

## Appendix 2

Comments raised in consultation on PR6b

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief	ABA response
London Oxford Airport	Along with PR6a and PR7a, the site is located under the flight path to/from LOA and therefore subject to noise associated with arriving/departing aircraft. The development of these sites will introduce new receptors into a potentially noisy environment. In accordance with 'agent of change' principles, the existing airport use must not be prejudiced by this. As a matter of principle OASL would prefer that these sites were not developed for noise sensitive uses like residential.	We note the point made, particularly in relation to the agent of change principle. The sites have been allocated in the Local Plan for residential development.	None	
London Oxford Airport	The onus must be on the developer(s) of these sites to ensure that suitable noise conditions are created for future occupiers that accounts for the existing noise constraints associated with aircraft movements. Future planning applications should be informed by thorough noise survey and assessment work with appropriate mitigation embedded into the scheme(s) from the outset in terms of design and building specification. This should account for the full extent of aircraft movements allowed by the s106 agreement (not just the current level of activity).	We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	
London Oxford Airport	We recommend that the planning permission(s) for the development of these sites are subject to s.106 obligations requiring the developer(s) to formally notify future purchasers in writing of the existence of flight paths that cross the sites. This is necessary (in line with agent of change principles) in order to avoid the risk of the airport use being prejudiced in the future. We recommend that the draft briefs are updated to account for this and recommend early applicant consultation with OASL as part of pre-application discussions.	There is a need for consistency across the development briefs; those for PR7b and PR9 didn't include this. Nevertheless, we note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.	None	
SSE	Refers us back to submissions they made in 2019 during the local plan policy formation	SSE's comments have been weighed in the formulation of the LPPR.	None	

St Andrews Church Oxford	<p>The DB promotion of healthy place shaping should go beyond expressing the principle in physical terms and set out the expectations of the steps required from the outset to engender a strong sense of community spirit and building a healthy community. Seeks confirmation that the Council will draw on its Healthy Bicester experience to create exemplary partnerships to support PR6b and other PR developments. One option to confirm this principle would be to require the developers to make available a community house in the first phase of building and to fund a full-time community liaison officer for the site. Another option would be to support the creation of a Community Trust with a suitable endowment. This is necessary to help build community spirit, including helping new residents settle into their new surroundings and facilitating social interaction between residents and local community groups.</p>	<p>Section 6.2 of the development brief sets out the detailed requirements for healthy place shaping. Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the community infrastructure required at the site</p>	None	
BBOWT	<p>The scale of development (across all six sites) will inevitably have a major impact in terms of vehicles and vehicle movements. If the Council is minded to proceed with the allocation of these sites for development then there are several aspects which will need to be required of developers to minimise the impact on wildlife</p>	<p>The principle of development has been established through the adoption of LPPR.</p>	None	
BBOWT	<p>The large scale of development should be matched by large-scale habitat restoration and enhancement (paras 175 and 179 of the NPPF).</p>	<p>The Local Plan policy requirements for biodiversity are set out at parts 9-11 of the policy</p>	None	
BBOWT	<p>Welcomes the requirement for a Biodiversity Impact Assessment to be submitted as part of the planning application and a supporting Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan</p>	Noted	None	
BBOWT	<p>Concerned that despite mitigation measures there may still be significant light pollution arising from the developments, both static lighting as well as lights from vehicles. There is an opportunity to consider lighting strategically to make this area an exemplar in terms of minimising light pollution in terms of the type of lighting used, how much is used and where it is used, as well as design of routes to avoid light pollution into wildlife-rich areas of the sites. A key principle will be to keep dark corridors where bats are using lines of trees and hedgerows as flight paths. Lighting will have to be managed carefully to ensure it is of low spill variety.</p>	<p>These comments are noted and it will be an important consideration for planning application proposals</p>	None	

BBOWT	<p>In order to provide the requisite wildlife benefits, to achieve the biodiversity net gain, there should not be public access across the entire area of green infrastructure. Zoning, and a 'hierarchy' of access levels of the combination of all green areas should be carefully planned, including consideration of main paths/cycle routes/desire lines. There should be informal recreation along a network of paths and openly accessible spaces included within a mosaic of areas that are closed off by appropriate use of hedgerows, screens, fences and ditches. Broad zones might help keep some larger restricted access nature conservation blocks 'quiet' rather than fragmenting areas too much - would be simpler for residents and visitors to understand and will allow wildlife to thrive and be observed from paths, in areas defined as 'nature reserves' with interpretation to the public to explain their value</p>	<p>We note the points made. It may be that the BIA and BIMP may lead to areas needing to be protected to meet the requirements of Policy PR6b but this information has not been available to inform preparation of the brief, and would need to be determined at the planning application stage.</p>	None	
BBOWT	<p>It is important that details are provided for how green infrastructure will be managed in the long term (i.e. forever). Once developed it can be reasonably assumed that the developed land will have buildings on forever. Therefore the GI should be retained forever and with an endowment fund to pay for its management forever.</p>	<p>It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9</p>	None	
BBOWT	<p>The GI including wildlife habitats should be managed forever and proposals should recognise this. Long term management plans and effective, sensitive management will be needed for the site. Ideally, there would be a funded officer role to coordinate and oversee this, which could be alongside or sharing a role as a community engagement officer; this role could be delivered by an officer in an external organisation with appropriate experience.</p>	Noted	None	
BBOWT	<p>The wording "The scheme is to include provision of in-built bird and bat boxes, wildlife connectivity between gardens and the provision of designated green walls and roofs where appropriate/viable" should be amended to: "A scheme for the provision of exemplary biodiversity in the built environment, including street trees with large canopies, wildflower road verges, wildlife connectivity between gardens, provision of designated green walls and roofs, and bird and bat boxes integrated into buildings." The order is important and the current order suggests that bird and bat boxes are more important than wildlife connectivity. The reality is that the provision of natural wildlife habitat, including within the built environment, is much more valuable for wildlife than bird and bat boxes.</p>	The point is very much noted, including the order of the sentence	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Text of P49 amended

BBOWT	<p>The development should be exemplary in terms of integrating biodiversity features. The Development Brief should require the development to maximise the provision of green roofs and install solar panels on roofs which are not green roofs. Wildlife connectivity between gardens can be achieved by allowing gaps in fencing and walls for hedgehogs and other small animals to roam. This can be used to raise community awareness of wildlife.</p>	<p>These points are very much noted. With regard to green roofs, they are mentioned at Section 6.0 ("The scheme is to include provision of in-built bird and bat boxes, wildlife connectivity between gardens and the provision of designated green walls and roofs where viable") and further text is not considered necessary</p>	None	
BBOWT	<p>Expects that wildlife-rich areas will be protected during construction and afterwards/during occupation. This will require long-term monitoring and sensitive management to a plan with developer-funded oversight. We welcome the requirement to retain mature trees and manage these sensitively.</p>	<p>We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.</p>	None	
BBOWT	<p>Any future planning application would need to be judged robustly against the biodiversity and green space elements of the Cherwell Local Plan and the NPPF. The impact on protected species, designated sites and any Species and Habitats of Principal Importance for Conservation in England (as listed under Section 41 of NERC Act (2006)) that may be affected will need to be assessed in relation to any planning applications on these sites. A full suite of habitat and species surveys should be carried out. The species surveys should address priority and notable species in addition to protected species. Surveys should include breeding bird surveys and, on the arable land, surveys for arable plants.</p>	<p>We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.</p>	None	
BBOWT	<p>Off-site compensation should be provided for farmland birds where these are impacted (and on-site compensation where this is possible – substantial nature reserves areas with zoning to control public access would be needed in this case since many of these species are not suited to built-up areas or disturbance by people, dogs and cats) to ensure that populations are maintained in line with the above quoted legislation. Such compensation is commonly required within Cherwell District, as evidenced for example by the NW Bicester Eco-Town development.</p>	<p>We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.</p>	None	
BBOWT	<p>Very little green space is to be provided within this site</p>	<p>Figures 14 and 21 show a series of public parkland corridors throughout the site to include tree planting and habitat corridors</p>	None	

