belt around Oxford is highlighted and that its function is to prevent coalescence with other settlements and to protect the countryside from encroachment. These objectives remain of major importance today and for the future. Concerned about the impact on air quality due to significant new housing in the absence of any realistic funding and delivery of new strategic infrastructure and improvements which cannot/will not be delivered by developers, the substantial growth indicated is not sustainable and should be rejected. Are concerned about the likely adverse impact on the viability of the character, cohesion and individuality of the village, the village centre and planned enhancement of the village (Kidlington Masterplan SPD). Are not convinced by the scores allocated to various factors in the SA. Many of the factors do not show a significant difference between the various search areas. More detailed work is required before any valid conclusions can be demonstrated.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1270 | P and H          | Stoddart |              | General      |                         |               | Regarding paragraphs C.247 and C.248 set out in the local plan can areas of search F to I be deleted from this review? What is going to be the impact of the 2,200 dwellings at Eynsham. Will this just impact West Oxfordshire's commitment of 2,750 or will it impact Cherwell's 4,400 commitment? Eynsham is in close proximity to West Oxfordshire's border with Cherwell as well as with Oxford itself and therefore satisfies the principle of housing being as close as possible to where the need arises –see the second bullet point in paragraph 3.31. Housing is being built close to where the requirement is needed. Have CDC given consideration to North Oxford's Golf Club. , which covers 80 acres, thus providing 1,600 dwellings of the 4,400 commitment from Cherwell. This land has good access to the road and public transport. It is close to Oxford Parkway and Water Eaton P and R for easy access to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-1275 | Dagmar           | Carr     |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. The Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.   |
| PR-B-1276 | John             | Carr     |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. The Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.   |
| PR-B-1277 | Roger and Eileen | Henman   |              | General      |                         |               | Object in the strongest terms to the Council's proposals for residential and other developments between Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton. The Oxford GB was created specifically to protect Oxford's setting, to prevent coalescence of villages such as Begbroke, Kidlington and Yarnton and to prevent urban sprawl. The proposal's are completely unacceptable and should be rejected. The short notice for residents to attend the consultation at Kidlington was an attempt to limit the number of objections. This is not acceptable.   |
| PR-B-1278 | Helena           | Boyce    |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised by CDC, they should have done more to inform people of the intentions to revise the local plan. It is potentially putting enormous pressure on the infrastructure of the community, such as traffic, schools and GP's. Along with the destruction of a substantial amount of GB in the area.  |
| PR-B-1279 | Neil             | Bennett  |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways.  |
| PR-B-1279 | Neil             | Bennett  |              | General      |                         |               | After attending Begbroke Village Hall was shocked to discover the extent of the proposed developments. Firmly reject these plans and urge your commitment to preserving GB, which CDC made in 2015. The plans will destroy our village and GB along with some historic walks such as Frogwelldown Lane, which has been documented being used by the King of England during the English Civil War. Infrastructure currently can not cope. The roads are full of potholes and repairs to these are long overdue. Living in Yarnton some of the proposals to build are only half a mile away from my house. Concern is with flooding due to amount of development, where will the water that drains into the ditches go? Schools, NHS and amenities are already over stretched along with the cuts. If struggling now to recruit where do we expect teachers and doctors to come from with the increase in house prices. Where are the new residents expected to work, and how will they travel to the area, by car which will add to the already congested roads. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1282 | John       | McArthur |              | General      |                         |               | Residents of Sibford Ferris and directly affected by the two proposed sites. Not in favour of Cherwell Councils Part 1 for these two sites being considered for development of 100+ houses. Also not in favour of Part 2 for these sites as potential for affordable housing of 10-99 homes. Sibford Ferris is an independent village which over 50 years has increased its house numbers from 50 to 100, and have had our fair share of development. It is critical that there is good public transport with new developments. There is only one single bus service in the morning and evening which is very restricting. The rep. has provided a list of recent, current or new developments in and around Banbury that are built or waiting to be built, many still waiting for buyers. It's questionable as to why we need to keep on developing, have these sites been taken into consideration?   |
| PR-B-1282 | John       | McArthur |              | General      |                         |               | These are the issues that would like to highlight regarding Sibford Ferris. With the average house prices in Sibford Ferris at £431,000 affordable housing would only be affordable for cash buyers or those on a large incomes as Oxfordshire is expensive and still out of the range of many. The geographical factor seems to have been overlooked or ignored for affordability. When affordable housing has been built the S106 agreement can be lifted after three months if not sold, this could prevent locals being able to buy these properties. The road is very narrow at Little London and on the Main Street the current issues would increase with more traffic. No parking outside the shop. The sewage works will not cope. There is a listed building near to the sites and what would the impact be on the long standing badger set?  |
| PR-B-1282 | John       | McArthur |              | General      |                         |               | There is criticism regarding the list of facilities and infrastructure the landowner for these two sites has produced. Sibford Ferris has no Doctor's surgery, primary school, church, public house and no village hall. Broadband is average and there are limited bus services. There is a private fee paying school and the small convenience store also houses the post office.   |
| PR-B-1285 | Jeffrey    | Wright   |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the provision of 4,400 houses to meet Oxford's unmet housing needs. House and village is within a GB and wish to preserve this in accordance with the five GB purposes. Check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. Prevent the merging of towns. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Assist urban regeneration with the encroachment of recycling derelict and other urban land. Preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Infrastructure is already overloaded and roads are too busy. We enjoy the open countryside and do not wish to be joined to other settlements. Oxford could do far more, their own provision is not enough. Have they considered building on the old speedway stadium. Oxford has 300 empty properties, 59 have been empty for a number of years. Oxfordshire has 4,400 empty homes why build more. These homes will be destined for London commuters and not meet the local needs. |
| PR-B-1285 | Jeffrey    | Wright   |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism at the timing of the consultation over the Christmas period when many people are away and are focused on other issues. Many of the proposals are complex but most know that they want GB to be preserved.   |
| PR-B-1288 | Maurice    | White    |              | General      |                         |               | Would like to register objection to the proposals on the basis that the potential addition of over 4,000 dwellings is overwhelmingly large and will largely occupy GB. The character of the area would be impacted. Particular concerns with the roads as these already suffer during the rush hours to and from Oxford despite recent improvements. There is a threat to the recreational amenities for the locals and also the wildlife and their habitats. Local services are under stress and new provision for these lags behind adding to that stress. Long waiting times at GP's, schools are already overcrowded.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1288 | Maurice    | White   |              | General      |                         |               | The value of GB has been clearly underwritten in the NPPF. NPPG states that unmet housing on GB would only be considered under very special circumstances. Locally there is a need for low cost, affordable housing to allow locals and key workers to remain in the area. Private developers would not provide this and evidence of current local building is to cater for well off commuters and private landlords who will buy the cheaper housing. Limiting the number of houses may be considered acceptable and limiting the increase in local employment that has people moving against the peak flow. Not however at the expense of any valuable recreation amenity. The North Oxford Golf Course has land considered for development to which I'm concerned as football, cricket and rugby spaces already under threat, so this needs protecting. Residents require access to open green spaces near to the canal and the River Cherwell as these act as a recreational parkland. Fundamentally, in favour of the original structure plan for Oxfordshire that allowed for the development of towns such as Banbury and Bicester rather than Oxford in order to ease development problems. The proposed plans are a developers dream, properties will be expensive, aimed at commuters and have no impact on house prices. Itsi questionable why Oxford has gone for jobs on it's Northern Gateway site if housing was such a problem. |
| PR-B-1289 | Berwyn     | Jones   |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Main concern is the destruction of GB. Understanding is GB can only be built on in exceptional circumstances. A recent report claims there are 4,400 homes unoccupied homes across Oxfordshire.You cannot justify the destruction of GB.   |
| PR-B-1289 | Berwyn     | Jones   |              | General      |                         |               | A number of bus services have been lost over the years and the cycling infrastructure in and around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington needs regenerating. Traffic in and out of Oxford during rush hour is extremely heavy and any new developments will only add this problem. The local health service is already overstretched, it can take up to three weeks for an appointment, this is not good and will only get worse with an increase in the population in the area.  |
| PR-B-1290 | John       | Perris  |              | General      |                         |               | The Sibford Ferris sites are unsuitable in terms of infrastructure, the rural road network, its rural character, and the impact on the surrounding countryside. The Oxfordshire County Council transport policy aims to reduce pressure on the road network by encouraging housing close to jobs. Sibford Ferris has no train, no taxi and poor bus service the timetable of which would not allow commute to Oxford via Banbury. The road connection to Sibford Ferris is one B road and unclassified roads making it unsuitable for commuting. There is no school or doctors and the sewage system is already overloaded. The sites are close to the Cotswold ANOB and adjoin village conservation areas.   |
| PR-B-1291 | Kumudu     | Perera  |              | General      |                         |               | Agree to only 600 new houses being built in the Kidlington area. As long as you have the provision to build extra schools or extend Gosford Hill. A lot of the surrounding area could benefit from an upgrade of the street lights to LED lighting as many are old.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname               | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------------|-----------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1292 | Christine          | Bower                 |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to build 4,400 house on the GB north of Oxford, residents of Kidlington chose to live here to be away from the hustle and bustle of a major city. GB offers residents fresh air less noise and light pollution and enjoyment of the open countryside. To build on GB between Oxford, Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton would change the area to one massive urban sprawl. The countryside and nature needs to be protected, not destroyed, keep the open space rather than encourage living in a concrete jungle. The local infrastructure will not be able to cope with the additional houses. Kidlington's high street needs improvement to the shops, not a reduction in the size of a supermarket to make way for flats. Traffic, schools and health services would be far greater stretched. Flooding is an issue in the area, to build on flood plains would lead to disaster. Proposal based on incorrect assumptions about job growth in Oxford. There are alternatives to building on GB which would protect historic Oxford. Make better use of previously developed land and using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing instead. There must be an alternative and between Oxford City and CDC hope that you are able to find one. |
| PR-B-1293 | Diane              | Perry                 |              | General      |                         |               | Strong objection to housing proposal. The roads are already busy and journey times long. Traffic is a hazard in Bladon. There is a lack of facilities to accommodate more people or housing.  |
| PR-B-1296 | Graciela Inglesias | Rogers                |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism with holding the consultation over the Christmas period. Having attended the exhibition on Exeter Hall, left more confused and demoralised. Criticism regarding the documentation that was present at the exhibition. A very resilient and patient planning officer did his best to convey the details about the proposals.   |
| PR-B-1299 | Clive              | Sherriff              |              | General      |                         |               | Am in total opposition to the proposal by Oxford City to build 4,400 houses on the scarce, long designated GB in the Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton area, an area already developed beyond its infrastructure, resources and transport capabilities. Oxford City have undeveloped land within the ring road, but have experienced previous opposition. Oxford City have seriously mismanaged their needs over the last 50 years. The university students use a lot of housing which hasn't been provided by the universities who have considerable amounts of land that could be used for accommodation, like Christchurch Meadow and University Park. Look at these options before imposing on the residents of Cherwell. The GB is beneficial to recreation and many varieties of wildlife such as otter, fox and deer. It is the only natural wildlife corridor to the wildlife reserve at Stratfield Brake. To build here would destroy the valuable ecosystem. Does it still remain the case the CDC will commit to preserve and protect GB areas. Will CDC oppose Oxford City's outrageous demands?   |
| PR-B-1306 | Frank              | Vreede                |              | General      |                         |               | This entire proposal reads like the antithesis of Nelson Mandela's "Long Walk to Freedom". It proposes a policy of economic apartheid under a cloak of equality, where the masses in neighbouring counties sacrifice their identities to protect and enhance the lives of the privileged few.   |
| PR-B-1307 | Victoria           | Campbell              |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation process has been inadequate and unfit for purpose. Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness as many local residents were not aware that this was happening. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website and the paperwork is long and challenging. The timing of the consultation over the Christmas period is not reasonable. Confusion regarding the deadline for responses.  |
| PR-B-1309 | Kate               | Miklaszewska-Gorczyca |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the timing and conduct of the consultation process. Poorly advertised and only knowledge was being informed by local residents. Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website and the paperwork is long and challenging. The Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname            | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1310 | Tara              | Prayag             |              | General      |                         |               | Concerns about the timing and consultation process. Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. The Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington and Gosford over the Christmas period is not reasonable and at worst deliberately blocking. Criticism that City Council have had the plans since July 2015 why has it taken so long to consult with the residents, with such a short public consultation process.   |
| PR-B-1311 | Keith E           | Stratford          |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism to the way that CDC have handled this consultation and the time given to respond. Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website , the paperwork is long and challenging. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable and verging on the devious.   |
| PR-B-1312 | Carl              | Parker             |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB, so that residents and those directly affected can voice their opinions and concerns. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website The Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.   |
| PR-B-1313 | Helen             | Broxap             |              | General      |                         |               | object to the proposal to build 4,400 house in the Kidlington and Cherwell area. overall very disappointed and angry that the council would reassign protected GB for housing for inadequate reasons.  |
| PR-B-1313 | Helen             | Broxap             |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website and the paperwork is long and challenging. Choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable. Was away from the area during this time and therefore was not able to attend the consultation at Exeter Hall. Kidlington has a great community spirit, which would change with the extra houses. Did not chose to live in a larger town, the results of this would be hugely detrimental and has been badly thought through. |
| PR-B-1314 | Nicole and Eugene | Brooks and Griffin |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website and the paperwork is long and challenging. The Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.   |
| PR-B-1317 | Rachel            | Walton             |              | General      |                         |               | To hold such an important consultation over the Christmas period will essentially prevent some interested parties submitting a response and the whole process has had a glaring lack of publicity. Saw no mention of the consultation in the Cherwell Link which is a surprise as this consultation is central to the way housing in the Cherwell District moves forward. The consultation document was also not well designed for the layman which makes submitting a response in the short time available very difficult.  |
| PR-B-1318 | Laura             | Walton             |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism with the timing of the consultation over the Christmas period, was it to deter people from raising any objections. Poor publicity by the council regarding the developments and the website lacks information. Found about the developments through a campaign group page on Facebook.   |
| PR-B-1319 | Mr and Mrs        | Unwin              |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and the consultation period too short. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition over the Christmas period was unreasonable.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname         | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1320 | Vassilis      | Athanassoglou   |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should of done more via the Cherwell Link and all other means to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website and the paperwork is long and challenging. The Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-1321 | Catherine R   | Mundell         |              | General      |                         |               | Wish to question and strongly object to the consultation and communication process. Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website and via the internet search. The paperwork is long and challenging, without the help of local groups it wasn't clear as to what was being proposed. Council has discretion on the timing and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable. This would have excluded many in being able to participate and comment on these plans.            |
| PR-B-1322 | Judy          | East            |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more via the Cherwell Link and all other means to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB.   |
| PR-B-1323 | Karen         | Suter           |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the timing and conduct of the consultation process. Poorly advertised and only knowledge was on receipt of a leaflet from Kidlington Development Watch. Choosing to hold the consultation meetings over the Christmas period is not reasonable and impacted the levels of attendance.  |
| PR-B-1324 | Katie L       | Stratford       |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism to the way that CDC have handled this consultation and the time given to respond. Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details on the website , the paperwork is long and challenging. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable and verging on the devious.  |
| PR-B-1326 | Jan and Chris | Lacey and Plant |              | General      |                         |               | Object strongly to the timing and conduct of the consultation process. Criticism regarding publicity and the difficulty in finding information on the website. Gained information from local action groups and Street life. The paperwork is long and challenging. Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-1327 | John          | Pilgrim         |              | General      |                         |               | The consultation has been poorly publicised and the possible loss of GB should have been highlighted. It is difficult to find the consultation details on the website and they are long and difficult to read. Holding the public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period was unreasonable and there was insufficient time allowed for comments.   |