BBOWT	<p>While not of wildlife site status, the current site does have significant wildlife habitat value, especially linking habitats to the north of the site and for birds. As with the other proposed allocations we reserve the right to object at planning application stage should we consider that wildlife habitat is not sufficiently incorporated into proposals. In particular, we consider that the mature trees should be retained except in a few isolated exceptional circumstances.</p>	We agree with regard to mature trees	None	
BBOWT	<p>Given its current use as a golf course, this site has a significant number of mature trees. We believe that the majority of mature trees should be retained as a feature within the development, guiding the layout of streets and plots so that they are incorporated as street trees, in public areas and in private gardens. An example of where this has been done successfully is at the Edgcombe Park development in Crowthorne in Berkshire.</p>	Noted	None	
BBOWT	<p>The trees support wildlife (particularly birds, bats and invertebrates), create a pleasant landscape and reduce the stark new appearance of the site as it is constructed and matures, and help to mitigate the urban heat island effect. Retaining trees provides a useful age-diversity of trees and benefits the wellbeing of future residents. At the Edgcombe Park development, trees were retained unless they were on actual road routes or immediately adjacent to houses. We would expect the developer to avoid harming trees during construction, for example, air-blasting for trenches near roots, and providing appropriate space for roots.</p>	Noted	None	
BBOWT	<p>The Ecological Appraisal published in December 2018 which covers PR6a and PR6b identified that bat activity levels were highest within the golf course, particularly above the northern end where there are a greater variety of habitats including a wet ditch, pond and rough ground.</p>	Noted	None	
BBOWT	<p>The site also has some small areas of scrub / semi-improved grassland which should be retained and sensitively managed long-term including providing a variety of grass heights (this supports invertebrates), areas of rough grassland (good for hunting birds of prey) and rotational management of both these habitats for an age diversity. These habitats are valuable together and as islands / scallops to increase edge habitat.</p>	Noted	None	

Harbord Road Area Residents	<p>Policy PR6b, 21 requires: "A programme for the submission of proposals and the development of land at Frieze Farm as a replacement golf course (under policy PR6c) before development of land west of Oxford Road commences, or the submission of evidence to demonstrate that a replacement course is not required".</p> <p>The Inspector who examined the Local Plan Partial review specifically mentioned this in paragraph 106 of his report: "On that basis, given that criterion 21 of the policy requires a programme for the submission of proposals and the development of a replacement golf course on the Policy PR6c site, if it is needed, before work on the housing on the existing golf course commences." The Inspector said more in paragraph 115 "...the idea being that, if deemed necessary, there will be no period when golfing facilities are unavailable".</p> <p>The requirement for a golf course cannot be in doubt. Golf provision in the area is diminishing but at the same time the population is set to increase very substantially. We believe that a new golf course must be built to meet both existing and future demand.</p> <p>In line with the Policy requirement copied above it is crucially important that the new golf course is fully operational and available for use before any development of PR6b takes place.</p>	Noted	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	<p>The site is acknowledged to be vulnerable to commuter parking. As a residents' association based very close to the site we believe (based on experience) that commuter parking will be inevitable unless a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) is put in place. We are aware of ambitions of the consultants working on PR6a to 'design out' commuter parking but we do not believe that this approach will be effective. We believe that this will not be possible and the only way to deal with commuter parking is a CPZ. For reasons of efficiency this should be put in place as a planned part of the development.</p>	<p>The point is noted; the CPZ is outside of the scope of planning, but we are happy to add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."</p>	<p>Add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."</p>	Text of 6.4.6 amended
Harbord Road Area Residents	<p>It is not just commuter parking that is an issue in this area. There is also the likelihood of the area being used for parking by visitors to Cutteslowe Park (which we also have experience of). If the new stadium at Stratfield Brake were to proceed, that too would pose parking issues for this site.</p>	Noted	None	

Harbord Road Area Residents	<p>Page 49 of the development brief mentions a wildlife corridor along the site's western boundary to accommodate noise mitigation to the railway line. Page 19 mentions noise and potential vibration arising from the railway line, A34 and Oxford Road. Both statements indicate a lack of appreciation of the noise from the A34 which is extremely close to this site. In other areas such as Wolvercote there are ongoing campaigns for a noise assessment for the A34 because of the level of noise and the adverse impact that it has on residents. The Wolvercote community is seeking noise control measures as their objective. The noise from the A34 (and A40) is also being raised in connection with the dwellings being developed at Oxford North. In relation to PR6b it would seem sensible to consider the noise from the A34 and what could be done to mitigate it at this early stage when it is easier to build in measures against what we believe will inevitably be an issue for the future residents.</p>	Agreed	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	<p>This site supports an exceptional amount of biodiversity but the development brief fails to demonstrate any appreciation of this. We acknowledge that there will be biodiversity impact assessment and that there is a requirement to increase biodiversity by 10%, but there is no indication of how this is going to be achieved on such a bio-diverse site or the challenges involved. As an example the briefs state that bat boxes will be put up but there is no acknowledgement of the effect of the removal of so many trees which will provide important and diverse types of feeding and roosting habitats for different types of bats. Due to the exceptional nature of this site, we feel that there should be an exceptional approach.</p> <p>Further to PR6b Policy 10 (e), existing corridors include east-west connectivity but these have been overlooked in the Development Brief. The "protection and enhancement of existing wildlife corridors" requires that entire continuous east-west corridors are maintained. It would not be satisfactory to have green areas that peter out and are dead ends or cul de sacs.</p>	<p>The point is noted. Although the land promoter would like the Development Brief not to require retention of certain trees, this is included in the Brief, e.g. as shown in Figures 12 and 13. Many of the fairways on the golf course run broadly north-south and the vegetation between them also run north-south; there appear to be two principal east-west corridors and these are retained / shown in the Development Brief, as shown in Figure 21.</p>	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	<p>Policy PR6b,10 requires: "Proposals for wildlife compensation from the loss of trees and wildlife management and maintenance". We understand that the biodiversity has yet to be assessed, but feel that the requirement to provide proposals for wildlife management and maintenance has been overlooked and should be included in the Development Brief.</p>	<p>The point is noted; Policy PR6b requires the submission of a Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan and sets out what the Plan needs to include. The Development Brief reflects the above, and it is not considered necessary to add to what is already included</p>	None	