| PR-B-1329 | Jaimie        | Pattison        |              | General      |                         |               | Strong objection to the plans to develop on farmland and GB around the boundaries of Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton. With the significant increase to housing and population this will put an enormous strain on an area that is already densely populated. Noise, air and light pollution from existing roads will increase and impact the residents health and wellbeing. Research has identified that road noise aggravates Dementia and Alzheimer's. It can take up to three weeks to get an appointment at the doctors due to a lack of funding and a staff. The schools are already overstretched with large classes, increasing the population will only make matters worse for these. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1329 | Jaimie     | Pattison      |              | General      |                         |               | A benefit enjoyed by all the residents is the easy access to the countryside, which will be reduced if built upon. The impact to wildlife and their natural habitats will be considerable. Has any consideration be given to the badger sets or deer that live in these sites. How will trees, streams and hedgerows be protected on the ancient track ways and paths. Concerns that litter will increase in the area. Some of the sites are areas prone to flooding to build here will increase this, with the loss of land, tree's and hedgerows which absorb water. The three villages are a close community. The history and heritage in these areas is traceable and valued, there identities and benefits will be wiped out, they must be protected from intensive development. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect GB must be upheld. It is not reasonable to build on GB and farmland when there are alternatives that need investigation.                   |
| PR-B-1329 | Jaimie     | Pattison      |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the manner in which this consultation has been conducted. Through the work of local residents this is how it has been brought to the attention of many affected by the plans. The timing of this over the Christmas period and general lack of contact from the council indicates a genuine lack of respect for the wishes of the residents of these villages. Have been unable to find anywhere on your website to lodge my objection and it has been extremely difficult to get reliable information   |
| PR-B-1330 | N M        | O'Mahoney     |              | General      |                         |               | Find it unbelievable that Oxford City can not find and utilise suitable sites around its own perimeter, for example Greater Leys. How much land does the University have that is not utilised. This needs to be questioned as they add to the lack of houses in Oxford. They need to build to accommodate the students. Students having to rent rooms in family homes which reduces the number of properties available for local people to buy or rent.   |
| PR-B-1330 | N M        | O'Mahoney     |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and that Cherwell should have done more to raise the public awareness of the possible loss of GB. Difficult to find the consultation details and the paperwork is long and challenging. Council has discretion on the timing, and choosing to hold the consultation and public exhibition in Kidlington over the Christmas period is not reasonable.  |
| PR-B-1332 | Edward     | Bradley       |              | General      |                         |               | Concerned as house is very close to farmland between Oxford and the Sainsbury roundabout and has the North Oxford Golf Club on the other side of Banbury Road. This would result in a significant increase to traffic flows if building was to be approved on either possible site. Development of housing appears to be on the same scale as the Northern Gateway. There has been virtually no publicity unlike that scheme. Any proposed sites would have a major impact on Kidlington and the surrounding areas. Decisions based on limited consultation must be viewed with caution. During the Northern Gateway public meetings, development in South Oxford would be more sensible, as this is were employment is.  |
| PR-B-1333 | Zoe        | Christodoulou |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Oxford City have approved business expansion at the Science Park and Northern Gateway. Both of which could be used for housing first. More business lead to more housing, if Oxford City want more business they must only allow it if they find areas in Oxford for housing. It is not the responsibility of CDC. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1334 | Jenny      | Betts   |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the unsatisfactory way in which the consultation has taken place. The south of Cherwell are the areas most affected, we were last to receive the public exhibition. No publicity in any villages or the Cherwell Link. Only through the Kidlington Development Watch was this brought to the residents attention. It was not helpful to have this over the Christmas period and its feels rushed. CDC have been less fair with the community around Kidlington and there seems to be little concern about ensuring that they have been adequately consulted. It's so important as this relates to the loss of GB.   |
| PR-B-1335 | Natalie    | Usher   |              | General      |                         |               | This rep. has provided detailed criticism regarding the quality, structure of the documents and the process. The consultation timeframe is too short and fell over the Christmas period. With the amount of documentation that goes with the consultation and the impact on local life more time is required, with more meetings and exhibitions. The whole process was poorly advertised by the council.  |
| PR-B-1335 | Natalie    | Usher   |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly object to building on GB due to the detrimental impact on the local area, loss of green space and natural habitats. If there is a compelling case made to build, it makes sense to prioritise the sites between the A34 which is a natural boundary and Cutteslowe/ North Oxford as they are close to the city. The gap between Kidlington and Oxford is important, but roads here are not accessible. The transport paper rates these sites as most sustainable and so having fewer adverse effects. Public transport is good in this area and are close to Oxford so cycling is more accessible, if the infrastructure was improved. Housing in this area could be linked and incorporated with Oxford and the Northern Gateway. If GB development was proven, sites should be prioritised as they are more sustainable than those outside the A34, impact on the local area is less adverse.   |
| PR-B-1336 | Patricia   | Stokes  |              | General      |                         |               | It seems iniquitous that Cherwell has to provide 4,400 homes to meet Oxford City's assessed future requirements. Where and what type of jobs will there be. For key workers such as nurses and teachers where are these workplaces anticipated. It seems that additional pressure for these extra houses to ensure that they are close to Oxford rather than throughout the Cherwell area. No regard has been given to the residents of Kidlington, which already has 6,000 homes, to increase this by 73% is unsustainable with the existing resources of schools, health services, shops, roads and other facilities. Alternatives can be found as a former office building was converted to homes. Find smaller zones. Look at disused and redundant buildings which are close to residential areas, they are already in areas of where people want to live. There would be less impact and remove the need for daily mass commuting from outside Oxford. |
| PR-B-1336 | Patricia   | Stokes  |              | General      |                         |               | Traffic will increase during the rush hour, with six mile traffic jams northwards from Oxford City centre. The quality of life would be impacted for Kidlington residents with increased air, noise and light pollution. There will be impacts to wildlife and their natural habitats which enhance the countryside setting. Walks, views, open spaces and areas of unpolluted air have been protected through the designated GB. Strongly object to development in the GB. Thought GB is a permanent designation and that Government guidance states that unmet housing need is not a reason for grabbing GB for development. The Government's Manifesto promise and Cherwell's existing policy to protect the GB must be upheld. Its important to avoid urban sprawl and ribbon development from Oxford to Kidlington, to prevent merging of a village to a city.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1336 | Patricia     | Stokes     |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Protecting GB for our future generations. Use brownfield or re-develop unused offices and warehouses. The scale and scope is too much for Kidlington to absorb. |
| PR-B-1337 | Marcus       | Lloyd      |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and the lack of communication. It was only brought to attention through posts on street life social network. Criticism regarding the timing which was over the Christmas period, was this intentionally done to prevent residents from having the opportunity to respond in time.  |
| PR-B-1341 | Olga Lascano | Choperena  |              | General      |                         |               | Criticism regarding publicity and the lack of communication. It was only brought to attention through posts on street life social network. Criticism regarding the timing which was over the Christmas period, was this intentionally done to prevent residents from having the opportunity to respond in time.  |
| PR-B-1348 | Prof Ephrat  | Tseëlon    |              | General      |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-1350 | Dr Autumn    | Rowan-Hull |              | General      |                         |               | Strongly oppose and register objections to the new developments around Begbroke (west) and Yarnton. This would destroy the countryside's flora and fauna. The area is home to rare butterflies and has a unique grasses due to the natural wet spring (Spring Hill Road). The area would lose its natural outstanding beauty and development would create unacceptable congestion in the area.   |
| PR-B-1356 | Mrs Dee      | Bailey     |              | General      |                         |               | Totally against this new plan, especially since S Oxfordshire has refused their extra houses. Assumed that CDC will have to take more because of this. Options C or E would amount to Bicester expanding down to Weston on the Green and incorporating Launton, Chesterton and Wendlebury in to one built up area, all with virtually no facilities. Rep goes on to heavily criticise existing and proposed developments at Bicester and the changes to rail services in the Town. Housing for Oxford should be as near to the City as possible - not anywhere near Bicester. We need facilities in Bicester, not more housing.  |
| PR-B-1357 | Dianne       | Jones      |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposed development around Begbroke because of the impact it will have on the A44, flooding and the wildlife. Rowel Brook regularly floods and more development will make this worse. Also a huge impact on the A44 which has existing highway safety problems. Loss of green belt will have a huge impact on the wildlife. Green Belt should not be built on. People will not be able to walk the footpaths like they do now.  |
| PR-B-1359 | Kate         | Berney     |              | General      |                         |               | Object to the proposal to build 4,400 new houses to the north of Oxford because it would lead to: unacceptable destruction of the GB, impossible pressure on local infrastructure, roads, schools and health services, loss of village character, identities and ancient historical settings, loss of countryside, local walks, scenery, fresh air. Do not believe that local villages and GB should be expected to meet the enormous unmet housing need of Oxford City.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname         | Organisation                          | Question No.                  | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-1360 | Alexandra         | Berney-Stewart  |                                       | General                       |                         |               | Object to the proposal to build 4,400 new homes to the north of Oxford. Do not agree the estimated number of houses required by Oxford and from what source it is from. Do not believe that GB should be sacrificed. Option I and Bicester Garden Town would be better locations than north Oxford. Road connections between Kidlington and Oxford are not adequate. Is CDC's contributed from existing numbers of residents and does it include data in trends in the Cherwell area?  |
| PR-B-1361 | Margaret and Alan | Crick and Trump |                                       | General                       |                         |               | Object to the plan for a huge number of houses to be built in areas A and B around Kidlington and Cutteslowe. Houses will not be affordable, would be on green belt, would affect Cutteslowe Park. The scale is completely disproportionate and would have an enormous impact on the area. Traffic congestion would be worse. CDC consultation has been minimal, especially for Oxford City residents. The email in the summary leaflet does not work.   |
| PR-B-1362 | Mary              | Whitby          |                                       | General                       |                         |               | Specifically in relation to development in and around Weston on the Green, Wendlebury and Heathfield; 1) affordable housing needs to be located where employment and the need for employment is a priority; 2) Excessive development of green areas around Oxford will detract irremediably and irrevocably from the attractiveness of the city; 3) good planning should preserve the identity, beauty and peace of villages close to the city 4) large developments on the edge of villages will destroy their character; 5) large developments require appropriate infrastructure; 6) traffic around Oxford is a particular problem. |
| PR-B-1363 | Nick              | Southern        |                                       | General                       |                         |               | Building yet more houses around Kidlington suggests reckless disregard for GB, vital agricultural land and the pressure on floodplains. CDC should resist pressure from Central Government and the private sector.   |
| PR-B-1364 | Elaine            | Boswell         | North Newington Parish Council        | General                       |                         |               | What evidence has been seen to show that Oxford is unable to meet its housing needs? Should be asking Oxford to revisit it's own ability to deliver required number of new dwellings. The housing, if needed, should be within areas of search A and B and coming out to Heyford and Bicester. There is already good transport and road infrastructure in to Oxford from these areas.  |
| PR-B-1365 | John              | Wass            |                                       | General                       |                         |               | Whilst not necessarily objecting to small developments the development of 100 houses is wholly inappropriate for the village of Sibford Ferris. It would completely dwarf the village. The infrastructure is inadequate. There is no state school, pub or GP in the village, only a small shop.  |
| PR-B-1162 | Roger             | Bellamy         | Hornton Parish Council                | General                       |                         |               | The Parish Council has provided detailed comments in its representation on the assumptions in the Cherwell Plan; they are: 1) National Net Migration; 2) Equal Levels of Population Growth; 3) Realistic Housing Targets; 4) Oxford cannot meet its allocated targets; 5) Oxford can be quickly and easily provided with adequate transport; and 6) The other councils can take higher building targets (6a) Declining facilities (6b) Sustainability. The Parish Council suggests that Oxford (and the four District Councils) provides its own allotted total of new housing, subject to five yearly reviews.                        |
| PR-B-0730 | Katherine         | Jones           | Savills on behalf of Thames Water plc | General - Waste Water Network |                         |               | Currently undertaking a Growth Study in the Bicester area. To ensure that the study is accurate we require as much detail on sites as possible. Have concerns at Launton. The current pumping station is at capacity therefore we will need to undertake further assessments. Banbury, Kidlington and Lower Heyford - need further information on location, scale and phasing to assess the capability of the network. Have Sewage Pumping Station and network capacity constraints at M40 Junction 9. Concerns about the network and pumping station at Adderbury.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation                          | Question No.                    | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0730 | Katherine  | Jones    | Savills on behalf of Thames Water plc | General - Waste Water Treatment |                         |               | Banbury has the most capacity to accommodate the most amount of growth. Bicester - There is already a lot of growth here, as such we would discourage any further growth in this area. Kidlington - Is in the Oxford STW catchment. The further growth of Kidlington would have a lesser impact given the size of the receiving STW. Development around Junctions 9 and 10 of M40 would cause concerns as they would drain to small STW's with less capacity and would require upgrades. Growth in Upper Heyford would cause concern as would likely drain to a small STW which would require upgrades.  |
| PR-B-0730 | Katherine  | Jones    | Savills on behalf of Thames Water plc | General - Water Supply          |                         |               | Our Water Supply team has been unable to make an assessment of the water supply issues in the proposed areas. Once further information is received on specific locations and sizes of sites the Asset Planners will be able to provide the required information.   |
| PR-B-0639 | Diane      | Downie   |                                       | General                         |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. The local GB should be retained and protected.  |
| PR-B-0725 | Andrew     | Cove     |                                       | General                         |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Extra housing on GB is a disgrace. More cars, ever increasing traffic delays and disruption. Increased hospital and doctor waiting times. |
| PR-B-0194 | Philip     | Hine     |                                       | PR32                            |                         |               | Some of the proposed sites in Kidlington are heading toward the flood plain and area of SSI. Oxford City gives a high level of protection to such areas. In addition PR32 is similar to previous applications in 2011 and 2013 which had strong objections due to badger setts. The planning inspectorate refused planning even under appeal in 2012.  |
| PR-B-0237 | J A        | Burt     |                                       | PR74, PR20, PR24,               |                         |               | Sites PR74, PR20 and PR24 are of specific concern. PR74 is a haven for wildlife with many species of birds and animals and access to this site is potentially dangerous. There is a much used, enjoyed and accessible byway between sites PR20 and PR24. East Begbroke is a small peaceful safe village and the prospect of losing this small community is terrifying for some residents. It is wrong that Oxford can retain its own green spaces but destroy ours. This rep provides a list of Cherwell's policies that would be contravened.   |
| PR-B-1242 | G          | Thompson |                                       |                                 | A                       | PR126         | Objection to this site as it is in the Green Belt. Policy ESD14 seeks to safeguard the countryside from development and prevent urban sprawl. Yarnton is a Cat A Village. Thus only minor development, infilling or conversion is allowed. Access to and from the A44 is restrictive and almost impossible at this location. This site includes an important watercourse. Development would exacerbate existing flooding problems in the village.  |
| PR-B-1242 | G          | Thompson |                                       |                                 | A                       | PR20          | Site PR20 lies within the GB and exceptional circumstances for development cannot be demonstrated in this area. Local plan policy ESD 14 has a strong role in preventing the coalescence of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington and ESD 13 in securing the appearance of the urban fringes. Policy Villages 1 categorises Yarnton and Begbroke as Category A villages which restricts development.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname  | Organisation                          | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific           | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|---------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| PR-B-1242 | G               | Thompson |                                       |              | A                       | PR34                    | Site PR34 lies completely within the GB and is protected by Local plan policy ESD 14. It is poorly served by a narrow class C road and adjacent to a well used railway line. Any development would affect the setting of the Oxford Canal Conservation area.  |
| PR-B-1242 | G               | Thompson |                                       |              | A                       | PR51                    | Site PR51 lies within the GB . Local plan policy ESD 14 has a strong role in preventing the coalescence of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington and ESD 13 in securing the appearance of the urban fringes. Policy Villages 1 categorises Yarnton and Begbroke as Category A villages which restricts development. Surface water run-off from this elevated site frequently causes significant flooding in Yarnton, a problem that will be made worse by any development.   |
| PR-B-1242 | G               | Thompson |                                       |              | A                       | PR75                    | Site PR75 lies within the GB. Local plan policy ESD14 seeks to prevent urban sprawl and safeguard the countryside form encroachment. Policy Villages 1 categorises Yarnton as category A village which restricts development. Access to this site would be poorly serviced by a single track lane.  |
| PR-B-1242 | G               | Thompson |                                       |              | A                       | PR92                    | This site lies wholly within the Green Belt, although part of it is considered brownfield. Policy ESD14 seeks to encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. However, access to the A44 from this site is totally inadequate, highly dangerous and can only be exacerbated if further development was allowed.  |