Harbord Road Area Residents	<p>There is much local concern regarding the discharge of effluent into waterways as a result of Thames Water's lack of capacity to cope with existing levels of sewage. This does not seem to be addressed in the Development Brief. While the PR6b Policy requirement 15 may have been fulfilled ("The application should demonstrate that Thames Water and the Environment Agency have been consulted regarding wastewater treatment capacity and agreement has been reached in principle that foul drainage from the site will be accepted into the drainage network"), this gives little assurance that the drainage network is able to cope with the foul drainage.</p>	The point is noted; Policy PR6b (15) remains a requirement - the planning application has yet to be submitted.	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	<p>In June 2021 Thames Water wrote to the Planning Authority in respect of Oxford City Council's nearby but much smaller St Frideswide's Farm development saying: "Thames Water has identified an inability of the existing foul water network infrastructure to accommodate the needs of this development proposal". In November 2021 Thames Water amended its approach but wrote again saying that they had been unable to contact the developer in the time available so they were unable to determine the foul water infrastructure needs of the planning application. Thames Water also said that they could only provide water infrastructure for 49 of the 134 dwellings and sought planning conditions regarding occupation of the dwellings. A similar but larger scale issue can be anticipated on PR6b.</p>	Noted	None	
Harbord Road Area Residents	<p>Pages 21/23 mention the "Opportunity to provide locations for vehicle access, in a co-ordinated manner between sites PR6a and PR6b and opportunities to connect into Linkside Avenue/streets to the south of the site.". There is only a narrow cul-de-sac (between two houses ) at the end of Lakeside (beyond Linkside Avenue) which could be used to gain access to PR6b from the South. For this to be used for pedestrian and cycle access might well be appropriate; but it cannot be right to take any through traffic along the length of Linkside Avenue (which alone contains 100 households ) and Lakeside and through this narrow passage. We ask that the references to Linkside Avenue be removed.</p>	Section 4.2.5 of the development brief does include connection to Linkside Avenue as a 'site opportunity' but it does not feature for the development framework for the site as set out from page 25 onwards - e.g. Figure 12 shows a walking & cycling connection to Jordan Hill but this is the only transport connection to land south of PR6b. The development brief does not allow for any connection, vehicular or otherwise, to Linkslade Avenue	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>With the new layout of the roads, worked on by the Christchurch team working on PR6a, do the access points and road layout remain the same as on this draft proposal?</p>	The development briefs set out the requirements for access, both for PR6a and PR6b. Developers may choose to propose something different - this is a risk they run	None	



Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>We are unhappy with the large number of trees being removed. The buildings can work around the trees. Just because the developers have classified most of the trees as less important, this does not make these trees less important. This is a very high pollution area cars, lorries and buses going into Oxford and the train station constantly. The A34 is in constant 24 hour use.</p> <p>We now have a frequent train service through this area between Oxford central and London Marylebone. Trees are needed to combat this high pollution area, created by all the traffic surrounding it.</p>	<p>The development of 670 houses on this site will require the removal of many of the trees on the site, and is therefore inherent in the allocation of the site for development. The impact on trees especially those worthy of protection, will be a material consideration in the assessment of any future planning application</p>	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>A pedestrian bridge is required. A bridge going over the main road between sites PR6b and PR6a is now required. The school on PR6a is for young children. There is not car traffic allowed to drop children off at school, children will be walked to school. Children will also go over onto site PR6a to use the recreational facilities and Cutteslow park.</p> <p>Extra safety precautions are required to ensure the safe crossing of a busy road by young children. A recent fatal accident along this very busy road, in this location caused a cyclist to be killed. Safe passage for walkers and cyclists is a Major Concern. Suggest this bridge be slightly to the northern side so that it allows for safe passage for those walking to the train station too.</p>	<p>The development of the PR6a and PR6b sites does not necessitate a bridge over Oxford Road because safe pedestrian and cycle movement is to be provided by signalised crossings of the road. There has been a Traffic Regulation Order consultation in July 2022 to reduce the speed of the road to 30mph.</p>	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>Place the buildings with their living areas facing south to maximise sunlight and warmth into homes. Put the higher rise homes to the north and the lower rise buildings to the south.</p>	<p>Having regard to the layout shown at Figure 15 this should be achievable in certain places across the site, but it would not seem appropriate to make this a stipulation given the potential impact on dwelling numbers and other development principles</p>	None	
Gosford & Water Eaton PC	<p>Allow for solar and photovoltaic panels on the south facing rooves to generate electricity and reduce heating requirements.</p>	<p>We note the point made - this will be relevant for planning applications for the site.</p>	None	
Summertown and St Margaret's Neighbourhood	<p>Wishes to register a request to be consulted on the progress of the development briefs and any development proposals at every stage</p>	Noted	None	
SSMNF	<p>Together with PR6a the site comprises a gateway into Oxford and is of great importance that their development reflects this importance and takes the opportunity to provide a genuinely 21st century development in terms of high quality design and low carbon development</p>	Noted	None	

SSMNF	<p>It is thus disappointing that these briefs do not suggest this level of imaginative planning and do not reflect contemporary public concerns about quality of development and design, climate change and sustainability/ regeneration including a commitment to passive house standards, and best practice in traffic calmed safe neighbourhoods. Rather, they reflect a piecemeal approach, and lack of holistic vision.</p>	<p>The objectives of the Development Brief include to provide comprehensive development of the site, to require high quality design, and to require traffic calmed safe neighbourhoods. Each Development Brief sets out a vision for the respective site.</p>	None	
SSMNF	<p>Nor do the briefs suggest the ambition made possible by the very large increase in land value that will arise from the development of these three greenfield sites. This uplift to landowners and developers gives Cherwell District Council significant leverage to secure an exceptional development, but this ambition does not appear to be recognized in the three development briefs. Nor is there any recognition of the need to have an overage scheme in place to allow for increases in planning gains as land values and houses prices rise over the long timescales of these developments.</p>	<p>It is important that there is consistency across the six development briefs, and the briefs for PR7b and PR9 don't include text in this regard. In addition, Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites</p>	None	
SSMNF	<p>Furthermore, the proximity of the sites to each other strongly suggests to the Forum that there should be an overarching planning framework to ensure the sites are developed in coordination with clear timescales, phasing, and infrastructure provision (for example traffic, public transport, cycling and pedestrian planning) to secure an integrated approach</p>	<p>Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites</p>	None	
SSMNF	<p>The development of these sites and others in the Kidlington area will significantly reduce the size and quality of the Green Belt and therefore it is of great importance that new development provides adequate compensation in terms of development quality and environmental protection in and around these sites to reflect the scale of this loss. There is particular concern about the future of land to the east of PR6A and we believe there is an opportunity to declare this area a wetland/natural habitat/sanctuary area up to the banks of the Cherwell River. It is important to people of North Oxford that this opportunity is not missed. Moreover, there is a need to make a significant, specific and tangible commitment to increase biodiversity.</p>	Noted	None	

SSMNF	<p>Development of the PR sites will have significant implications for our area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The loss of high quality Green Belt</li> <li>•The implications of increased demand for public services (such as GPs, pharmacies, schools, libraries, social care, policing) in Summertown and North Oxford – who is to provide/fund these additional services?</li> <li>•The implications for water and sewage provision given the appalling overflows currently taking place</li> <li>•The lack of clarity about exactly who the new housing will be for? For example what does 'affordable' housing mean? How much housing will there be for the elderly and disabled and for those with special housing needs? Is the housing goes to be at passive house standards or above?</li> <li>•How will the increase in traffic through our neighbourhood, particularly down the Banbury Road and in Summertown Centre, be managed? How will residents cross safely across the Banbury Road between PR6A and PR6B? What traffic calming measures will be introduced along the Banbury Road? What safety by design measures are to be taken for pedestrians and cyclists?</li> <li>•The precise impact of development on landscape, trees, biodiversity, and public access particularly to the east of PR6A is unclear. Any changes to landscape and trees should be strictly phased and evolutionary, mitigating any damage to the environment</li> </ul>	<p>Loss of Green Belt - The principle of development has been established through the adoption. Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements across the PR sites; these would be funded by the site developers. Housing - 50% must be Affordable Housing; green belt land has been released for housing on the basis of meeting Oxford's unmet need; Policy BSC4 of the Local Plan requires an appropriate housing mix and provision on sites of this size for extra care, and encourages the provision of specialist housing for older and/or disabled people and those with mental health needs. Impacts re traffic, trees, biodiversity, etc. - this will be a matter for the planning application assessment</p>		
SSMNF	<p>We note there is much in the development briefs about sustainability but little about the mechanism that will ensure high design standards of sustainability, and high levels of service provision that these Gateway sites deserve. Leaving it to section 106 agreements alone is highly risky. The danger is that the failures of the Oxford North scheme, which the Forum objected to due to loss of affordable housing provision, will be repeated again with the community losing out due to the use of 'viability' arguments when planning applications are submitted – unless the terms of the planning briefs are as precise and exacting as they need to be.</p>	<p>Section 106 agreements will take precedence over and have more weight than the development brief. Development of the site will be required to conform to the LPPR requirements. The development briefs are intended to guide landowners/developers as to how the site(s) should be developed.</p>	None	
SSMNF	<p>We believe there is an opportunity to create an innovative delivery mechanism - a public/ private partnership to deliver these schemes and capture land value, comprising opportunities for community land trusts and community participation in protecting and managing the environment.</p>	Noted	None	