| PR-B-0738 | Martin          | Smail    |                                       |              | H, A                    | PR43, PR58, PR13, PR146 | Search option H and A sites PR43, PR58 PR13 and PR146 have been identified as unsuitable for these reasons. Increased traffic congestion at Broughton Road adds to congestion of many other streets. Direct and indirect impact on Crouch Hill, Banbury's most valued historic and natural landmarks. The area should be considered a designated Landscape Protection Area. West side of town away from employment and main transport hubs. Negative impact on schools, shops, water supply, sewers etc.  |
| PR-B-0021 | Kenneth         | Porter   | Cropredy Parish Council               |              | I                       |                         | Road system in and around Cropredy is under strain. This is a rural village with no immediate relationship with Oxford. Any major development would inevitable impact to the detriment of the surrounding countryside.  |
| PR-B-1144 | Martin          | Lipson   | Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum |              | I, F                    | General                 | Supports the findings and recommendation of the Partial Review. Although express doubts about the 4,400 consider that the methodology and general approach is sound and clearly presented. The areas of search have been thoroughly carried out with supporting evidence. MCNP area is essentially rural and in area of search I, with the exception of Heyford Park, a strategic site in area F. Both these areas scores show negative effects when analysed for the sustainability of potential development in such rural location, on this basis these areas of search should be eliminated from the process for Oxford's unmet needs. Suggest that search areas I and F should be removed from any future consideration for sites associated with Oxford's housing need, to retain its rural values in the District as set out in paragraphs C240 to C250 on the Cherwell Local Plan. |
| PR-B-0798 | Sue             | Holmes   | Oxford Brookes University             |              |                         | General                 | Have provided a detailed representation to this consultation on housing, transport, public transport infrastructure, Cycle network, and private transport. Housing and transport are their main issues. With regards to housing it is accommodation for students and affordability. Would support any policies that provide housing for their students. With regards to transport it is wider and their main concern is that adequate transport infrastructure and public transport is provided with the proposed growth.   |
| PR-B-0875 | Gavin and Sarah | Smith    |                                       |              |                         | General                 | Oxford City has developed a plan where it is using its own space to develop more employment but does not have the space to house the workers for the employment it is creating. This means that people have to travel in to the City for work. This is unsustainable, their plans for employment should be matched to the amount of space they have to house those workers.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname    | Organisation               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-----------------|------------|----------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0875 | Gavin and Sarah | Smith      |                            |              |                         | General       | Assuming there is a need for the housing to support expanding business in Oxford then it should be located in areas that meet with the current planning policy guidelines. In order to justify building homes close to employment this should be backed up with evidence including both the distance current workers travel and also where the people living in that area travel to work.   |
| PR-B-0875 | Gavin and Sarah | Smith      |                            |              |                         | General       | Cherwell has been very good at protecting the green belt. This protection needs to be maintained to protect the individuality of villages like Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington. Failure to maintain a gap between the villages would allow a large settlement to develop to the north of Oxford. Towns would be a better and more sustainable locations for additional development.  |
| PR-B-0875 | Gavin and Sarah | Smith      |                            |              |                         | General       | The rep explains in some detail why there should be no development in the green belt in the vicinity of Yarnton. However, does state that if there is to be development in the Green Belt around Yarnton the best location would be to the south and south west of the village, making the church more of the centre of the village. It would also provide opportunities for transport improvements. Concludes by stating that Oxford should not be allowed to expand to the north to join up with Oxford Parkway as this would erode the gap between Kidlington and Oxford. Kidlington should not expand south of Stratfield Brake as it would also erode the gap between Kidlington and Oxford, particularly as Oxford could extend up to the A34. There should not be any development east of the A44 at Yarnton due to the A44 splitting the village.   |
| PR-B-0876 | David           | Heathfield | Chiltern Railways          |              |                         | General       | <p>The Chiltern Railway Company operates a franchised passenger train service between London Marylebone and Oxford Parkway. Welcome the opportunity to respond to this consultation and are pleased to see an emphasis on locating development in sustainable locations in transportation terms and managing patterns of growth to make the fullest possible use of public transport. Support the policy of building houses within walking distance of their railway station in Cherwell. Support the findings of the ITP that land around Kidlington holds the best opportunity for sustainable transport options for new residents. Support carefully considered around Oxford Parkway and Kidlington. With the existing connection to London and the completion of East West Rail will provide future connectivity to Reading, Milton Keynes, Bedford, Cambridge and Norwich making Oxford Parkway one of the best connected stations of its size in the country. The station and its capacity can be constructed with sufficient capacity to support growth in the local area.</p> <p>CIL - they believe that proper expansion of the facilities at stations adjacent to housing developments is vital to ensure that the railway is able to meet the needs of future customers. Investing in passenger facilities at railway stations will contribute to ensuring that the residents of new developments are not solely dependent on private vehicles. Would encourage the CIL process to be transparent and accessible to transport operators. Are keen to understand how they can interact with the process and ensure that the Council is aware of the opportunities for development at their stations.</p> |
| PR-B-0877 | David           | Flavin     | Oxfordshire County Council |              |                         | General       | <p>Have provided a detailed response on Drainage, Education, Transport, and Public Health with a very detailed comments on each area including specific comments on each site with rag rating for each response on Transport DC, Transport Strategy, Public Transport, Archaeology, Minerals and Waste, and Education.</p> <p>The key issues are that additional growth should be planned in such a way as to facilitate the delivery of services and infrastructure, either by being located where existing services/infrastructure would benefit from additional population, or are capable of being expanded in a cost effective manner, or by being clustered in such a way as to make the creation of new infrastructure viable. Preferred areas of search should relate well to Oxford with new developments along the transport corridors.</p>   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0936 | Tim        | del Nevo   | Friends of Cutteslowe and Sunnymead Park                               |              |                         | General       | Are very concerned with the development of the site, in particular the sites around Cutteslowe Park. The statement that Cutteslowe Park "seems underutilised" is unsubstantiated and is in fact completely untrue and inaccurate. Cutteslowe Park is a "Destination Park" meaning that people travel many miles to visit it. It has a wide range of facilities and is a very well used facility. Have provided details of facilities and uses in their representation. Have summarised the comments from the exhibition at Cutteslowe Park in detail in their representation, in particular their strong objections regarding the loss of the Green Belt. Strongly recommend that Cherwell does NOT accept Oxford's attempt to offload its so called unmet housing 'need' on Cherwell onto Green Belt land. Instead recommends that Oxford City is forced to cater for its own unmet housing need and build houses as opposed to businesses on itsexisting brownfield sites, within its own boundaries!   |
| PR-B-1035 | Robert     | Davies     | Gerald Eve LLP on behalf of Merton College, Oxford and Blenheim Palace |              |                         | General       | Promoting Land at Pear Tree on behalf of Merton College and Blenheim Palace   |
| PR-B-1115 | Vicky      | Aston      | Sport England  |              |                         | General       | Sport England is currently working with Cherwell and its consultants to prepare a Playing Pitch Strategy. Before progressing to the next stage of the Local Plan, the Council should complete its playing pitch strategy and undertake an assessment covering indoor sport and any relevant outdoor sports. Without this important part of the evidence Sport England requires Cherwell to protect any existing sports facilities (indoor and outdoor). Sport England object to the loss of any existing sites that are identified for housing sites within this options paper if they have a sporting use, in accordance with paragraph 74 of the NPPF. It is also considered important that this work is undertaken to inform any new sporting provision that is required to meet the needs of the additional population. They believe that it is possible for the planning system to shape existing and proposed physical environments to promote physical activity. If the achievements of healthy lifestyles in an inclusive aspiration, they recommend their 'Active Design' design guidance . There is a model (local plan) policy within Sport England's document that could be used by Local Authorities. They have provided a link to their design guide. |
| PR-B-1132 | Linda      | Ward       | Kidlington Development Watch   |              |                         | General       | Kidlington Development Watch have provided a response to the consultation on behalf of the community, whose strength of feeling has been expressed in their support of KDW's objections to the proposed developments around Kidlington and surrounding villages. They have provided a detailed statement as part of their representation.   |
| PR-B-1156 | Robert     | de Newtown | ENGAGE Oxford  |              |                         | General       | ENGAGE Oxford have provided a brief response to the consultation. Strongly endorse the responses provided by CPRE and support their representation.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation                             | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-1195 | Laurence   | Clark     |  |              |                         | General       | <p>Objects to the 4,400 homes in North Oxford and particularly around Yarnton. His reasons are: 1. The infrastructure around North Oxford even when this includes recent renovations to Cutteslowe and Wolvercote roundabouts isn't sufficient to cope with the huge increase in traffic from such a big development. 2. Most of the predicted job growth is around the Science Vale on the South side of Oxford and the roads will not cope with more traffic from North travelling South. It can already take up to 60 mins in peak traffic just to reach Oxford. This would also increase pollution and decrease safety etc. 3. Greenbelt land is meant to be protected and is a link to the Cotswolds and allows wildlife to thrive and move. It also stops urban sprawl which means villages become towns and lose their identity and community, and crime can increase. 4. The government should be looking at Brownfield sites as they are doing elsewhere in the country. In addition, is opposed to development in the Green Belt, as it will cause one congested urban sprawl in an already heavily congested area. It will cause the loss of a beautiful village and its character. There will be a provision for people to have a work life balance. To use the GB areas as intended there are many unused buildings in Oxford City some 4000 which are uninhabited. Surely, these must be renovated before any proposal to use the Green Belt. Is concerned that this will inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the GB, which CDC has undertaken to protect. Most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain it. Even more pressure on local infrastructure: local roads, schools and health services are already overstretched. Creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock. This is unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Loss of their village' characters, identities and ancient historical settings.</p> <p>Loss, for ever, of their adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways.</p> |
| PR-B-1342 | Laura      | Precious  | Quod on behalf of Albion Land            |              |                         | General       | <p>CDC has not considered the suitability of sites within Area E and have failed to explore development options located outside the GB and in these circumstances cannot show that there are no alternative sites that would deliver sustainable development. Area E Bicester and surroundings is the third most sustainable location for growth to meet Oxford's needs only after areas A and B, both of which are located in the GB. They are promoting the Site on behalf of the landowners, who are actively seeking to promote the site for development over the plan period via an allocation for residential development in the Partial Review. The Site is therefore available for development now, and is "deliverable" within the meaning set out in the NPPF (Footnote 11). By virtue of its location outside of the GB, it would not abuse any harm to the purposes of the OGB. They have provided a detailed statement in their representation.</p>  |
| PR-B-1352 | Liz        | Boden     | Pegasus on behalf of Richborough Estates |              |                         | General       | <p>Pegasus Group are representing Richborough Estates regarding Land at Grange Farm, Station Road, Launton, Bicester. Have provided an addendum to the Vision Document, which was submitted in response to our Call for Sites in March 2016.</p>  |
| PR-B-0762 | Elizabeth  | Moore     |  |              |                         | General       | <p>Makes a strong protest about the consultation process itself. Considers the consultation process as complex, lengthy, not easy to access on the website, etc. Has provided a detailed list of concerns. Has also provided a summary statement the adverse effects on the quality of life in the representation</p>   |
| PR-B-0788 | Tom        | McCulloch | Community First Oxfordshire              |              |                         | General       | <p>Concerns over the overall numbers of homes proposed in the Cherwell area up to 2031. Feel that more consideration should be paid to housing density and thereby to the provision of more homes within Oxford City boundaries. Consider that all districts should take a share of Oxford's need. The area around Kidlington would appear to be the most logical location for Cherwell contribution. Have provided more detailed comments on Infrastructure, the building of communities and not just houses in the representation.</p>  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname   | Organisation                       | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|------------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0870 | Stewart     | Patience  | Anglian Water Services Ltd         |              |                         | General       | Anglian Water Services Limited is the sewerage undertaker for the parishes of Ardley, Cottisford, Finmere, Fringford, Fritwell, Godington, Hardwick with Tusmore, Hethe, Mixbury, Newton Purcell with Shelswell, Somerton, Stoke Lyne and Stratton Audley within Cherwell District. All sites will require a local connection to the existing sewerage network which may include network upgrades. Have provided a spreadsheet identifying where improvements are needed. These are in Ardley and Finmere. The highlighting of these potential upgrades should not be seen as an objection to the allocation of these sites as we can work with the District Council to ensure development is brought online at the correct time. Upgrades are to be expected as sewers are not designed to have capacity for all future growth. Consider that appropriate management of flood risk and the consideration if climate change is critical for long term resilience. Suggest that all development should seek to reduce flood risk and incorporate (SuDS) and expect that developers should adhere to the surface water management hierarchy outlined in Part H of Building Regulations with the disposal to a surface water sewer seen as a last resort. Have provided an site assessment of the site PR114 with their representation. |
| PR-B-0923 | Keerpa      | Patel     | South Oxfordshire District Council |              |                         | General       | Acknowledges the approach in meeting Oxford's unmet need in the latter part of the plan period and potentially having a stepped trajectory would be useful in terms of delivering Oxford's unmet need. Any over delivery in the earlier part of the plan period could have counted towards Oxford's unmet need. Further clarity is needed in that respect. Support the 4,400 homes apportionment, and note that in paras 8.9 to 8.11 of the options paper that the idea of 'ring-fencing' Oxford's unmet need is undecided at present and that this approach will be clarified in the Proposed Submission document due later in 2017. State that more clarity is required on 'ring-fencing'. Regarding SA, are not clear what exactly has been tested, in terms of the 4,400 homes apportionment. Note the three scenarios which have been tested in terms of the 4,400 homes apportionment and significantly less and significantly more than this. However, would like more clarity on what is 'significant' as it is not clear at present? The testing of the higher and lower numbers also does not appear to relate to any spatial strategy so the implication of this are also unclear.  |
| PR-B-0928 | Stephanie   | White     |                                    |              |                         | General       | Deeply concerned about the proposed development around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington. The scale and scope of this development would have a huge and negative impact on the quality of life of the residents of these three villages. Particularly concerned about the destruction of countryside: loss of footpaths and wildlife, development within the Green Belt, increased pressure on local services, particularly roads, risk of flooding, lack of affordable housing in detail in her representation. Does not object in principle to development and realises that new development has to be built somewhere. However, objects in the strongest terms to the scale of this proposed development around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington, which will destroy precious countryside. Refers to an article in Oxford Mail about 4,400 homes vacant in Oxfordshire, which should be utilised rather than building in the Green Belt.   |
| PR-B-0952 | Cllr Carmen | Griffiths |                                    |              |                         | General       | Endorses the views expressed by Kidlington PC. In addition, nothing should be built before infrastructure is in place. S106 monies would be insufficient and not available until after the houses are built, further the Growth Board does not offer any guarantees, which would not be acceptable as our Schools, health centres, and roads are at full capacity, and more houses will add pressure to our already stretched resources. Does not consider it acceptable to build new schools for houses in Water Eaton when West Kidlington School is in a poor state and desperately in need of cash injection for the existing residents. Discusses the issues of land and opportunity within Oxford City and the Green Belt in more detail in his submission. Refers to Kidlington Masterplan stating that sites such as north of the Moors, Stratfield Farm and Gosford Farm should be out of the question for development and the GB should be retained for the purposes that it was formed in 1947.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname         | Organisation                   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------|-----------------|--------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0958 | Richard     | Meadows         | Easington Sports Football Club |              |                         | General       | Proposing their grounds at Addison Road as a potential site for housing. Are actively looking for a larger and more suitable site and are considering some options. Would use proceeds from the sale of this site towards a new site in Banbury. Are working very closely with the Council on the Playing Pitch Strategy and sports provisions. Have provided a detailed statement in their representation.   |
| PR-B-0960 | M           | O'Mahoney       |                                |              |                         | General       | The consultation details published on the website were very difficult to access. They were long and difficult to understand. Consultation held over Christmas was not reasonable.   |
| PR-B-1121 | Rebecca     | Micklem         | Natural England                |              |                         | General       | Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Its statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England expects sufficient evidence to be provided, through the SA and HRA, to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected, e.g. land allocations should avoid designated sites and landscapes and should consider the direct and indirect effects of development on land within the setting of designated landscapes. Areas A and B are the closest to the Oxford Meadows Special Area of Conservation; therefore the Local Plan should be screened under Regulation 102 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010 at an early stage so that outcomes of the assessments can inform key decision making on strategic options and development sites. It may be necessary to outline avoidance and/or mitigation measures at the plan level, including a clear direction for project level HRA work to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of internationally designated sites. It may also be necessary for plans to provide policies for strategic or cross boundary approaches, particularly in areas where designated sites cover more than one Local Planning Authority boundary. They have provided detailed comments on Landscape, Priority habitats, ecological networks and priorities and/or legally protected species populations; Soils; Air Pollution; and comments on each area of search in their representation |