SSMNF	There is opportunity for CDC to promote a community self-build scheme for the PR sites as they have so successfully at Graven Hill in Bicester	There is no planning policy requirement for the provision of self-build as part of the development	None	
Mark Fransham	Emphasises the importance of seizing the opportunity to dramatically improve cycling and walking provision for the Kidlington-Summertown-Oxford route. References the 8th Feb 2022 fatality. Would like to see the development briefs adopt a 'Vision Zero' approach to reduce pedestrian and cycling deaths to zero. Central to this is the provision of segregated routes, separating pedestrians from cyclists from motor vehicles, reduction in speeds and safe road design, and must be design for the convenience of pedestrians and cyclists, deprioritising the convenience and speed of motor vehicles	The objectives of segregating traffic are captured in the development brief. It will be a matter for the planning application assessment to ensure these objectives have been met with the proposed development	None	
Mark Fransham	The proposed cycle route to Cutteslowe Park is potentially an excellent addition to the area, but must be seen as a leisure route as must the canal to the west. Fast, priority, segregated and direct routes for cyclists and pedestrians on the Kidlington-Summertown-Oxford route are essential	Noted	None	
Mark Fransham	Would like to see the development briefs incorporate a complete redesign of the Kidlington roundabout. The current sketches for a redesigned roundabout are car-centred and unfit for purpose , designed like a motorway junction and regular site of accidents. 11th Feb 2022 a car came off Kidlington roundabout and hit a tree; on 8th March 2022 a HGV hit a car.	Very much noted, but this is beyond the remit of the development brief as it falls outside the site. The development brief is not able to require more than the Local Plan policy	None	
Mark Fransham	The development briefs should include unambiguous instructions that cycle paths have to be LTN1/20 compliant and that shared paths on this site are unacceptable; the north-south cycle and walking route cannot be a shared path; any new cycle/walking crossings cannot be shared.	This is captured in the Development Brief, e.g. Page 32 / Figure 16.	None	
David Peddy	This is an unwarranted intrusion into green belt land with damage to flora & fauna;valuable recreational facilities and creating congestion for which no provision is being made Housing will create unacceptable pressure on road,medical,hospital and school facilities	This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR	None	

Peter Hehir (destr of golf c)	There is much underused and plain green belt around the shoe development to take in the additional houses you are proposing for the Golf Club site. Some of the closer to sites could readily be enlarged without further issues arising for those neighbourhoods.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR	None	
Peter Hehir (destr of golf c)	Describing the development as an elegant gateway to the city is ridiculous. From cars you see only hedges and trees. If these are not thick enough on the boundary , thicken them.	The Development Brief provides for retention, enhancement and replanting of trees, etc. to the Oxford Road frontage and woodland planting to the northern edge of the site.	None	
Peter Hehir (destr of golf c)	Talk of streets making connections better completely ignores a simple fact - who needs to be connected around a suburb of developments? Just the residents to exits to the roads in and out of Oxford. They don't need to charge through the golf club area.	Connectivity and permeability are important so that the development can be successfully integrated with its surroundings. The Development Brief provides for vehicular connections onto Oxford Road and additional walking and cycling connections to the south, just west of Jordan Hill Business Park, and to the east onto Oxford Road close to the park and ride	None	
Peter Hehir (destr of golf c)	You imply that the houses will bring an environmental benefit. You know this is not just nonsense, but completely untrue. How can the thousands of trees, bushes, and and grass be improved by covering most of the site with concrete and reducing run off potentially seriously.	There are several requirements of the policy, some of which are elaborated upon within the Development Brief, which will secure mitigation for the development, particularly in regard to biodiversity, water, waste, soils	None	
Peter Hehir (destr of golf c)	Overall, this looks like Cherwell DC's over- ambitious leader dumping Banbury problems out to the edge of it jurisdiction where its voters are less significant to his reign. He also supports the Arc, a vainglorious idea to connect two university's who have not demonstrated great benefits to science and the world from building hundreds of thousands of new houses and more roads. Again, significantly, this Arc won't affect Banbury and its environs. It does look as though he is on the losing side with the Arc, thank goodness, but voters in the south of his principality will not forgive this current sad adventure into the unnecessary destruction of not only the North Oxford - Kidlington gap but also adding to the already very high emissions encountered on the roads nearby	This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR	None	
Peter Hehir (destr of golf c)	Planning rigour seems to have declined alarmingly in favour of land owners, especially some University colleges, aided and abetted by estate agencies now taking up much of the work once done by experienced planners - who stood up to politicians seeking land development for ulterior motives.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR	None	

Peter Hehir (destr of golf c)	<p>Finally, since none of the houses will be sold at prices reachable by the ordinary working families who keep the City running: "affordable" meaning 80% of market value) is NOT affordable in the real world..</p>	This is not within the scope of the Development Brief	None	
Oxford Cricket Club (xerox)	<p>Our future is under threat because we play at the Oxford University Press ground at Jordan Hill, which is also scheduled for residential development under Oxford City Council plans. The future of the club and the important health and social benefits it provides is therefore at risk. What would secure the future of this important asset would be if the development proposals for both Jordan Hill and site PR6b could be adapted to allow the retention of space for two cricket grounds and a pavilion, by retaining part of Jordan Hill and part of site PR6b to create a site for the future of Oxford cricket. Specifically there would need to be enough space for pitches with regulation sized boundaries so that houses in adjoining developments would not be under threat. The draft Development Brief requires there to be space for "formal sports, play areas and allotments" within the area. An additional benefit would be the retention of an important area of green space within the development, helping to retain a break among solid ranks of housing proposed in the plans. It would be available not only for formal sport, but for walking and casual recreation when not in use for training or matches.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. The draft Development Brief states at page 24 that, "It is the Council's preference that in lieu of on-site formal sports provision an appropriate financial contribution be made towards new and improved facilities off-site."</p>	None	

Andrew & Sue Moss (cricket)	<p>At present we play matches and offer coaching and training on the Oxford University Press ground at Jordan Hill, just over the boundary from Cherwell District and immediately adjoining the golf course. This site is also zoned for housing in Oxford City Council's future plans. We have long cherished the hope that one day we would be able to offer two grounds, side by side so that all our teams can use the same facilities (currently our 3rd and 4th XI teams play on another rented ground in Marston). We propose that part of the land inside the city and part of site PR6b should be set aside for two cricket grounds (with regulation size boundaries) to provide a long term future for the club, with all the benefits it brings to the community. The draft development brief proposes that there should be space for "formal sports" within the area. We argue that this should be for cricket on the basis that there is already a flourishing premier league club (ourselves) in the area and other sports are already well provided for. By adding this sports facility to the proposed housing development, Cherwell District Council could demonstrate commitment to health and well being as well as sustain an important part of the future for cricket. It would retain a green break between Oxford City and Cherwell, and provide relief from the solid ranks of housing proposed in the draft brief. It would be available for informal recreation when not in use for formal sport.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. The draft Development Brief states at page 24 that, "It is the Council's preference that in lieu of on-site formal sports provision an appropriate financial contribution be made towards new and improved facilities off-site."</p>	None	
Haiming Liu and Lydia Lee (same comment made)	<p>I propose that part of the land inside the city and part of site PR6b should be set aside for two cricket grounds (with regulation size boundaries) to provide a long term future for the club, with all the benefits it brings to the community as well as being available for informal recreational use when not in use for formal sports. The draft development brief proposes that there should be space for "formal sports" within the area.</p> <p>I believe that this should be for cricket on the basis that there is already a flourishing premier league club (ourselves) in the area which has a growing women's and youth section and that other sports are already well provided for.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. The draft Development Brief states at page 24 that, "It is the Council's preference that in lieu of on-site formal sports provision an appropriate financial contribution be made towards new and improved facilities off-site."</p>	None	
Greenway Oxon (golf)	<p>Given the assurances at the EIP and High Court about the feasibility of replacement provision at the Frieze Farm (6c) site allocated for that purpose in the Partial Review, you will understand that we judge it particularly important that such replacement is secured, provided at the expense of the applicants, and ready for play before any development of 6b occurs.</p>	Noted	None	