| PR-B-1121 | Rebecca     | Micklem         | Natural England                |              |                         | General       | Have provided detailed comments on Landscape, priority habitats, ecological networks and priorities and/or legally protected species populations, soils and air pollution. Detailed site specific comments have also been made for each area of search.   |
| PR-B-1160 | Christopher | Hardman         |                                |              |                         | General       | Have made a detailed response setting out their concerns. These are mainly on the importance of the Green Belt which seems to have been almost entirely disregarded, contrary to both National policy and strong local feeling. There is an over reliance on assumed future developments in transport infrastructure that are by no means guaranteed to happen. Routes from and around the selected sites for development (e.g. 38 and 50) are already congested and unsuitable for further traffic. Developments in areas close to major routes are unsuitable for housing, with young children and the elderly particularly at risk. A major development at PR19, Shipton-on-Cherwell Quarry, should be considered. This would be an opportunity for a self-contained community to be created, rather than merely increasing population density in existing areas. Have provided detailed comments on the Consultation, Housing Allocation, Other Issues to be Considered, Transport, Areas of Search and Identified Sites. Have also listed the Effects Of Site Options On Oxford, and Evidence Base in their representations.   |
| PR-B-1240 | Suzanne     | Willson-Higgins |                                |              |                         | General       | Concerned by the huge volume of complex new reports issued for consultation and her family did not have sufficient time to respond. Has provided a long statement in response to this consultation in the representation, which discusses the importance of the GB and the Kidlington/ Gosford / Oxford gap.  |
| PR-B-1353 | P           | White           |                                |              |                         | General       | Fully supports the 4,400 new homes in Cherwell area to meet Oxford's unmet need. It is high time that this was done as desperately need more homes to cater for the young and new talented people moving into the area. When can you start! However, CDC needs to ensure that there are good cycle routes to and from all areas. The roads within the Oxford ring road are somewhat to be desired.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation                                      | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                                       | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-0769 | Debbie     | Jones     | Bidwells on behalf of City of Oxford Charity      |              |                         | Land adjacent to Bicester Road, Gosford, Kidlington | Wish to promote its site located off Bicester Road, Gosford, Kidlington. It owns the whole 4.44ha site and it is available with no constraints that could preclude development. It could deliver around 140 dwellings. A detailed justification for the allocation is provided and the Charity advises that it will be undertaking further technical studies to support the allocation.   |
| PR-B-0964 | Vickesh    | Rathod    | Carter Jones LLP on behalf of Mr Henry Teare      |              |                         | Land at Middleton Stoney                            | 3.75ha site at Middleton Stoney proposed. A site plan is provided. Access can be achieved off Bicester Road. Residential development of this site would make a significant contribution to meeting both CDC's and Oxford City's unmet housing need. The site is well defined and well related to the built up area of Middleton Stoney. The site is also well connected to Bicester and Oxford via the public transport network.  |
| PR-B-0158 | Jon        | Waite     | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Mewslade (Eastern) Ltd |              |                         | Land south of Springfield Road, Caversfield         | This site is a sustainable location for residential development. It forms vacant, informal private space. The site forms a natural and logical addition to Caversfield and will integrate well with the existing settlement pattern and density. An indicative layout is provided. Access can be taken from Springfield Road. Heritage, landscape, environment and ecology issues are also briefly addressed in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0784 | Rosie      | Cotterill | Turley on behalf of Bovis Homes                   |              |                         | PR 54   | Bovis Homes Limited has an interest in land east of Warwick Road, Banbury. A site plan is provided.   |
| PR-B-0158 | Jon        | Waite     | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Mewslade (Eastern) Ltd |              |                         | PR105   | This is an appropriate location for a housing allocation. The site sits naturally within the built up settlement limits of Caversfield and can be successfully integrated with the existing pattern and scale of surrounding development. An indicative layout plan is provided. Access would be via Rau Court. Heritage, landscape, environment and ecology issues are also briefly addressed in the representation.   |
| PR-B-0791 | Elizabeth  | Platts    |   |              |                         | PR123   | Objection and concern to site PR123. Concerned with access to the site. Long walk to the buses on Banbury and Woodstock roads from the site, traffic would increase through the residential areas increasing the risk to cyclist's. Air and noise pollution would increase. Another development on GB, GB are important for health and well being for the community.  |
| PR-B-0622 | Ian        | James     |   |              |                         | PR125   | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. House purchased due to its semi-rural location. If the development goes ahead on site PR125, the house will be in the middle of an estate. |
| PR-B-1034 | Anita      | Spencer   | Sibford Ferris Parish Council                     |              |                         | PR125   | Concerned that the site submission is incorrect and provides the following information:<br>* There are badger setts along the southern hedge boundary;<br>* Sibford Ferris has a private fee paying school;<br>* It has one shop and a post office counter;<br>* There is a short, isolated, section of pedestrian footway on the northern side of Woodway Road;<br>* There are four buses each way in a week between Stratford-on-Avon and Banbury, not to Oxford and the last bus leaves Banbury at 5.22pm;<br>Sibford Ferris on its own would not have the amenities to be a Category A village.   |
| PR-B-0173 | Janet      | Persson   |   |              |                         | PR125, PR178  | These sites are a possibility for housing but the noise of the A34 would be restrictive as reported by residents in Hampton Poyle.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0606 | P              | Merrill |              |              |                         | PR125, PR178  | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Sites PR125 and PR178 are both subject to flooding. They have standing water a number of months during the year. If the sites are built on the risk of flooding to residents will greatly be increased. These sites are also a AONB enjoyed by many residents due to the abundance of wildlife that can be seen. |
| PR-B-0163 | Wendy and John | Castle  |              |              |                         | PR14, PR27    | It is unclear where vehicular access to sites 14 and 27 will be, but access to The Moors is already congested and lack of allocated spaces has resulted in on road parking which restricts emergency vehicle access. The sites are in the Thames Valley Floodplain and are home to a wide variety of wildlife. The GB is essential for recreational purposes and the government and medical profession are encouraging people to take exercise to stay healthy.   |
| PR-B-0529 | Karen          | Brading |              |              |                         | PR14, PR27    | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Strongly object to sites PR27 and PR14. These are areas of outstanding beauty and importance to wildlife and enjoyed by many. Building on these sites would destroy that and will have an effect on flooding, due to the proximity to the Cherwell.  |
| PR-B-0785 | David          | Orman   |              |              |                         | PR14, PR27    | The rep has provided views why site PR14 and PR27 should not be built upon. Concerns regarding GB being sacrificed, there are other areas that could be used. Its not acceptable to destroy the villages identity. GB shouldn't be used according to the Conservative Manifesto, this needs to be upheld. Traffic will increase, along with air, light and noise pollution the quality of life will suffer.   |
| PR-B-0918 | Casey          | Orman   |              |              |                         | PR14, PR27    | Object strongly to site PR14 and PR27 as it's GB which surrounds Kidlington. It would destroy the abundant wildlife, natural habitats and the open countryside which is used and enjoyed by residents of Kidlington and the surrounding villages. The area is prone to flooding, the impact on residents in the area of The Moors and Mill Street would be disastrous as the countryside is concreted over. The excess water would flow into the river and gardens that back onto GB and in the surrounding area. Quality of life will deteriorate due to increased traffic, noise, air and light pollution.  |
| PR-B-0010 | Tina           | Davies  |              |              |                         | PR148         | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development of flood zone 3 and the River Ray Conservation Target area. Photo provided to illustrate the point.  |
| PR-B-0013 | Bernadette     | Evans   |              |              |                         | PR148         | Has farmed near Launton since 1963, has extensive knowledge of this parcel of land and knows it floods every year. The flat area of land on this side of Launton has ancient ridge and furrow and established hedgerows which should be preserved.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation                               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0034 | Mark       | Ashe    |  |              |                         | PR148         | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development of flood zone 3 and the Ray conservation Target area. Photo provided to illustrate the point. Congestion and safety of the roads is also a concern.   |
| PR-B-0182 | Jon        | Spinage |  |              |                         | PR148         | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development of flood zone 3 and the Ray conservation Target area. Photo provided to illustrate the point. Additional concern with regards to the size of the site in comparison to the village which would change the nature of the community. Noted that large amount of houses being built less than 2 miles away in Bicester.  |
| PR-B-0183 | Cathy      | Spinage |  |              |                         | PR148         | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development of flood zone 3 and the Ray conservation Target area. Photo provided to illustrate the point. Additional concern that a development this size would jeopardise the village community and increase pressure on local services such a schools. The very real risk of flooding and inadequate drainage system must not be overlooked.  |
| PR-B-0845 | David      | Stalder |  |              |                         | PR148         | Object to the inclusion Site PR148 Land at Blackthorn Road. Unsuitable as consists of green field land. The site also falls within Flood Zone 3 and the Ray Conversation Target Area, any development would be out of character with the village of Launton. Disproportionate level of growth unsupported by local service and facilities. Launton village already has a high level of traffic more development would exacerbate the current situation. CDC has already rejected, which is too small to be considered as a strategic development site. Flooding is also a risk at this site. The development of this site would fail to deliver sustainable development and therefore be contrary to the golden thread of national policy. |
| PR-B-0854 | Jan        | Stalder |  |              |                         | PR148         | Object to the inclusion of Site PR 148 in Launton. Site is not suitable as it has green field land that stretches outside the limits for building in the area which consists of open countryside. I believe that the site is on a flood zone too. But more importantly than this any more development in Launton would detract from the village feel. We already have a huge problem with traffic using the village as a rat run in the mornings and evenings. There is a fatality waiting to happen   |
| PR-B-1019 | Jon        | Waite   | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Manor Oak Homes |              |                         | PR148         | Details are provided in support of this site. They cover urban form, access/transport links, heritage and ecology, landscape, flooding. Confirm that the site is available immediately. An indicative layout is provided.  |
| PR-B-1020 | Jon        | Waite   | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Manor Oak Homes |              |                         | PR149         | Details are provided in support of this site. They cover urban form, access/transport links, heritage and ecology, landscape, flooding. Confirm that the site is available immediately. An indicative layout is provided.  |
| PR-B-0059 | Celia      | Walton  |  |              |                         | PR157         | At site PR157 the proposed siting of the access road in to new houses is dangerous. Driving uphill into the sun also gives little visibility. The village of Noke lacks facilities, no shops, no bus and no mains gas. Fast broadband is only available through Gigaclear and the mobile signal is erratic.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific            | Comments  |
|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------------|---|
| PR-B-0167 | Francis       | Josephs   |              |              |                         | PR157                    | Object to the housing proposals at Upper Noke. The CDC's need "to ensure people have convenient, affordable and sustainable travel opportunities to the city" could not happen at PR157 due to traffic congestion. 100 homes would be highly detrimental to Noke, tripling the population. GB is sacrosanct and CDC's table 16 admits there are some key strategic constraints for building there. Noke hill is one of the last remaining unspoilt hills in the area, enjoyed by many and a bird migration route. Otmoor RSPB reserve is 1 km away and PR157 is close to breeding sites for bitterns, marsh harriers, buzzards and ravens. I accept the need for more housing but it needs to be in an area with existing public transport links and infrastructure, such as Bicester and Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0165 | Stuart        | Dunlop    |              |              |                         | PR164                    | The access issues seem to be very substantially misunderstood in the proposal. The Barford Road, the ingress/egress point of Sands Lane is narrow, with limited visibility at the junction and will not support the amount of traffic in the proposal. The junction with A361 is hazardous due to very limited visibility of traffic coming at speed from the direction of Chipping Norton. Increased traffic at this junction is likely to be very hazardous.<br>A 50% increase in the size of a small village with Conservation status is completely out of proportion and would destroy the character of a long-established and stable settlement. Infrastructure in the village is inadequate for the proposal and access to infrastructure in neighbouring locations is effectively impossible by public transport. The number of new homes in Bloxham (the only realistic location for necessary services) renders any further pressure on services by a development in South Newington an impossible burden. The assertion that 'We do not consider that any infrastructure would be necessary for this development' is untenable. |
| PR-B-0737 | Paul          | Clarke    |              |              |                         | PR164                    | The rep has raises concerns as to why Site PR164 Land East of Sands Lane South Newington is unacceptable for development. Building within the village boundaries. Protection of important open spaces and views, referring to The 2014 South Newington Conservation Area appraisal. Traffic impact on Sands Lane. Physical impact on Sands Lane. Access to Sands Lane. Public transport and the facilities.   |
| PR-B-1181 | Heidi         | Lancaster |              |              |                         | PR178, PR39, PR122, PR38 | Building on sites PR178, PR39, PR122 and PR38 to the south of Kidlington will mean there is no distinction between Oxford and Kidlington. They will lose their individual character which will impact on tourism.   |
| PR-B-0938 | H John        | East      |              |              |                         | PR183                    | Confirm that Gladman Developments no longer have an interest in this site. Would be willing to offer the whole site of 5.8has for development and would give a site for a new village school within the development if required.  |
| PR-B-0701 | Ray and Janet | Phipps    |              |              |                         | PR186                    | Site PR186 objections to this site due to flooding. Site is not the most accessible. Increased traffic through the village and Water Lane is not a proper road, it is a lane and bridleway. It could be a precursor to more development in the area. Major traffic issues already in the area, especially for our village. LTP4 and Master plan where will funding for infrastructure come from?  |
| PR-B-0035 | Victoria      | Sayell    |              |              |                         | PR186, PR199             | Objects strongly to the proposed sites that are already congested with traffic. The infrastructure cannot cope, air pollution would become worse and quality of life reduced. Services are already under threat i.e. the Horton Hospital.   |
| PR-B-0701 | Ray and Janet | Phipps    |              |              |                         | PR199                    | Site PR199 objection to this site due to traffic being the major problem. Wykham Lane is a narrow and winding, which is already in poor condition. Subject to near misses, therefore its not appropriate to build here and use this lane to enter and exit the site.  |
| PR-B-0921 | Paul          | Weston    |              |              |                         | PR199                    | Object strongly to site PR199 with the impact that this would have on Bloxham and Wykham. It is totally inequitable in the terms of distribution of housing around Banbury, even it if was for Banbury. The land on this site has been sold therefore is there a need as many properties are going to be developed just up to the North up to Salt Way. This is a step closer to bring together Bloxham and Banbury, despite the policy to prevent coalescence. Wykham has been in longer existence than Banbury, site PR199 would completely obliterate it.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific                      | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| PR-B-0173 | Janet           | Persson       |   |              |                         | PR20                               | Part of this area could be suitable for housing, between Begbroke science park and A44, south of Begbroke, with access from the science park road. The land by Rowel Brook is subject to flooding and would mean Begbroke and Yarnton would lose their separate identities.  |
| PR-B-0079 | David and Susan | Cantwell      |   |              |                         | PR20, PR24, PR74, PR23, PR28, PR51 | Whilst understanding the need for housing have concern over these sites. The small, quiet, safe community of Begbroke will be lost. The countryside brings health benefits to its users, Begbroke school is oversubscribed and doctors are at capacity. Roads are already congested and commute times into Oxford increasing. Question how the roads will be and what provision will be made for cyclists as not all areas have safe cycling lanes.  |
| PR-B-0846 | James C         | Bridon        |   |              |                         | PR21                               | Statutory criteria for GB protection MUST be adhered to. Around Begbroke Science Park further development should be blocked because of its fatal effect on maintaining separate identity of Begbroke relative to Kidlington.   |
| PR-B-0846 | James C         | Bridon        |   |              |                         | PR23                               | Statutory criteria for GB protection MUST be adhered to development would be disproportionately damaging, destroying the rural separation of Begbroke from Woodstock   |
| PR-B-0080 | Lee             | Hewlett       |   |              |                         | PR24                               | Have grave concerns that fields surrounding Begbroke are subject to proposed development plans. These include GB that both Oxfordshire County Council and CDC had vowed to protect. The impact on the environment, nature and substandard roads around Begbroke is incomprehensible. Whilst understand the need for development sites, don't like the way PR24 has been selected and strongly believe this is as a direct retaliation to the failed bid to build a substantial amount of new houses in Woodstock, which was rejected. These plans will erode the village heritage, privacy and community. They are poorly constructed and in breach of all community values. The timeframe is short for such a huge decision, with far-reaching ramifications. |
| PR-B-1022 | Jon             | Waite         | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of W Lucy and Co.                 |              |                         | PR24                               | The rep provides a detailed assessment and justification for strategic growth west of Kidlington. In addition there is support for the Begbroke Science Park site (PR20). It is submitted that site PR24 is a logical addition to the land the Tripartite is promoting.  |
| PR-B-0285 | Michael         | De Selincourt |   |              |                         | PR27                               | Many allotment holders were moved to site 27 when the site on the other side of the railway tracks was allocated for the building of the new care facility in 2015.  |
| PR-B-0922 | Sarah           | Smith         | Rapleys LLP on behalf of Pandora Trading Ltd              |              |                         | PR28                               | Client is the sole owner of a 17.79ha site on the northern edge of Banbury. Approx. 6ha of the land benefits from an extant outline planning permission. The same area of land also forms part of Policy Banbury 2 : Hardwick Farm. It is suggested that the remaining 11.5ha of our clients land is a suitable location for further growth (potentially approx. 150 dwellings) A site location plan is provided. The rep goes on to provide a detailed justification for the development of this site.  |
| PR-B-1033 | Matthew         | Symons        | Hollins Strategic Land                                    |              |                         | PR3                                | Are promoting site PR3 - Land adjoining Graven Hill. Have provided a detailed analysis and the benefits of the access to transport and all facilities and services due to its location. A detailed report has been submitted as part of the representation.  |