Greenway Oxon (golf)	<p>•4.1 We find the comment ‘The replacement (or otherwise) of the golf course needs to be addressed (my italics) before development commences under policy PR6b’ worrying. On the basis that there is found to be a need for replacement, it should be clear that provision has to be made before any 6b development begins.</p> <p>Inspector Griffiths specified at paragraph 106 of his Report that “criterion 21 of the NPPF requires a programme for submission of proposals and the development of a replacement golf course on the Policy PR6c site, if it is needed, before work on the housing on the existing golf course commences...” He added in paragraph 115 “...there will need to be a Delivery Plan that co-ordinates development with any taking place on the Policy PR6b allocation; the idea being that, if deemed necessary, there will be no period when golfing facilities are unavailable.”</p> <p>This is critically important because you make it clear that the brief will have the status of a material consideration. Accordingly, we consider that the Brief must be changed to clarify this. •6.2 ‘meet the need for early provision of health promoting infrastructure’ (and indeed 2.1 vi)) precisely endorse our arguments for reprovision</p>	These comments are noted and the first bullet point in Section 4.1 will be amended accordingly	Page 19, 1st bullet - amend to state: "The site is currently in use as a golf course and club. An alternative site for the course at Frieze Farm (PR6c) has been identified in the LPPR. Policy PR6b requires a programme for the submission of proposals and the development of land at Frieze Farm as a replacement golf course before development commences under policy PR6b)."	text of 4.1 amended
Greenway Oxon (golf)	<p>•7.0 relates to planning obligations to be secured via a planning agreement, and for avoidance of doubt, the potential need for the applicant to finance and deliver the reprovision at Frieze Farm should be spelt out here as well.</p>	Section 7 doesn't set out the particular planning obligations that will be required. Under 7.1 it states that the planning application will need to be accompanied by a S106 Draft Heads of Terms, and under 7.2 that obligations will be secured via a Section 106 agreement and that in preparing a draft Heads of Terms applicants are encouraged to consult the LPPR Infrastructure schedule. In order for the LPA to require reprovision at Frieze Farm it would need to be included in Appendix 4 of the LPPR.	None	
Greenway Oxon (golf)	<p>•In sum, we are in no doubt that the golf course will need to be re-provided. Demand was rising before Covid, and has risen steeply since. The building of the Partial Review dwellings on top of other commitments in the wider area, will further fuel demand. Yet at the same time, for a variety of reasons golf provision in this part of the County has significantly declined over the last two or three years. Public health issues, both directly and indirectly arising from the Covid pandemic, make recreation provision (and golf in particular) critical. The Brief should reflect this.</p>	We acknowledge the importance of recreation provision and note the comments regarding demand and availability. It is considered, however, that Policies PR6b and PR6c are sufficiently clear in the requirement for and securing of replacement golf course provision.	None	



Greenway Oxon (golf)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•4.2.5 (second bullet) 'opportunity to provide locations for vehicular access in a co-ordinated manner between sites PR6a and PR6b and opportunities to connect into Linkside Avenue/streets to the south of the site'.</li> </ul> <p>On the first part of this, we have concerns that 'left in left out' only option at the northern joint access to the sites, will promote rat-running through the Primary street and/or unnecessary vehicle movements on the Oxford road. In the case of 6b it would be more sensible to take access as a fourth leg of the existing P&amp;Ride junction. On the second, we think that it would be a huge mistake to attract more vehicles through what is presently a relatively quiet cul-de-sac; paragraph 103 of the Inspectors report makes it clear that access should be to the Oxford Road.</p>	Spatially there is merit to the suggestion of the secondary access being located at the existing park and ride junction. However, land levels would prevent the access from being achieved here. With regard to linkages to the south, the only one proposed is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue.	None	
Greenway Oxon (golf)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The allocation of this site was predicated entirely on Oxford's alleged housing need. We would expect to see a high proportion of social housing within the 'affordable' 50%. We would absolutely not wish to see the site developed for University accommodation (as has been suggested at the EIP and elsewhere by the University and College owners).</li> </ul>	The Council's preference is for social housing and so we would expect to see 70% of the Affordable Housing and therefore 35% of all of the housing to be Social Rent. If the landowner wishes to develop housing for university accommodation this would need to be additional to the allocated 670 or form part of the non-Affordable housing.	None	
Greenway Oxon (golf)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•There is reference to measures to attenuate noise from the railway line. Though movements are likely to grow over the next few years as E-W rail is developed, noise from the A34 is the bigger problem and should be specifically considered. Indeed this may pose problems with establishing a wildlife corridor. In sum, mitigation measures will need to be robust.</li> </ul>	Noted	None	
Greenway Oxon (golf)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•As we pointed out at the EIP, the golf course site is extremely biodiverse. It is disappointing to see little evidence of this in the Brief. A look at our evidence should convince you of the need to include proposals for wildlife conservation in the Brief.</li> </ul>	Policy PR6b requires that application(s) are supported by a Biodiversity Impact Assessment, a Biodiversity Improvement and Management Plan, measures for securing net biodiversity gain within the site and for the protection of wildlife during construction and measures for retaining and conserving protected/notable species within the development. Further details are set out in Sections 6.3.2 and 6.5 of the Development Brief, e.g. there is required to be a linear wildlife corridor/green buffer along the full length of the site's western boundary.	None	

Greenway Oxon (golf)	<p>•Although you mention the possible need for residents parking measures of some sort, because of the proximity of the P&amp;R interchanges, experience of present commuter parking pressures locally, indicates that a Controlled Parking Zone will be needed at the very beginning of the development phase. There are also existing pressures from Cutteslowe Park.</p> <p>Moreover were the stadium proposal at Stratfield Brake to go ahead, measures would need to be particularly robust.</p>	<p>Noted; the CPZ is outside of the scope of planning, but as with PR7a we are happy to add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."</p>	<p>Add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."</p>	Text at 6.4.6 amended
Jonathan Anelay (Linkside)	<p>There is only a narrow cul-de-sac ( between two houses )at the end of Lakeside ( beyond Linkside Avenue ) which could be used to gain access to PR6b from the South. For this to be used for pedestrian and cycle access might well be appropriate; but it cannot be right to take any through traffic along the length of Linkside Avenue ( which alone contains 100 households ) and Lakeside and through this narrow passage.</p> <p>Please omit the references to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Martin McNamara (Linkside)	<p>Cherwell's draft Local Plan seems to indicate that there could be a motor road at the far end of Lakeside Avenue, on to what is currently the golf course.</p> <p>This is a very narrow cul-de-sac (between two houses) at the end of Lakeside which could be used to gain access to PR6b from the South. Whilst it may be considered appropriate for this to be used for pedestrian and cycle access, it is wholly inappropriate to consider allowing traffic access.</p> <p>This would create the potential for considerable vehicle movements along the length of Lakeside and Linkside, which the current roads will be unable to cope with.</p> <p>I therefore would ask that you make amendments to omit the references to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Deepak Mukhi (Linkside)	<p>possibility of a draft proposal in the Briefs which would introduce a thoroughfare route for motor traffic through Linkside Avenue. I am sure I am mistaken but if I am not I am strongly against any such proposal as it would destroy the tranquillity of our road.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	

Deborah Eyre (Linkside)	<p>I would like to object to this road being added to a quiet residential area. It will create an unsafe passage and ruin this quiet road.</p> <p>There is only a narrow cul-de-sac ( between two houses )at the end of Lakeside ( beyond Linkside Avenue ) which could be used to gain access to PR6b from the South. For this to be used for pedestrian and cycle access might well be appropriate; but it cannot be right to take any through traffic along the length of Linkside Avenue ( which alone contains 100 households ) and Lakeside and through this narrow passage.</p>	<p>Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Tony Edwards (principle of dev)	<p>The proposal to give access to golf course land seems completely nonsensical The sensible way forward should be to give access directly onto Banbury road as currently .</p> <p>Why destroy the environment presently provided in linkside and lakeside when there is a perfectly good alternative Proposal to route down linkside and lakeside makes no sense at all A Edwards Sent from my iPad</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Minal Mukhi (Linkside)	<p>I am most unhappy at your proposal to build a thoroughfare traffic route using a narrow cul-de-sac between two houses at the end of Lakeside beyond Linkside Avenue. This is unacceptable as it is dangerous with a constant stream of traffic on our quiet road. This will also destroy the peace and tranquillity of our cul-de-sac.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Elsbeth Gourd (Linkside)	<p>proposed traffic route leading from the south-west side of the new development into the end of Lakeside, thus providing a cut-through or rat-run through what is currently a peaceful no-through-road area of Lakeside and Linkside Avenue. We strongly object to any traffic route of this sort. It appears under 'Site Opportunities' as an 'important connection' on Figure 11 on page 22 of the document.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Matt Elsey (Linkside)	<p>I would like to raise concern at proposal to develop a through road that would increase traffic and disturb tranquility of the linkside/LAKESIDE cul de sac, OX2 8JB. Please treat this mail as an objection</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	

<p>Louise Greenwell (Linkside)</p>	<p>it has just been brought to our attention that the Cherwell Local Plan Development Brief includes a draft that would create a road from a narrow cul-de-sac at the far end of Lakeside (to which Linkside Avenue leads) to give access to PR6b, the proposed development of North Oxford Golf Club.</p> <p>Linkside Avenue and Lakeside is a cul-de-sac which is a quiet oasis with no through traffic at all. We are now surrounded by huge building projects on most sides which bring with them vastly increased traffic on all roads in the immediate vicinity. To then have this unique quiet residential area blighted by large volumes of traffic using it as a through road to a new development would be totally unacceptable and unnecessary. A number of children live in the roads.</p> <p>Oxford is being built up at an alarming rate with green corridors disappearing with the loss of habitat and all that entails. Can we not at least try and preserve some neighbourhoods which are still pleasant quiet places to live?</p>	<p>Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>Tim Davison (Linkside)</p>	<p>the idea of a thoroughfare along Linkside Avenue into the proposed development at the North Oxford Gold course is completely unacceptable. The traffic will ruin this narrow quiet street. It is in any case a disaster that a sporting amenity on the green belt is possibly to be used for housing.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>Hossein Moghaddam (Linkside)</p>	<p>the Cherwell Local Plan Development Brief includes a draft that would create a thoroughfare traffic route using a narrow cul-de-sac between two houses at the end of Lakeside beyond Linkside Avenue which could be used to gain access to PR6b from the South through Linkside Avenue. As a resident of Linkside, I am writing to strongly object to the possibility of creating such a motor road which is going to ruin not only the tranquillity of this road but also create a heavy traffic and parking issue in a road which has already been experiencing trouble by non-local travellers who are using the Westway Train station as well as some trade vehicles.</p>	<p>Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>Shirley Careford (Linkside)</p>	<p>If a through road went via Linkside Avenue it would be chaotic. The junction with Five Mile Drive is already an accident waiting to happen. Parking in Five Mile Drive creates a blind spot, and at the week end parking with the football in the recreation ground causes absolute mayhem. There is also a hairdressers at 2 Linkside Avenue and they double park because of lack of parking available. Linkside Avenue is just not able to take any more traffic.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	

Richard Garbutt (Linkside)	<p>I am distressed to hear that there is a possibility of a motor road at the far end of Lakeside/Linkside cutting through to the North Oxford golf course development.</p> <p>The proposal to create a thoroughfare traffic route using a narrow cul-de-sac between two houses at the end of Lakeside beyond Linkside Avenue, to gain access to PR6b from the South through Linkside Avenue and Lakeside, would destroy the tranquillity and safety of our road.</p> <p>There are lots of young families who live on Linkside Avenue and on Lakeside and I am especially concerned for the safety of my children and of the other children in these roads. Our roads connects to Five Mile Drive which is not a particular safe road for children as it used as a cut-through between the Woodstock Road and Banbury Road and this proposal would also make Linkside Avenue and Lakeside a much less safe road for everyone, with absolutely zero consideration for local people.</p> <p>This proposal is not a good one and should not be considered an option. If the development of the golf course is to go ahead it should be kept totally separate from our roads. As council tax payers we deserve to have our views respected.</p>	<p>Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Richard Garbutt (Linkside)	<p>Not only are we loosing valuable local amenities such as the golf course and other green spaces with no viable proposed replacements for these amenities. The development of the golf course will harm our local environment and make the owners and developers of the land huge amounts of money. Why can't they use some of those vast profits to put roads into the development instead of trying to get a free ride at the expense of the local community.</p>	<p>This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR</p>	None	

James Ruddick (Linkside)	<p>Unacceptable proposal to create a throughfare at the end of our road. The road is a family orientated cul de sac of sorts (it's a loop back on itself) and this keeps our children safe from fast drivers, and lowers the volume of cars passing our houses.</p> <p>My son has Cystic Fibrosis and the pollution already in the area is detrimental to his health, however an increase in traffic will likely increase the chances of exacerbations in his condition which sadly leads to life shortening changes in his lungs. As a result we're already in the process of installing an air filtration system, however if you give the go ahead for this opening of our road we will be forced to move. Other families in the area have the same concerns with regard to fast moving traffic preventing our children from being near the roads, which has been documented with the local police at several meetings. Given that in most parts of Oxford there are the creation of low traffic neighbourhoods, it would be unimaginable to do the opposite to our lovely community and neighbourhood by creating a high traffic neighbourhood.</p>	<p>Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Scarlett Bingham (Linkside)	<p>Absolutely unacceptable to cut through Lakeside/Linkside Avenue to new development on golf course. Residents tried to raise funds to buy the land to preclude this but were assured it was unnecessary and that access would be by foot/cycle only.</p> <p>If you are going to suggest this as a possibility, what is your justification? (This is an actual question to you that demands a response)</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	