| PR-B-0157 | Jon             | Waite         | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Newcore Capital Management LLP |              |                         | PR30                               | A detailed Land Quality Assessment together with a Detailed Landscape and Visual Appraisal have been submitted in support of this site. The LVA states that there are no overriding landscape constraints to development of part of the site. In addition the site is not currently 'open' due to the existing built development. As such this site does not currently serve its GB purpose making development acceptable.   |
| PR-B-0157 | Jon             | Waite         | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Newcore Capital Management LLP |              |                         | PR30                               | If this site were to be developed, Newcore would commit to providing traffic calming measures and a new footbridge over the River Ray. This is over and above the standard affordable housing/Section 106 requirements.  |
| PR-B-0016 | Anne            | Hine          |   |              |                         | PR32                               | I object to the development of land behind Webb Way, Kidlington as the land acts as a flood plain for the river Cherwell. Any building could result in the river bursting its banks and flooding the Webb Way area.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname       | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific   | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---|---|
| PR-B-0285 | Michael    | De Selincourt |   |              |                         | PR32, PR125, PR178  | Sites to the east of the village, in particular site PR32, PR125 and PR178 become waterlogged in the winter and any building would result in flooding. Some of the sites are also important wildlife habitats where enormous effort has been made to keep them as natural as possible   |
| PR-B-0173 | Janet      | Persson       |   |              |                         | PR34, PR91  | Both of these site are unsuitable for development because they are difficult to access. PR91 is very wet and would be better used for a recreation area with improved access to the canal.  |
| PR-B-0765 | Layla      | Vidal-Martin  | NLP Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners on behalf of Taylor Wimpey |              |                         | PR35  | Additional information has been provided which include plans showing site features and constraints, opportunities and an illustrative masterplan. A comprehensive Sustainability Analysis prepared by Calibro has also been provided.   |
| PR-B-0533 | Sara       | Buck          |   |              |                         | PR38, PR50  | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Sites PR38 and PR50 are green spaces used by local people. Cutteslowe Park, where will sport and fund raising events be held. Kidlington will lose its identity and become part of the commuter belt. Need to help the current residents.  |
| PR-B-0173 | Janet      | Persson       |   |              |                         | PR49  | Stratfield Farm would be good for a maximum of 300 houses, provided there is access from the south end of Garden City and not Kidlington roundabout.  |
| PR-B-0173 | Janet      | Persson       |   |              |                         | PR49  | Stratfield Farm would be good for a maximum of 300 houses, provided there is access from the south end of Garden City and not Kidlington roundabout.  |
| PR-B-1021 | Jon        | Waite         | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Manor Oak Homes                      |              |                         | PR49  | Details are provided in support of this site. They cover urban form, access/transport links, heritage and ecology, landscape, flooding. Confirm that the site is available immediately. An indicative layout is provided.   |
| PR-B-0587 | P          | Bennett       |   |              |                         | PR50, PR38, PR91, PR122, PR118, PR92, PR23, PR124, PR167, PR168, PR34 | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. The council are making stupid, provocative statements designed to deliberately annoy the residents as areas are obviously impractical. Why can not CDC be sensible about this, objection to sites PR50, PR38, PR91, PR122, PR118, PR92, PR23, PR124, PR167, PR168 and PR34.  |
| PR-B-0472 | Harry      | Carrier       |   |              |                         | PR51  | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Site PR51 not economical to build on Spring Hill. Collecting run off water during heavy downpours will be prohibitive to the whole proposal. One site leading onto a main road, otherwise the disruption and costs will be horrendous. |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname   | Organisation                  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific           | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|-----------|-------------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---|
| PR-B-0822 | Nikki        | Lewis     |                               |              |                         | PR51                    | Spring Hill site PR51 is a precious local amenity. Popular in both Begbroke and Yarnton for its access to nature, with its view across to Oxford, Whytham Forest and the ridgeway beyond Wantage. Ancient pathways from Begbroke to Cassington; along Shakespeare's Way; and up Frogwelldown Lane from Yarnton meadows, along which Charles 1 fled from Oxford to Bladon in 1642. Is it really worth sacrificing this, with its hundreds of years of history, to short term economic gain?  |
| PR-B-0846 | James C      | Bridon    |                               |              |                         | PR51                    | Statutory criteria for GB protection MUST be adhered to. Spring Hill, vital open space comparable to Wytham and Boars Hill, with fine views in the Oxford area. Development would urbanise Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington area.   |
| PR-B-1354 | James        | Macnamara | Lower Heyford Parish Council  |              |                         | PR52                    | Strong objection to Site PR52. Reasons for objecting are: development size; impact on settlements of Lower Heyford, Caulcott and Upper Heyford; Impact on Conservation Areas of Rousham, Oxford Canal, and RAF Upper Heyford; Lack of road capacity on all roads in the area; lack of railway capacity; unsustainable location; too far from Oxford and unlikely to meet Oxford's needs; concern about cumulative impact; developer's inability to deliver, and conflict with Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan.  |
| PR-B-0004 | Cathy        | Fleet     | Lower Heyford Parish Council  |              |                         | PR52 and PR53           | Strong objection due to development size; impact on settlements of Lower Heyford, Caulcott and Upper Heyford; Impact on Conservation Areas of Rousham, Oxford Canal, and RAF Upper Heyford; Lack of road capacity on all roads in the area; lack of railway capacity; unsustainable location; too far from Oxford and unlikely to meet Oxford's needs; concern about cumulative impact; developer's inability to deliver, and conflict with Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan.  |
| PR-B-1034 | Anita        | Spencer   | Sibford Ferris Parish Council |              |                         | PR66                    | Concerned that the site submission is incorrect and provides the following information regarding Brown and Co Land at Folly Farm - Regarding good range of facilities<br>* Sibford Ferris has a private School and no church;<br>* Limited public transport links;<br>* Regarding 'Pasture', corrections is 'arable';<br>* Planning History 'none'. Ref 03/00716/F - Refused access on the grounds of detrimental impact on the visual amenities and rural character of the area;<br>* 'Housing to the West' - correction - ignores house in the centre of the site and on its eastern boundary;<br>* 'Site of amenity value' - 'N/A' - correction - the site contains both a well used public footpath and bridleway;<br>* 'Conservation Area - N/A' - comment - the site is directly adjacent to the conservation area;<br>* 'Listed Building' - 'N/A' - correction - adjacent to a Grade II listed cottage;<br>* 'Safe access available' - comment - pre-application advise for a proposal for housing behind the listed cottage - refusal.  |
| PR-B-0488 | Martin James | Hastings  |                               |              |                         | PR74, PR92, PR34, PR126 | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Understand GB was only supposed to be built on in exceptional circumstances. Do not believe this gross expansion plan to merge three villages into a massive dormitory town where the houses will be snapped up by Oxford/London commuters meet the criteria as exceptional. Am not opposed to small tasteful developments sites such as PR74, PR92, PR34 and PR126. Believe that we need affordable local housing for local people. |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation  | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|---|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0159 | Jon               | Waite     | Kemp and Kemp on behalf of Sheehan Group of Companies |              |                         | PR92          | The site is well related to Yarnton. There is an existing access to the site from A44. Site is not within a conservation area nor does it contain any listed buildings. There are no environmental or landscape policy designations constraining the site. The site can be developed in isolation or could be considered as a wider strategic allocation at Yarnton. The site is of sufficient size to make a meaningful contribution to Oxford's unmet housing need as well as providing the necessary local facilities and infrastructure.  |
| PR-B-0009 | Colin and Gillian | Watts     |   |              |                         | PR92, PR95    | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to development around the Sibford villages beyond that envisioned in the local community plan. The conservation areas are of concern along with the road structures limited capacity. Photos provided to illustrate the point.   |
| PR-B-0829 | Fergus            | Campbell  | Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group              |              |                         | SA            | Have provided a detailed statement in response to this question in their representation.  |
| PR-B-0913 | Helen             | Marshall  | CPRE Oxfordshire                                      |              |                         | SA            | Agree with Para 3.98 of the Initial SA Report part 2, which states, "Oxford is a world-renowned historic city, with over 1,500 listed buildings and 16 conservation areas, which cover 17.3% of the total area of the city. The built-up area extends to the administrative boundary around much of the eastern side of the city, and the river corridors of the Thames to the west and Cherwell to the east have created extensive green wedges running north south through the city. This gives Oxford a distinctive physical form. "Although these assets have limited development within Oxford city, they are a large part of what makes the City a major tourist destination." In scoping for any development, in particular those covered by Options A and B, these issues must be paramount if the City centre and the large number of those working in services there are to thrive. If Oxford is to retain its attractiveness to visitors, road access cannot be allowed to be adversely affected by developments outside, with the look and feel of the City and its access to open countryside preserved. |
| PR-B-1294 | Giles             | Hughes    | West Oxfordshire District Council                     |              |                         | SA            | It is not clear that the impacts on West Oxfordshire have been considered even though some sites adjoin or a very close to West Oxfordshire. Do not agree with the mixed assessment given to site PR22 against the sustainability appraisal heritage objective. Although the fact that there is a scheduled ancient monument on site is Item No. , Page 8 of 8 referenced there is no acknowledgement that it is next to a World Heritage site within West Oxfordshire. The significance of these heritage assets is very high and this should be addressed in the appraisal and reflected in the subsequent scoring. There is no evidence in the appraisal to back up the conclusion that that there may be instances where a site allocation on site PR22 could enhance heritage assets. The impact of urbanisation on the currently rural setting of the Blenheim Palace World Heritage site and on the setting of the buried Roman Villa would be significant and negative. The assessment of site PR22 on this aspect does not appear consistent with the assessment of site PR92.                               |
| PR-B-0003 | Robert            | Armstrong |   |              |                         |               | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to PR148, Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton. The primary reasons are that it has previously been rejected by CDC, does not meet the minimum requirement for a strategic development site and would include development on Flood Zone 3 and the River Ray Conservation Target area.  |
| PR-B-0005 | Peter             | Jay       |   |              |                         |               | These changes proposed by WODC and CDC will obliterate acre upon acre of pristine greenfield sites with the wrong houses ,in the wrong places for the wrong people at the wrong prices. This kind of developer-driven cynical opportunism, exploiting temporary loopholes in the broken-down NPPF system, catering for weekenders bankers and mansion-seeking Mayfair retirees, does less than nothing for the homeless or even the 'barely coping'. The districts must rebel full-frontally against the intolerable abuse of the broken NPPF.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name                | Surname           | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------------|-------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0006 | Ian                       | East              |              |              |                         |               | Many of the sites identified encroach on GB and will saturate villages. Option B proposal for Islip would more than double its size, destroying an ancient villages identity and community. It is acceptable for a village to absorb an extra 10-15% houses but not 100-150%. Once the GB is denied, protection loses credibility. Distributing development widely will lighten the additional burden on roads and offer real choice over living environments. Talks on 'rapid transport' must include rail links and safe cycle ways as roads are heavily congested and car journeys slow. The need for affordable houses has to be addressed. I suggest that a roof tax, similar to that proposed by builders in Milton Keynes, be levied to pay for the construction of that network (to come out of profit, not purchase price, of which there is plenty, given the disconnection between price and cost). |
| PR-B-0007 | James                     | Philpott          |              |              |                         |               | The last government manifesto confirmed that GB would not be considered for housing. I object to Kidlington being used to provide Oxford City housing for commuters into the city and London. Kidlington is already oversized, has insufficient shops and its infrastructure is stretched.   |
| PR-B-0008 | Bilham                    | Woods             |              |              |                         |               | The proposed development at Kidlington should be confined to the area west of Kidlington and bounded on the east by the canal, on the south by Sandy lane, on the west by the A44 and the north by Langford Lane. This is not open country but already developed on the north by and Industrial estate and Campsfield detention centre, on the west by Begbroke village and the Science park to the south. Transport links are good with a main line railway to the east and a trunk road to the west. It would be sensible to provide housing near to the Science Park and the industrial estate to reduce commuting times.   |
| PR-B-0012 | Alan                      | Joy               |              |              |                         |               | Support the proposed development for Kidlington and Yarnton, as it will provide housing for the younger generation. Supports 4,400 homes to the north of Oxford and considers that moving forward with the expansion for today's needs and more so tomorrow's demands. Pleased that action is now being taken to provide much needed homes whilst improving the travel network. Need to double or more, as trying to tempt talent into Oxford area is proving difficult for both small and large employers, let alone providing homes for the future generations. The new Oxford Parkway Station is wonderful and would approve plans to re-open the northern Kidlington Brunelian station (closed in 1964) along with further links from the former Woodstock town line.  |
| PR-B-0014 | Rev George                | Fryer             |              |              |                         |               | A village is a semi-urban entity in its own right and that character and atmosphere should not be changed  |
| PR-B-0017 | Fay                       | Plumb             |              |              |                         |               | Find the building of housing estates all around our villages a blight on the landscape and they look such heartless places to live. As someone who deals with tenants, find a lot of people don't want the responsibility of a garden and maintenance of a building. It would be a far more efficient use of land to build some attractive, landscaped low rise apartment blocks, less land would be required, more people housed and lower priced accommodation achieved. It is common in Switzerland, France, and Germany.   |
| PR-B-0018 | Anumod                    | Gujral            |              |              |                         |               | This rep provides a detailed objection to the planning decisions made at Blenheim Estates. Shipton-on-Cherwell quarry is suggested for housing development, and questions the need for more houses in the Woodstock/Bladon/Upper Campsfield area before 2031 as sited in an Oxfordshire plan. Didcot/Witney and Abingdon would be better suited for large developments.  |
| PR-B-0020 | Dr Bridget and Mr Richard | Atkins and Clarke |              |              |                         |               | This rep provides a detailed and lengthy objection to development on GB land and open countryside at Kidlington. It also has concerns for the roads and public services with the high number of houses proposed.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name           | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0022 | L                    | Brennan   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0023 | Frances              | Cotton    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0024 | Carolyn and Benjamin | Capel     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0025 | P F                  | Green     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0026 | Mr and Mrs A         | Drury     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0027 | Shirley              | Steventon |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname          | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0030 | Mr and Mrs M      | Pearce           |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over-development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0031 | Todd              | Huffman          |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0032 | Damian and Sharon | Hill             |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0038 | Ernest            | Edgar            |              |              |                         |               | When are you going to stop ruining the countryside of our beautiful island to satisfy mass immigration?  |
| PR-B-0040 | Karl              | Bushell          |              |              |                         |               | The building of 4,400 homes is not sustainable as the roads are already at capacity due to the proximity of the A34 and Oxford Parkway. The school at Yarnton is at capacity as is the doctors. The greenfield sites are an important corridor for wildlife, and mass building would destroy Yarnton and Begbroke.   |
| PR-B-0047 | Steve and Julia   | Cross and Taylor |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0048 | C L               | Goldsworthy      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0049 | John       | Mildenhall |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0050 | Anne       | Prince     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0051 | A M        | George     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0052 | S          | Kerry      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0053 | Joan       | Arthur     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Wrong to develop wild areas around Kidlington and North Oxford. Houses will be bought by London commuters and will be unaffordable for locals. Concern over impact on wildlife. People with spare bedrooms should accommodate others in them |
| PR-B-0054 | John       | Penny      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0056 | S            | Virrill |              |              |                         |               | 4,400 homes is not an appropriate requirement and unrealistically high. Local infrastructure and services are already stretched, in particular schools and the health services. GB which is enjoyed by many for its walks and views will be sacrificed. It's habitats are of great local importance and it protects the historic city of Oxford from overdevelopment. The government's promise and Cherwell's policy to protect GB should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0061 | Mr and Mrs R | Gynes   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0062 | S            | Fisher  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0063 | Mr and Mrs P | Duffy   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0064 | Mrs P S      | Rice    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0065 | Kathryn      | Gould   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0066 | Ros        | Avery    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0067 | M          | Beesley  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0068 | Anne       | Pearce   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Concerned regarding the effect of development on the services provided by the Churchill Hospital |