John Hill (principle of dev)	<p>This proposal is a ridiculous waste of a priceless asset LAND. Building over a century old golf course tells you everything which is wrong with planning in England. It is a well used and valuable local amenity. An area of open space treasured by many not just golfers (of which I am not one). It is used every day besides possibly Christmas day.</p> <p>It is to be sacrificed on the basis that Oxford has a housing need (plus ca change). So what do we get - a low density development which will house almost no-one on Oxford's housing register which will pretend to be green but clearly is not. Aspects of the old golf course will be left which of course no-one will be able to play on Why ? As some sort of tribute to those that played there in better more rational times perhaps. Who knows. In the meantime, certain colleges will pocket a great deal of money and their own wholly under used sports fields will continue to sit empty for most of the year.</p> <p>If we are going to build on these sorts of precious sites, lets build densely so ordinary people can afford to live there so at least some advantage is gained. Why not replicate Summertown or Jericho just down the road.</p>	<p>It is worth noting that the development will not be low-density. Gross density may be 20 dwellings per hectare, but net density is substantially higher. Aside from density, these comments relate to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR.</p>	None	
Al Butler (Linkside)	<p>There is a possibility of a motor road at the far end of Lakeside/Linkside cutting through to the golf course. I understand the Cherwell Local Plan Development Brief includes a draft that would create a thoroughfare traffic route using a narrow cul-de-sac between two houses at the end of Lakeside beyond Linkside Avenue which could be used to gain access to PR6b from the South through Linkside. I believe such an access road would not be appropriate to the area as it would increase traffic in a residential area.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Annie Allsebrook (Linkside)	<p>The Cherwell Local Plan Development Brief includes a draft that would make my quiet residential Cul de sac into a Thoroughfare. I would never have thought that in this country my community could be doormated in this way.</p> <p>There have been rumours of this proposed thoroughfare in the past, and I know there was a lot of opposition to the outrageous idea. The matter then went quiet, and I understood that the threat had gone away: anyone who has visited this community would know that it is a dangerous and very damaging suggestion. The people who gain would be the owner of the 'hostage' land; the developers of the golf course; and impatient drivers who would speed along the Council imposed rat run.</p> <p>Given your deadline of midnight tonight, I don't have enough time to respond as I would wish. But I can assure you your deadline isn't my deadline: I will not be silenced.</p>	<p>Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	

Marg Crick (Linkside)	I understand there is a possibility that a planned thoroughfare road will cut through the golf course and lead into Linkside Avenue and Lakeside. I find this proposal unacceptable on the grounds it would increase local traffic still further and destroy the tranquillity of our road	No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	
Cristina Whitecross and Tom Whitecross (Linkside)	<p>there is a proposal to create a thoroughfare traffic route using a cul-de-sac between two houses at the end of Lakeside, beyond Linkside Avenue.</p> <p>This would be used to gain access to PR6b from the South through Linkside Avenue.</p> <p>We believe that this proposal would destroy the tranquillity of our neighbourhood where children play safely in the street, and would create a rat run to avoid traffic to the new train station. It may also increase burglaries in the area.</p> <p>We object in the strongest terms to this proposal.</p>	No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	
S&X Thompson (Linkside)	<p>It has come to our attention there is a consideration for a motor road at the far end of Lakeside/Linkside avenue as part of the Cherwell local plan development brief.</p> <p>We (Stanley and Xanthe Thompson) strongly oppose this possibility.</p> <p>Making Linkside and Lakeside avenue a through road would have a significant impact of the quality of our lives and all those currently living in the cul-de-sac.</p> <p>The level of motor traffic would vastly increase which would have significant detrimental affect on our community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Pollution and air quality would be harmed</li> <li>•Significant loss of privacy for the residents</li> <li>•Pedestrian safety will be at risk, particularly for young kids whom play, and a large proportion of elderly residents.</li> <li>•Safety for our pets and other wildlife, particularly a large amount of cats in the area who will be more at risk of being run over. Also due to the lake being there, a lot of other wildlife is in the area from hedgehogs to house martins (whom are protected) who would all be at greater risk with increased traffic..</li> <li>•Significant increase in noise pollution</li> <li>•Lower house values</li> <li>•Leave our area more vulnerable to crime</li> <li>•Harm the overall community feel</li> </ul>	Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	
Maclagan (Linkside)	The proposal for a route for through traffic via Linkside Avenue is unacceptable. The entire character and tranquillity of the road would be destroyed.	No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	



Teresa Leong (Linkside)	<p>I disagree with the draft proposal to create a vehicle thoroughfare between the Lakeside cul de sac and the development site at the North Oxford Golf Course, the reasons being:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Unnecessary vehicle access and at wrong position. Even if an alternative vehicle access is warranted, PR 6 must consider a substantial proper spine access at the northern side of parcel of its development.</li> <li>2. Vehicle Access for the PR6 development, taking into account the number of dwellings would overwhelm the current basic road quality and width, fit only for purpose for the existing dwellings at Lakeside and Linkside.</li> <li>3. If access had to be made , it ought to be only be pedestrian/cycle paths to be in line with the Zero Emission principles</li> </ol>	No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	
Moirá Donald (Linkside)	<p>The Linkside Avenue residents committee have brought to my attention as a local resident a draft proposal for a motor traffic route to and from the PR6b site and Linkside Avenue/Lakeside at the closed off end of Lakeside. I confess I have looked at the plans which are part of the brief and can find no reference to such a route. Indeed on the golf course side at this site is an indicative allotment. If there is a route on another plan then this is very misleading and makes it difficult to send in a timely objection. Whether such a route is proposed or not I wish to make it clear that a motor route into Linkside Avenue/Lakeside is unacceptable. The main motor entry routes on to the PR6b site are from Oxford Road and creating a new route into Linkside Avenue would make a rat run both for the residents of the new development as well as the existing residents on the Linkside estate which would be dangerous for all concerned and so cannot be entertained.</p>	The correspondent is correct in their analysis that there are no connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue, and that the Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	
Moirá Donald (Linkside)	<p>I am happy for a well planned development on the site to go ahead so long as the houses are of the highest environmental standard and that there are good cycling/pedestrian routes to buses, Oxford Parkway station and to the new developments which are being planned in the area. There should also be a biodiversity gain with appropriate ecological features across the site. In addition I would expect at least 50% of the properties to be affordable housing with 80% of these to be for homes for rent. I may add that I would welcome good cycle/pedestrian links from the Linkside estate where I live to and from the new PR6b site as this would give existing residents the benefit of the biodiversity gain and access to the new cycle/pedestrian routes on the development.</p>	Policy PR6b includes requirements relating to biodiversity net gain and the Development Brief includes outline measures in this regard. Policy PR6b also includes the requirement for 50% of the homes to be Affordable Dwellings. We will give further consideration to the provision of a walking and cycling connection to Linkside/Lakeside.	None	

Ben Hall (Linkside)	<p>Concerning the proposal for the creation of a through-road along Linkside Avenue, as a traffic route to the PR6b development: My family and I have been happy residents of this road for over ten years, enjoying the sight of many other young families coming to live here. It's cul-de-sac nature lends it a distinctly family-friendly and safe atmosphere with children playing out on the street and along its pavements. Any subsequent increase in traffic would cause damage to the local environment, the quality of life for local residents, as well as jeopardise the safety of the children who live and play here.</p>	No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	
Sue Cope (Linkside)	<p>Objects in the strongest possible terms to the proposed motor road that will link the development on the golf course with Lakeside/Linkside Avenue. The present cul de sac leading up to the golf course is extremely narrow and having that as a cut through for cars on the golf course development would be extremely dangerous for the inhabitants of those houses and the inhabitants of Linkside and Lakeside. The number of cars using the road in Linkside and Lakeside has already increased dramatically since houses started being built in Linkside and Lakeside and turning onto Five Mile Drive, particularly if you want to turn right, is extremely difficult as it is almost impossible to see any traffic coming from the Woodstock roundabout until you are nearly in the middle of the road because of the cars parked on the north of Five Mile Drive. Increasing the number of cars turning out of Linkside just increases the likelihood of accidents.</p> <p>One of the benefits of living in Linkside/lakeside is the fact that it is a no-through road and therefore safer for children which will no longer be the case if the proposed road goes ahead. Anyone using the proposed road will be using it as a shortcut to get to the ring road and therefore is likely to be going fast - again increasing the chances of an accident. Since the traffic lights were introduced at the roundabouts on the ring road the number of cars using Five Mile Drive as a cut-through has increased enormously and it has become extremely difficult to get out onto the Banbury Road from Five Mile Drive - a problem that will only be exacerbated by an increase in the amount of traffic using Five Mile Drive.</p> <p>I feel very strongly that if a development is to go ahead on the current</p>	No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	
Alan Kestner (Linkside)	<p>We would like to object to the proposed creation of a route between lakeside/ linkside Avenue and the Golf course. This would create a lot of extra traffic through our road and be a danger to old people, children and animals and would be against the pollution policies of the Council to encourage walking and cycling in the city. This is a quiet residential area with narrow roads and its nature would be completely changed.</p>	No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	