| PR-B-0069 | Richard L  | Eddy     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0070 | Sheila     | Nichols  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0071 | Norma      | Stallard |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name          | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0072 | G                   | Tasker    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0073 | Mrs M               | Sammons   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0074 | Dr S                | Bhandare  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0084 | Mrs B               | Wright    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0085 | Denise              | Greenspan |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0086 | Richard and Stephen | Danbury   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0087 | Danby and Sandy | Bloch   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0088 | Dr M A          | Fraser  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0089 | John and Sue    | Jenkins |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0090 | Louise          | Gregory |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0091 | Eleanor         | Mace    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0092 | Allen           | Souch   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0093 | Mr and Mrs     | Guest    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0094 | Tatiana        | Iseborn  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0095 | Rachael        | McTegart |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0096 | Philip P       | Skipp    |              |              |                         |               | Strongly oppose the proposed building around Begbroke and Kidlington. GB must be maintained to protect open space and stop urban sprawl. The villages of Yarnton, Kidlington and Begbroke will lose their identity as ancient villages, as they are swallowed up by roads and houses. Local schools and doctors already struggle to cope with demand. Congestion, pollution and accidents would increase. Open space isn't dormant land, it is farmed or grazed and provides open space for all ages to enjoy. Woods provide valuable habitat and corridors for wildlife. I appreciate the need for housing especially affordable housing for key workers. Smart thinking by planners and architects is required for housing that doesn't impact heavily on the environment. |
| PR-B-0097 | M              | Eastley  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0098 | Mr and Mrs D M | Steffens |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0099 | Jane       | Wilson   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0101 | A          | Pigram   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0102 | Lucy       | Moore    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0103 | Kelly      | Williams |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0104 | Terence G  | Denton   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0105 | Mr and Mrs | Grant    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name           | Surname             | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0106 | Vassilis             | Karatzios           |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0108 | Nikrouz              | Soheili             |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0109 | Edwin                | Southern            |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0110 | Drs Victoria and Guy | Slater and Harrison |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0111 | Mrs J                | Hall                |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0114 | Sandra               | Whitfield           |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0115 | Helen and David | Allen   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0116 | D               | Ives    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0117 | Mrs L           | Ives    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0118 | A J             | Cooper  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0123 | Alison          | Ingram  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0124 | Mary and Paul   | Layland |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0125 | Mr and Mrs   | Dixon    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0126 | Michael      | Gardner  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0127 | D            | Richens  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0128 | Mr and Mrs A | McMullen |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0129 | R and J      | Morgan   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0130 | James        | Walton   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname          | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0131 | S                | Mason            |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0132 | D J and M J      | Pretty and Brind |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0133 | Miss L E         | Jackson          |              |              |                         |               | Strongly opposed to the efforts of Oxford City to over-ride our council and attempt to build in Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. These villages are already full, and their characters will be destroyed if they become a suburb of Oxford. Traffic and parking is already a problem.   |
| PR-B-0135 | CG and RW        | Lewis            |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0136 | Matthew and Anne | McNeile          |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0137 | Katie            | Butler           |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0138 | Mrs Denise   | Buick      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0139 | K and P      | McCarthy   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0140 | Jan and Andy | Hodgson    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0141 | A            | Hadaway    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0142 | Michael C    | Warmington |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0143 | Mrs C        | Wilkins    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname     | Organisation             | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0144 | M and J           | Dabney      |                          |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0145 | Jo and Giles      | Charrington |                          |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0146 | Craig             | Williams    |                          |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0160 | Dr Matthew        | Cheetham    | Summertown Health Centre |              |                         |               | Development would have a significant impact on general practice in the area.Has any thought been given to a new Health Care facility?  |
| PR-B-0163 | Wendy and John    | Castle      |                          |              |                         |               | Concerned that Kidlington would merge with Yarnton and Begbroke and become a suburb of Oxford. The majority of employment within Oxford is not in the northern section. Kidlington will not alleviate the housing needs for Oxford as Oxford Parkway will expand London's commuter belt, and it's unlikely that affordable houses will be available due to buy to let landlords. Kidlington already has congested roads and stretched services and facilities.   |
| PR-B-0187 | Christine         | Brooks      |                          |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0188 | Hilary and Gordon | Lord        |                          |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name                  | Surname     | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0189 | Sarah                       | Baughan     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0190 | Mr and Mrs                  | Dowler      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0191 | Xiaohui                     | Wu          |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0192 | Christopher and Shirle      | Jarvis      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0193 | D J                         | Wintersgill |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0214 | Dr Michael and Mrs Margaret | Foster      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |



| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0215 | Neil         | Roberts  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0216 | Mrs Patricia | Yendle   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0217 | Synetta      | Robinson |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0218 | Mrs Barbara  | Sharlott |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0219 | V            | Masey    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0220 | Joy          | Barrett  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0221 | J V        | Barber   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0226 | Melanie    | Dempster |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0227 | M J        | Moore    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0228 | S          | Newell   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0229 | Julia      | Long     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0230 | Colin      | Goodgame |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0243 | Michael    | Harris   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0244 | Steve      | Taberner |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0245 | Mr R       | Sawala   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0246 | Fiona      | Gibson   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0247 | E          | Lewis    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0248 | Liam       | King     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0249 | S            | Jones   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0250 | Mr and Mrs R | Wheeler |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0251 | Kevin        | Bezant  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0252 | Amanda       | Platt   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0253 | Harry        | Platt   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0254 | Samantha     | Keates  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name            | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0255 | Andrew                | Platt     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0256 | Mrs Anne              | Sharp     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0257 | J C                   | Webb      |              |              |                         |               | Object to the proposed building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford, these figures are unrealistically high and should be challenged by CDC. It is unsustainable, traffic problems would become worse and schools and health services would be overstretched. Walks and views would be lost, and natural habitats of local importance destroyed. Object strongly to development on GB which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government's promise and CDC's policy to protect it should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0268 | Mrs Margaret Gwynneth | Seume     |              |              |                         |               | Am pleading with you not to accept the housing development around Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington along with those around Woodstock, the Airport, Langford Lane and the A4095. The area along the A44 would become a huge suburb for Oxford, joining Woodstock to Kidlington, with the villages losing their character and boundaries. The villages do not have the infrastructure to cope and traffic congestion would increase. Our schools and doctors are already at capacity and developers promises of new schools rarely happens. Please join with WODC to fight this grossly unfair development.  |
| PR-B-0270 | Patricia              | Cove      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0271 | Katrin                | Magorrian |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0272 | Charlotte     | Evans     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0273 | Julia         | Middleton |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0274 | Rob           | Chambers  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0275 | Mr and Mrs PB | Jeffreys  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0276 | D             | Bloomer   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0277 | Alison        | Weston    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0278 | Colin      | Fisher    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0279 | Anne       | Todd      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0280 | John       | Weston    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0281 | Sandra A   | Taylor    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0282 | Richard    | Taylor    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0287 | Peggy      | Edgington |              |              |                         |               | This rep has questions and concerns about the sewers, the access road and construction traffic at the Moors. Would like to know if the houses will be affordable and if a school and medical centre will be built. Suggests that Oxford City build on North Oxford Golf Course as this will affect less people and the wildlife.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname                 | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-------------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0292 | Kim Wah    | Lee                     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0293 | N          | Blake                   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0294 | KP         | Lloyd                   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0296 | Patricia   | Campbell-Meikle<br>John |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0297 | SJ         | Wickson                 |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0298 | John       | Wakefield               |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0299 | John       | Sullivan |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0300 | B          | Eastgate |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0301 | B          | Pickard  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0302 | Beth       | Morgan   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0303 | Mark       | Butler   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0304 | Sherene    | Butler   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0305 | A             | Eastgate |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0306 | C             | Mills    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0307 | L             | Brooks   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0308 | Kasey         | Butler   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0309 | Simon and Sue | Parker   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0310 | David         | Surman   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0311 | John       | Edwards |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0312 | Imran      | Rahman  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0313 | Paul       | Davies  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0314 | Claire     | Brandon |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0315 | LP         | Passant |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0316 |            | Holt    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0317 | Tom        | Daggitt  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0318 | S          | Ward     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0319 | AC         | Marchant |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0320 | E          | Holdak   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0321 | Adrian     | White    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0322 | Amy        | White    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0323 | Martin        | Long    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0324 | Kim           | Taplin  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0325 | Arthur Jeremy | Hilton  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0326 | D             | Nolan   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0327 | June          | Hackney |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0329 | E             | Mason   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name       | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0330 | Wendy            | Manners   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0331 | Margaret         | Duffield  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0332 | SG               | Warburton |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0333 | David and Joanne | Phillips  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0334 | J                | Watts     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0335 | June             | Simnett   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0336 | JB         | Weston    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0337 | P          | Abraham   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0338 | Susan      | Hooker    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0339 | David E    | Sawyer    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0340 | Susan      | Booker    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0341 | S and P    | Cranfield |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0342 | E                  | Hughes     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0343 | RC                 | Brown      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0344 | Mr and Mrs Anthony | Stewart    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0345 | R                  | Norrie     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0346 | Grace              | Sim        |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0347 | Peter              | Mackintosh |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0348 | Rosalind   | Franklin |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0349 | C          | Ripps    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0350 | Malcolm    | Cook     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0351 | Barbara    | Cook     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0352 | Alan A     | Green    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0354 | Kieran     | Brooks   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0355 | John       | Warland |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0356 | M          | Sims    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0357 | Mrs Y      | Amner   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0358 | GP         | Goddard |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0359 | JE         | Goddard |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0360 | Philippa   | Burrell |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name    | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|---------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0361 | M and V       | Pratley  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0362 | Maura         | Cordell  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0363 | Mr and Mrs BV | Port     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0364 | LG            | Kennell  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0365 | Gillian       | Thurling |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0366 | J             | Franklin |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0367 | Jennifer        | Colegrove  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0368 | S               | Willoughby |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0369 | B               | May        |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0370 | Robin and Wendy | Cowley     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0371 | David           | Thurling   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0372 | Joanne          | Collett    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0373 | Michael      | Crowther |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0374 | Mr and Mrs E | Varney   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0375 | Mr and Mrs C | Hodgkins |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0376 | Christine    | Howard   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0377 | MJ           | Kelly    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0378 | Karen        | Keene    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0379 | George     | Wakefield |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0380 | C          | Shenton   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0382 | S          | Shenton   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0383 | Mrs M G    | Kibby     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0384 | AJ         | Andrews   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0385 | N          | Payne     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname     | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0386 | Annabel    | Kastiek     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0387 | Heather    | Bishop      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0388 | PW         | Harvey      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0389 | Paul       | Mackilligin |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0390 | Lee        | Pickard     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0391 | L          | Boodell     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0392 | MR         | Ryan     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0393 | R          | Quinnell |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0394 | Marie      | Griffin  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0396 | Annabelle  | Mundy    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0398 | Michael    | Darke    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0399 | Harry      | Mundy   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0401 | Chris      | Digweed |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0402 | Alison     | Digweed |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0403 | Lindsay    | Gregory |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0404 | Caroline   | Gregory |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0405 | Philip     | Kilby    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0406 | FA         | Williams |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0407 | Helen      | Newman   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0408 | Ian        | Howdill  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0409 | Emma       | Mundy    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0412 | Stephen    | Youngman |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0413 | Mary       | Merrills |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0418 | HW         | Mitchell |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0419 | BM         | Brown    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0420 | B          | Haxton   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0422 | Ruth       | Davies   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0423 | J          | Davies   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0424 | Danny      | Griffin  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0425 | L          | Sullivan |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0426 | Ash V      | Smith    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0427 | Philip A   | Rawlins  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0428 | Yvonne     | Bunn     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0429 | C          | Andrews  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0430 | Peter      | Clayton  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0431 | Gary       | Bateman  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. |
| PR-B-0432 | I          | Andrews  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0434 | R          | Hardwick |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0435 | PB         | Johnson  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0436 | Elaine     | Simonds    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways.   |
| PR-B-0437 | AP         | Applegarth |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Local infrastructure already stretched, can not cope at peak times. To build homes without first addressing the impact to the A44, A40 and A43 corridors is irresponsible. Development would further harm Oxford's poor transport network and real productivity (too much time in the traffic jams).  |
| PR-B-0440 | N          | Carr       |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. The GB is a designated area protected (by government) to ensure independence of villages, protecting them from urban sprawl. It should not be used to fill areas between villages and towns. This proposal will have a huge impact on the countryside and local services. |
| PR-B-0441 | Roy        | Furniss    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Have lived on the Cassington Road for 30 years, every year the road floods. Just can't believe anyone is thinking of building on Spring Hill. Repairing the existing road and remove all the hump would be more productive. Strongly object to this proposal.             |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0442 | Irina        | Bystron  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0443 | Mr P J       | Ibson    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. More GB being used.  |
| PR-B-0444 | David        | Norris   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Have lived in Water Eaton Lane for 66 years and do not want to see it surrounded by houses. It would destroy the lane completely. Please do not do this.   |
| PR-B-0448 | Mr and Mrs A | Thompson |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Agree Kidlington is being spoilt. Too many properties being pulled down, flats being built resulting in not enough parking places. Building on the Co-op car park, that's why we are leaving here. |
| PR-B-0449 | E and N      | Morris   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Objection to these proposals of Oxford City becoming joint to Kidlington.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname             | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0450 | R and B    | Davies and Fenemore |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. The Moors is already a rat run because Banbury and Oxford roads are unable to cope as it is.   |
| PR-B-0451 | M and C    | Orr                 |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Sheer vandalism of our countryside. Expanding Kidlington either in areas A or B will have a terrible impact. Creating more and more urban sprawl. Kidlington is already outgrown its facilities and roads. |
| PR-B-0452 | MI         | Reed                |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. It is currently very difficult to obtain GP appointments or access an NHS dentist in Kidlington. The proposed development will significantly exacerbate the problem.                                       |
| PR-B-0453 | Marion J   | Wakeling            |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Extra homes will put too much pressure on clinics, schools, houses, parking and traffic flow etc.  |
| PR-B-0454 | Roger      | Panaman             |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. In desperate need of fewer people not more housing.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0455 | Michael John       | Wilton   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Area between The Moors and the river is not suitable because of risk to flooding each year. Area between Kidlington and Yarnton should be totally developed because access from Kidlington is totally inadequate.   |
| PR-B-0456 | DJC                | Lyke     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Wish to stay with CDC, do not wish to lose every green field and be joined to Oxford. Nicola Blackwood does not do anything for Kidlington only North Oxford and Abingdon which have no connections with us. The main road through Kidlington is already congested with traffic, same applies to the A34. |
| PR-B-0458 | Laurance and Faith | McKeever |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Making better use of previously developed land in Oxford. Using some proposed employment sites in the city for housing more appropriate. Rather than swallowing Kidlington and melting to a suburb of the city instead of a village with its individual characters and community.                         |
| PR-B-0459 | H and C            | Wardrop  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. No further developments, not enough schools, doctors etc. Also encounter more road problems. More shops needed and more parking in the centre.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0460 | Paul           | Spokes  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. This area is GB you can not keep destroying this county. No money will be able to bring this back so that we have a countryside. This is wrong.  |
| PR-B-0461 | Mr and Mrs J S | Holland |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. 27 days waiting time for doctors appointment. Streets already clogged with parked cars. Where is the infrastructure in these plans. Green spaces are needed in and around Kidlington, they are the lungs of the community, decent air to breath, not further pollution. Kidlington is a village Oxford City should sort this. GB was put in place by our predecessors to protect us all. |
| PR-B-0462 | Mr and Mrs R   | Bullock |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Co-op redevelopment with flats must stop. Proposed fever spaces for car parking, causing problems for existing Kidlington residents and people coming to the facilities from local villages. Proposed additional housing with the current infrastructure in Kidlington would totally destroy the character and community.  |
| PR-B-0463 | Mary           | Lunn    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Low lying floodplains are involved. Protection of GB is vital for wild life including birds, mammals and insects.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0464 | Simon           | Hedges  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Kidlington's roads over capacity, posing a significant health risk to children in particular when walking to school due to the high concentration of exhaust fumes. Doubling the housing in Kidlington will be completely irresponsible, further increasing the severe problems, other options must be considered.  |
| PR-B-0465 | Howard and Joan | James   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. This land is also water logged at times, concerned about flooding.  |
| PR-B-0466 | David           | Smith   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Objections and reasons have been made clear in this circular. Kidlington would become a residential sprawl, with little or no identity. Oxford City need to have a rethink.   |
| PR-B-0467 | NT and R        | Simpson |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Kidlington is a village and should remain a village, it has had its fair share of development over the last 50 years. More houses would invalidate all the recent road improvements and lead to greater delays to traffic, stretching our infrastructure which is to breaking point. GB and local parks are precious and should not be destroyed further. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0469 | Paula      | Hastings |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Under the impression that GB should not be built on unless it is an exceptional circumstance, which this is not. Our local schools and doctors are already struggling with demand let alone adding 1,000 or 4,000 houses. |
| PR-B-0471 | N          | Carrier  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Currently suffer many hundreds of cars rat racing on Cassington Road during peak hours. This would be made more unbearable and dangerous for walkers and cyclists along Cassington Road if we increase Yarntons housing.  |
| PR-B-0473 | Ken        | Marsland |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. My views are really covered by the comments on the postcard. Emphasis in particular referring to page 5 in the options consultation summary leaflet on the GB. Also query how this mysterious figure of the requirement for 4,400 new homes has been arrived at.  |
| PR-B-0474 | John       | Grain    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. I have lived in Kidlington since 1950, enjoying walking the many areas of green fields and wooded areas. I am amazed that anyone would want to ruin the green areas, other than to make money.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0475 | Keith      | Nicholson |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. S3 bus service already overstretched/inadequate for the areas transport needs. Proper public transport links need to be in place before any developments occurs. The proposals place an intolerable burden on the lives of people already living in Begbroke and Yarnton. Impossible to see a doctor in an emergency due to the inadequate resources. |
| PR-B-0477 | RP         | Nicholson |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Development would cause ribbon development from Oxford to Woodstock. Increased likelihood of more GB being later developed. Increased congestion, pollution and reduced quality of life.  |
| PR-B-0479 | M          | Beaker    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Traffic is already horrendous, there is no capacity to build these houses within our community. The GB is irreplaceable.  |
| PR-B-0480 | MC         | Seymour   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0481 | KI         | Fong      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0482 | DP              | Hamill   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Health services are overstretched as it is, resulting in time spent in hospital due to not getting an appointment with a GP. Three to four weeks is the usual waiting time.   |
| PR-B-0483 | Peter           | Venables |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Consideration to the effects of the present residents have not been considered in anyway.   |
| PR-B-0484 | Graham          | Clark    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. The proposed destruction of the GB is not acceptable, please support the common sense view by retaining the original GB. For the benefit of future generations and ourselves, nature and wild life. |
| PR-B-0486 | Andrew and Jane | Coggins  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Agree with the comments on the postcard. GB is sacrosanct and should be preserved to prevent urban sprawl. CDC and Oxford City should concentrate on brown field developments implementing low cost and high new building methods.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0487 | Lisa         | Barnwell |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Object due to our Doctors always being full at the moment, without more houses. What about schools. GB should only be built on in exceptional circumstances and what about the extra traffic. |
| PR-B-0489 | Brett        | Barnwell |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Traffic already congested on the A34, A44 and A40. Doctors appointments hard to get already. Hard to get placements at schools.   |
| PR-B-0490 | E A          | Kane     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0491 | Stephen      | Hewer    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0492 | Mr and Mrs B | Higgins  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0494 | Ross       | Poulter |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0495 | S          | Kenny   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0496 | Robert     | Bruce   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0497 | A          | Womack  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0498 | Ora        | Sapir   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0499 | KD and ML  | Cooke   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0500 | David      | Callicott |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Yarnton has had a number of houses built over the last 5 years, with nothing being done to the infrastructure. Can not take more houses until this is addressed.  |
| PR-B-0501 | Fiona      | Garratt   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Agree with the comments made on the postcard and object to Oxford City's proposal to build 4,400 houses on the GB for the reasons stated.   |
| PR-B-0502 | Robert B   | Sim       |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Land west of Water Eaton Lane is low lying. Building here would increase flooding of the lower lying houses in the south end of Water Eaton Lane. It would also effect the water levels at Kidlington cemetery. Building on east side of Water Eaton Lane should not be undertaken until a decision is made on the widening of the A43. |
| PR-B-0503 | Edith      | Sim       |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. The proposal to build adjacent to Water Eaton Lane increases the possibility of flooding in an already high risk area. This would also have adverse effect on Kidlington cemetery.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0504 | Ann        | Martin    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. New schools needed. Healthcare and transport all strapped for cash now. What about the wildlife and the Great Crested Newt at Croxford Gardens.   |
| PR-B-0505 | Kim        | Martin    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. How many are going to be social houses. Who is going to pay for the additional police in the area of Croxford Gardens. What about the Great Crested Newt in the proposed wildlife areas of Croxford Gardens.  |
| PR-B-0506 | J          | Nelson    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Proposed massive developments in an existing village with traffic and parking problems. Building in areas of natural beauty and wildlife. Flooding already exists in the fields.  |
| PR-B-0507 | WLH        | Horlick   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. I would like to be informed of any local meetings for the residents of Kidlington in the near future.   |
| PR-B-0508 | Tina       | Callicott |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Have lived in Yarnton for 30 years and it has already doubled in size. There has been enough development already. The infrastructure and roads have not been increased or updated to reflect this. Our schools, doctors and road can not cope sufficiently now. |

| Rep No.   | First Name      | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0509 | Clr Emilie      | Walton  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. There are hundreds of empty houses in Oxford City. Many are owned by companies and greedy landlords. What's to stop the new houses being snapped up by them and not those who need it.  |
| PR-B-0510 | VJ              | Goodall |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Kidlington is becoming an ugly sprawling mess, is the objective to make us a suburb of Oxford. Please save the GB. When is it going to stop. Is it going to go on forever.  |
| PR-B-0511 | Patricia        | Shaw    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Its vital to provide residents space to relax by walking, running, cycling etc. Children must have space to roam and explore natural habitats. Must have GB to keep housing developments in check. Doctors surgeries can not cope now. Kidlington lacks leisure facilities for all ages, which should be addressed. |
| PR-B-0512 | Alan and Sylvia | Osborn  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Have already lost our local bus along The Moors. If properties were built adjacent to The Moors they would definitely need to be a bus again, otherwise the traffic will increase.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0513 | Joan       | Davies  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Planned number of houses will almost double the population of Kidlington, causing unacceptable road congestion of planned area west of St Mary's Church. Unacceptable congestion on Church Street and Mill Street. All of this will cause unrest amongst existing residents and crime rates could rise.  |
| PR-B-0514 | MR         | Cooper  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Having lived in Kidlington for 36 years, have been a lover of the GB by using the many footpaths that go to make the area so beautiful and enjoyable. Would hope that the estimate extra 4,400 residences would not impinge on the area due to the infrastructure to accommodate the extra need for the amenities.   |
| PR-B-0515 | P          | Foyle   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Object strongly to all the houses being built on and around Kidlington, taking over our GB areas and joining up with Oxford City. There isn't much green area to enjoy for walking in the areas of Kidlington. Being a pensioner don't want to travel far to enjoy the fresh air and to get away from traffic. Want Kidlington to remain as a village and not become part of Oxford. |
| PR-B-0516 | Douglas    | Roberts |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Along side the need of additional 4,400 residences in the Kidlington area, it is important for the necessary infrastructure, schools, surgeries, shops and transport requirements. These amenities are at full stretch at the moment. It would be nice to know what is intended.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0517 | Pamela M   | Cooper    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Have lived in Kidlington for 54 years and loved every minute. Have seen a lot of changes but these proposals are excessive for all the reasons mentioned. The Government's promise to protect the GB should be upheld.   |
| PR-B-0518 | Anthony    | Morris    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Feel strongly that the GB should not be built on, both to preserve the environment and to prevent Kidlington becoming non-stop urban sprawl from here to Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0519 | Lucy       | Loveridge |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Proposals to build on The Co-op and Ghurkha Village car park in Kidlington will be a nightmare even without any extra house building, let alone thousands more.  |
| PR-B-0520 | Dawn       | Glatz     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Extremely concerned about the abuse this will inflict on the GB, brown field sites should be pitched. Excessive number of housing for this area. Affordable housing for locals is imperative but not at such volumes. The present infrastructure can not cope. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0521 | LJ         | Holstead |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. GB should not be built on to allow for the overspill of Oxford. The area requires a major alteration to the road network, there is already bad congestion at the moment with the A34, A40 and A44 at capacity.  |
| PR-B-0522 | F          | Lambert  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Concerns over flooding.   |
| PR-B-0523 | Peter      | Druce    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. The numbers and areas of development clearly show no regard for GB policy. Kidlington amenities, Schools, Doctors etc. already stretched. The proposal will mean Oxford expanding to consume Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton and should be resisted at all costs to preserve their identities. |
| PR-B-0525 | Ronald     | Phipps   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. On the CDC we have many conservative members, who should be voting against building on the GB and also including farm land.   |
| PR-B-0526 | MD         | McLean   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. A number of empty houses due to the owner abandoning them. Complaints have been made to the local council about this.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0527 | H          | Steele   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Really going to reduce the green and pleasant land to concrete. Over development of the worst possible kind, this should be rejected. Our future generations will never forgive us for spoiling our countryside. |
| PR-B-0528 | Anthony F  | Bennell  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. The infrastructure in our area does not allow for additional traffic. Our village is already at saturation point. Important now and for future generations that green fields and GB are protected.               |
| PR-B-0530 | T          | Blake    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Risk of losing village status by becoming an overspill of Oxford. The houses being built will end up as rental properties, charging high rents, people will still not be able to become home owners.             |
| PR-B-0531 | D          | Burridge |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. GB needs preserving for nature and a place for body and mind. Between the church and Thrupp is especially precious which needs protection.   |
| PR-B-0532 | Pat        | Hawtin   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. John Prescott over ruled all local councils on the Water - Eaton P and R. The same will happen with 4,000 homes in Kidlington. Government will overrule any objections.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name            | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-----------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0535 | Maureen               | Gale     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Schools, health services would not be able to cope. Getting a Doctors appointment is difficult now. More houses would stretch the services. Affordable houses never enough.   |
| PR-B-0536 | Jane, Elizabeth, Kate | Rendle   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0537 | Margaret              | Holstead |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. As a walk leader we encourage more people to walk. The loss of the GB around Kidlington would discourage walking by limiting the local countryside in which to walk. Once built on GB you can never get it back. For future generations please keep GB.   |
| PR-B-0538 | J                     | Fossey   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Consultation process by DC has been inadequate, if had not been for development watch poster, Would not have known about it. GB land is essential to maintain health and well being, contributing to public health. What consideration has been given to health and education infrastructure? How were the figures arrived at and what impact does Brexit have? |
| PR-B-0540 | Linda                 | Nicholls |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. There is no exceptional need to build in this GB area.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname    | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0541 | Sheila     | Churchill  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Concerned about the addition of more than 4,000 houses. Upset about the plan to develop on GB, which is meant to restrict urban sprawl. Kidlington will lose its unique character with this proposed development, it should not be allowed.  |
| PR-B-0542 | Helen      | Bristow    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Destruction of the GB is a major consideration. The infrastructure, especially travel would not be able to cope. The village would lose its identity.  |
| PR-B-0543 | Benito     | Wainwright |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. GB were intended to be permanent, so should be immune to development. The countryside North of the Moors is of high scenic value, enjoyed buy locals and provides vital habitats for wildlife, like the protected badger. The Moors would be ruined and Benmead Road would become very busy. 4,400 extra houses would double Kidlington's population, the figure for housing needs are widely exaggerated. The lack of infrastructure would be disastrous. |
| PR-B-0544 | Sally      | Markham    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. GB land surrounding Kidlington should be protected and not sacrificed. Its use for recreational space and habitat for wildlife is of utmost importance. The scale of the proposed development is alarming and seems unjustified.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0545 | Kelvin     | Markham  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. The loss of GB land is not justified. The loss of valuable and irreplaceable recreational space which is heavily used and enjoyed by local residents.  |
| PR-B-0546 | Trevor     | Campbell |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. GB development should only take place when justified. It is not feasible to remove open spaces that is valued by Kidlington and Yarnton residents, to satisfy the housing needs for Oxford. The need is driven by the University who own large amounts of undeveloped land, within the walls of the city.                    |
| PR-B-0547 | Gwen       | Young    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Strongly object to the possible terms of this proposal. Owe it to our children and future generations to preserve open green spaces. This would destroy Kidlington's character and be to the significant detriment of the health and wellbeing of local residents. Question the justification for this scale of development. |
| PR-B-0549 | William C  | Gills    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Concerned about increased risk of flooding.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name  | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|-------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0550 | Dawn        | Williams |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. It is Oxford's problem, if they need houses stop building student accommodation and build houses instead. There is no clarification of house types for these proposals. The sites are waterlogged and flooding is already a problem in Kidlington. No indications of where or if schools, shops, pubs and other amenities would be sited. Oxford has been trying to turn Kidlington into a suburb for yeas and we do not want it. |
| PR-B-0552 | Mary-Louise | Riley    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0553 | P           | Blackman |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0554 | H           | Williams |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0555 | P           | Wyatt    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0556 | F            | Salter   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0557 | Mr and Mrs   | Bushnell |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0558 | Mr and Mrs D | Stuart   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0559 | Nicholas     | Kubat    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0560 | Mr and Mrs   | Nash     |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-0561 | Margaret     | Bishop   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |

| Rep No.   | First Name        | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|-------------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0562 | Mr and Mrs        | Fennymore |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0563 | Susan             | Rivers    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0564 | Maxine and Seamus | Ryan      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0565 | Amanda            | Roberts   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0566 | J                 | Cook      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Proposal for extra dwellings is an environmental disaster on GB sites. Concrete, tarmac in huge proportions equals flooding. In Yarnton, Spring Hill, springs frequently burst and pour down into the village, where would these springs be diverted if possible. Oxford known as a pit of carbon monoxide fumes, with the increase of vehicles the breathing green spaces will be lost. |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0567 | Gerald     | Hunt      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Unhappy with the proposal careful consideration needed.   |
| PR-B-0568 | Malcolm    | Blackshaw |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Agree that we need extra housing but not 4,000+ in our area. Equating to 6,000+ more cars on local roads, which are already overloaded. Any agreed amount of housing should included more affordable housing. |
| PR-B-0569 | C          | Williams  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Chose to live in a quiet village 45 years ago and would not like to see all these changes happen.   |
| PR-B-0570 | Roberta J  | Lailey    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Concerns about the extra housing are around health and if the health services are able to provide a service. Moving to a village that could lose its character would be upsetting.                            |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0571 | Carla      | Skinner |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. The loss of the GB especially on Spring Hill, which is a spot of beauty on the Shakespearian Way. Would be terrible and detrimental to all.   |
| PR-B-0572 | Christina  | Bailey  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Roads are already congested. Need substantial improvements to roads, bus lanes and cycle lanes before additional housing could be considered. Our GB is precious and an essential green lung for Oxford we should not destroy it. |
| PR-B-0573 | George A   | Lailey  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Want to object on many grounds but mainly the roads. Congestion is growing and adding more houses will not help. Thought that this area was GB, does that mean nothing nowadays?  |
| PR-B-0574 | Julia      | Wiseman |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0575 | Matthew    | Keates  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Object due to the roads already being regularly jammed with traffic. The land that has been outlined was marked as GB, which is partly the reason to live in Yarnton to enjoy the local countryside. |
| PR-B-0576 | M          | Jackson |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Quality of life matters.   |
| PR-B-0578 | J          | Cooper  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Have a lovely countryside why spoil it by building houses.   |
| PR-B-0580 | GM         | Waddle  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. This takes away Kidlington village identity. It will become a suburb of Oxford. Traffic is a nightmare now so travelling in and out of Oxford will be awful with our infrastructure improvements before building starts. Building on a floodplain is nonsense.   |
| PR-B-0581 | C          | Fenn    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname          | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|------------------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0582 | Lee and Dawn | Palmer and Young |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0583 | Marion       | Jones            |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Strongly object to the building of these houses in the North of Oxford. The roads can not cope as it is and the schools and Doctors surgeries also. Both Yarnton and Rutten Lane flood badly. |
| PR-B-0584 | Rita         | White            |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Please save the Oxford GB, thank you.   |
| PR-B-0585 | CD           | Millward         |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Appalled that this amount of houses could be built, agree with everything printed on the card. Understand some housing is required, build on brown sites that are there. Imagine trying to get into Oxford or in an emergency to the hospital in the morning.   |
| PR-B-0586 | Roger        | Pounds           |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Feel strongly that the GB should be protected, rather than expand villages, small towns etc. Would it not be wiser or time to build new cities.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0589 | EA         | Bristow |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. To put the majority of the housing requirement in one area would put too much strain on the infrastructure. You need to reconsider.   |
| PR-B-0590 | Clive A    | Bristow |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Utilise empty properties and brownfield sites in the first instance. Any remaining needs should be spread evenly around ring road and certainly not in one area.                      |
| PR-B-0593 | G          | Thomas  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Chose to live in a small village, not a large town. Want Begbroke to remain a small village. Enjoy open land and country walks and do not want to walk through a housing development. |
| PR-B-0594 | D          | Thomas  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Do not want to spoil our lovely village with more homes, traffic etc. Chose to live here for the non hectic life, open space and small community.                                     |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0597 | N          | Dresdon |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Having commuted from Begbroke to Oxford for over 30 years by bus and car, the journey time has increased by over 50% even with the new Wolvercote modification. With developments in Woodstock and Chipping Norton, within the planned expansion would cause chaos on the roads. |
| PR-B-0598 | EA         | Dresden |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Having worked at both Kidlington and Woodstock surgeries as a Health Visitor. The services are already stretched to capacity. Residents of Begbroke without a car can no longer access Kidlington since the K3 bus was scrapped.   |
| PR-B-0602 | Nadine     | Wyatt   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. During the new station build, endured 18 months of site traffic, causing noise and dirty everyday. The volume of traffic in the lane was dangerous and made for a miserable year and a half. The area is used by walkers and cyclists as a safe and pleasant route from Kidlington to Cutteslowe/Oxford.   |
| PR-B-0604 | Lucy       | Pilgrim |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Why should Kidlington be responsible for providing GB housing for Oxford City. Why create jobs in an area of low employment and then build houses for extra people coming into the county. Protect our GB it is there for a reason.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0605 | Diana      | Cinlott  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Site PR125 is an area liable to flooding, building on this area will increase the risk of flooding. Extensive house building is inappropriate on this ground and is not in the interest of Gosford.   |
| PR-B-0607 | Tom        | Pilgrim  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Why should Kidlington be responsible for providing housing for Oxford City. They will not be affordable for the local people, absolute disgrace.  |
| PR-B-0608 | RH         | Ryder    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Protect the GB at all cost. 2,000 houses already planned at Eynsham, so Oxford City only need 400 do not encroach on the GB. Wolvercote roundabout traffic will increase by 6,000 twice a day, Oxford can not cope with the level of traffic. |
| PR-B-0609 | Philip     | Williams |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. The strain on the existing facilities would be ridiculous, this can not happen.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0610 | Anne       | Lewis    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. GB areas serve to support the community young and old. As there is no park in Kidlington to serve all, as such this will lead to an unhealthy life style with consequences on health, community and well being. |
| PR-B-0611 | Anne       | Clifton  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0612 | Anthony    | Thompson |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0613 | P          | Bradley  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Am opposed to the building on GB. Also the over loading on Doctors and schools which are already full to capacity.  |
| PR-B-0615 | Susan      | Pfinder  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Main objection is to protect all GB areas. In addition local schools, medical centres etc. would be overstretched. Pollution is already too high.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname   | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|-----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0616 | Rosemary   | Keen      |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. More flooding and chaos on the A44, which is dreadful even now.  |
| PR-B-0617 | Stephen    | Connolly  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0618 | Elizabeth  | Solopova  |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. GB should not be removed to meet housing requirements. Local Planning should avoid coalescence of villages. Infrastructure should come first. Housing should be across the county. |
| PR-B-0619 | J          | Ashley    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Don't agree with all the points above but it will be a bad development if the rural areas lose their identity due to lots of houses being built.                                   |
| PR-B-0621 | Annabel    | Henderson |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name         | Surname  | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------------|----------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0623 | J                  | Casey    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Too much congestion and too many cars. Not enough schools and Doctors.                                  |
| PR-B-0624 | Stuart and Phyllis | Holcroft |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Flooding is a big risk, houses that become affected will be blighted for ever. Has GB lost its meaning. |
| PR-B-0625 | Christopher        | Rogers   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. I understand that GB was called GB for a reason.  |
| PR-B-0626 | Mr and Mrs         | Taylor   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0631 | AT                 | Ryan     |              |              |                         |               | Whilst understand the need for housing object to the scale of proposed building which would destroy the village of Begbroke and its rural setting. The traffic is already busy, in particular the A44 and the area prone to flooding.  |
| PR-B-0670 | Mary               | Phipps   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Save our GB especially between Oxford and Kidlington.   |

| Rep No.   | First Name | Surname | Organisation | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments  |
|-----------|------------|---------|--------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|---|
| PR-B-0713 | Tim        | Baldwin |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City's housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages' characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways. Why is CDC prepared to have GB destroyed, when the Government has already stated a commitment for GB preservation. |
| PR-B-0718 | David      | Bird    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0719 | Albert     | Prior   |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |
| PR-B-0720 | Mr and Mrs | Head    |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. GB is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. Oxfordshire is steeped in history and should be protected from being turned into an urban suburb of London. GB land in Kidlington is a valued resource for recreational activities to destroy this would harm peoples well being.            |
| PR-B-0721 | Pauline    | Kearney |              |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.  |



| Rep No.   | First Name   | Surname | Organisation                               | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|--------------|---------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0724 | Christine    | Daley   |  |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0749 | Dr and Mrs M | Wallace |  |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.   |
| PR-B-0826 | Alan         | Dobson  |  |              |                         |               | Publicity about the exhibition and consultation in the Cutteslowe Pavilion in November was poorly distributed and too short notice. Some people found out by accident and others when it was over. No way to run a credible consultation. However, the two Cherwell staff whom I met were pleasant and helpful.  |
| PR-B-0849 | Caroline     | Briden  |  |              |                         |               | Protest and object to the proposal to build 4,400 houses around Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke. The use of GB land which both CDC and Oxford City have undertaken to protect, is unacceptable. The three villages (Kidlington, Yarnton and Begbroke) would lose their individual characters, historical settings etc. The local infrastructure already struggles to cope. This proposal comes on top of developments already proposed in the Cherwell Local Plan, adding intolerable further pressure to the area. Who is taking a holistic county-wide view of development and conservation in which residents can have any faith? Many, if not most residents of the villages wish to retain the green belt and for it to be a "green lung" and an amenity for prosperity. |
| PR-B-0879 | Francis W    | Kirkham | JW Kirkham Will Trust                      |              |                         |               | It is noted that a minimum site size threshold of 2ha is proposed, providing a notional density of 50 homes. Suggested that this approach could be modified where a smaller area might provide additional access to the larger one. An example would be my family's field on the northern edge of Kidlington, accessed at the junction of St Mary's Close (off The Moors) and Freeborn Close. The field comprises parcels NG3972 and NG5272, totalling 1.497ha.  |
| PR-B-0882 | Julia        | Trowles |  |              |                         |               | The Kidlington Framework Masterplan adopted by CDC in December 2016 has not been taken into account.   |
| PR-B-0919 | Prof Daphne  | Hampson |  |              |                         |               | If going to get 4,400 more homes in Kidlington then it's imperative that there is an adequate town centre to go with the town that we would become. It needs to be pointed out to central Government, CDC and Oxford City that if we accept Oxford's overflow who will be paying for this. Perhaps should not build on the Co-op car park, perhaps pull the building down instead and allow the planners to design the town centre.  |
| PR-B-0934 | Chris        | Gaskell | Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks |              |                         |               | The development land areas detailed in the consultation document are typical of a number of recent sites across Southern England where insufficient discussion has taken place between planning authorities and ourselves prior to planning permission being granted. The land in question is crossed by various 132kV overhead tower line, 33,000ehv overhead lines and 11,000 volt (hv) overhead lines. In the case of 132kV OTL, this is an extremely important link in the transmission system. Modifying such a line is a major undertaking and should be avoided if possible. Details of the Mains Records for each of the Options Consultation sites have been provided.  |

| Rep No.   | First Name     | Surname   | Organisation   | Question No. | Area of Search Specific | Site Specific | Comments   |
|-----------|----------------|-----------|--|--------------|-------------------------|---------------|--|
| PR-B-0946 | Sarah          | Karatzios |  |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-1064 | Karen and Tony | East      |  |              |                         |               | Criticism regarding the complicated process to object to the plans. Very difficult to find information as the plans on the website and the documents are very lengthy. This could put a lot of people off objecting.   |
| PR-B-1069 | JP             | Lyes      |  |              |                         |               | Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City's unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected. |
| PR-B-1099 | Alan           | Storah    | Oxford City Council                                      |              |                         |               | Supports Cherwell in the duty to co-operate through Oxford's OAN. It welcomes the opportunity to discuss with the Cherwell on affordable housing that would meet some of Oxford's unmet need.  |
| PR-B-1261 | Sarah          | Pyne      | Indigo Planning on behalf of McKay Security Services PLC |              |                         |               | Rep seeks to promote the Lower Cherwell Industrial Estate, Banbury as a site with potential to deliver mixed-use development in the District. A site location plan is provided. Details in support of the site are provided. Mc Kay Securities PLC is an existing investor in Banbury. It is committed to working with CDC to support the Council's aims for development to address the recognised shortage of housing and presents the Council with an opportunity for mixed-use development in a highly sustainable location.  |
| PR-B-1301 | Nigel          | McGurk    | The Blenheim Palace Estate / Vanbrugh Unit Trust         |              |                         |               | Full consideration needs to be given to the need for a location within a strategic transport corridor within close proximity to Oxford. In reality, this should limit the Area of Search to land within the A44 Corridor only, but this has not been given sufficient priority in the Options Paper. Consequently, sites lacking sustainability credentials and/or located in areas not immediately accessible to Oxford City are afforded too much weight in the site assessment process. This results in inappropriate scoring of sites.   |
| PR-B-1355 | James          | Macnamara | Parish councillor/individual                             |              |                         |               | Strong objection to Site PR52. Reasons for objecting are: development size; impact on settlements of Lower Heyford, Caulcott and Upper Heyford; Impact on Conservation Areas of Rousham, Oxford Canal, and RAF Upper Heyford; Lack of road capacity on all roads in the area; lack of railway capacity; unsustainable location; too far from Oxford and unlikely to meet Oxford's needs; concern about cumulative impact; developer's inability to deliver, and conflict with Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan.   |