Susan Pfunder (Linkside)	<p>There is a possibility of a road being opened where Lakeside and Linkside join. This is currently a narrow gap and would be unsuitable for a road joining the development on the golf course.</p> <p>It would, of course, entirely change the nature of our existing roads and houses.</p> <p>There is already an exit from the golf course and it will be possible to create a further exit closer to Frieze Way.</p> <p>Any further traffic through to Five Mile Drive will create more congestion on the Wolvercote and Cutteslowe roundabouts.</p> <p>In addition, the pollution caused will add to that already produced by the diesel railway engines and be detrimental to residents, particularly on Lakeside.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Cat Temple (Linkside)	<p>I have significant concerns about the proposed development of 670 residential properties backing onto the Linkside/Lakeside area.</p> <p>The development brief is not clear how close these properties would be to the existing properties, nor exactly where the access roads would be.</p> <p>In addition I note that area Pr6b adjoins the potential development of the Oxford University Press sports ground where Oxford City Council are proposing to build at least 130 homes.</p> <p>The current Linkside/Lakeside development is a quiet no through road of approximately 140 homes in an area roughly one third/one quarter of the proposed pr6b site, and more than twice the size of the OUP sports ground site.</p> <p>Please take this email as objection to any potential access roads being joined to Linkside/Lakeside or the potential development by Oxford City Council of the Oxford University Press sports ground.</p>	<p>The development will be required to retain satisfactory separation distances to existing properties to the south e.g. 22 metres from principal elevation to principal elevation, and 14 metres from side elevation to principal elevation.</p> <p>This will be aided by the required retention of a group of trees to the north of Nos. 104-110 Linkside Avenue, trees within the gardens of Linkside Avenue properties and, to the north of Jordan Hill, retained and/or new hedgerows.</p>	None	
Cat Temple (Linkside)	<p>Both developments combined in addition to the pr6a site would put significant pressure on current transport infrastructure. Please take this email as objection to the high density nature of the development proposals.</p>	<p>This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR</p>	None	

Cat Temple (Linkside)	<p>With the shift away from high street shopping and office space accelerating as a result of the pandemic and increased ability for employees to adopt hybrid working practises, perhaps the councils could consider repurposing empty commercial property to provide more affordable housing combined with lower density developments around existing residential areas, particularly where these are being built on green spaces which will have a significant impact on the environment.</p>	<p>This relates to the principle of development, which has been set through the adoption of the LPPR</p>	<p>None</p>	
Cat Temple (Linkside)	<p>If these properties are to be built personally I would want to see an enforceable commitment by the developer to providing community green space, replacing every tree which is chopped down, as well as carbon neutral housing with heat pump technology and solar panels required as well as being thermally efficient.</p>	<p>These comments are noted</p>	<p>None</p>	
Radojicic (Linkside)	<p>We are writing to protest strongly against the proposal to build a thoroughfare traffic route at the corner of Lakeside and Linkside Avenue to gain access to PR6b through the golf course. We are very concerned about the resulting noise and pollution, which will harm our quality of life.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	
Paul Gourd (Linkside)	<p>I would object very strongly to any proposal to allow Linkside Avenue and Lakeside to be used for vehicular access to the proposed new residential development at Oxford North golf course.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	
Cecilia Jonsson (Linkside)	<p>that there is a possibility of a motor road at the far end of Lakeside/Linkside Ave cutting through the golf course.  I find such a proposal unacceptable as it would destroy the tranquility of the roads.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	

Caroline Jess (Linkside)	<p>The proposed use of the area between Lakeside and Linkside Avenue as a thoroughfare, is totally unsuitable. The area is very narrow and the proposed development the other side is for 530 homes, this would bring a considerable amount of traffic using it as a rat run. The increased pollution would be on top of the already significant pollution from the railway, situated very close to this area. This is totally unsuitable and should not be considered as a viable proposition.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Kathryn McNicoll (Linkside)	<p>There seems to be some confusion about the access corridor through Linkside/Lakeside to this development. The plan states clearly that this will be for pedestrian/cycle access only. I trust that you will adhere to this and not allow vehicular access.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Alan Trump (Linkside)	<p>This is appalling. It's bad enough to lose the Golf Course but to inflict a new main interlink road on this quiet residential area, especially for the families living directly beside it's apparent line, is totally unacceptable .</p> <p>To which I must add, the brutal cynicism and lack of courtesy in giving us only (I am told) from 6.00p.m. last night until midnight in which to register our protest.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Rosemary Dorey (Linkside)	<p>In your develop plans please maintain the relative peace and quiet of Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Mike Gotch (Linkside)	<p>please do not propose a road link between the proposed new housing on the golf course and Lakeside Avenue . The loss of the fine landscaping on the golf course will be bad enough , but to lose the comparative tranquility of the Lakeside and Linkside residential streets adds insult to injury .Vehicular access should be from the course to the main road A4165 – there are no highway reasons not so to do , and thereby avoiding damage to existing residential areas . Pedestrian links , of course , would be sensible and unobjectionable - there is an existing public footpath across the golf course .</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	

Mike Gotch (Linkside)	<p>may I add a plea for the golf course site- design approach to be that of pavilions in a landscaped setting – thus saving just as many as possible of the fine trees [ how many have TPO's ? ] and other landscape features . What will be a tragedy and loss of an opportunity to show how sensitive designs can save the best features of an fine existing site, would be a conventional developer's estate with detached and semi-detached housing on small plots – and may help to meet some of the powerful objections to developing the course at all .</p>	<p>These comments are noted, and go to the heart of the remit of the Development Brief. Page 35 of the Brief sets out the development principles for the Parkland Setting Character Area of the site and which includes 'pavilions in the landscape' - individual apartment buildings of 3-4 storeys, set within a generous landscape or, in part of the site, a street based layout of larger houses of 2-3 storeys in generous plots, either way</p>	None	
Savills (promoter for 6a)	<p>Whilst the DB confirms it is a “Framework” the extent (at 60 pages) and detailed nature of much of the document reads more as a Design Code, with a lot of repetition from the Local Plan that is not needed. The DB is too detailed for this stage of the process and could stifle a successful development coming forward, for example in referring to the exact type of access junction when this has not yet been determined.</p> <p>The DB would benefit from being slimmed down and limited to setting out high level principles, i.e. to provide a “brief” for the site. Detail will come through in the planning application process.</p>	<p>We would disagree. Most other commenters consider the Brief not detailed enough and it is notable that the land promoter considers it too detailed. The Development Brief strikes the appropriate balance, setting sufficient parameters to enable a successful development to be delivered, whilst allowing flexibility in respect of the details. Development Briefs are defined as documents that provide information on the type of development, the design thereof and layout constraints relating to a particular site; A development brief allows stakeholders and residents to influence the design of a development from the outset. It sets the parameters for a development in order to guide future planning applications and includes: an explanation of how the site meets national and local policies and guidance. a development brief: ‘...sets out the vision for a development. It is grounded firmly in the economic, social, environmental and planning context. Apart from its aspirational qualities, the brief must include site constraints and opportunities, infrastructure including energy and transport access and planning policies. It should also set out the proposed uses, densities and other design requirements.’</p>	None	

Savills (promoter for 6a)	<p>The PR6b DB sets out a confused approach to the Oxford Road frontage. In some places it refers to retention of the trees, hedges and scrub along the road edge but in other places it refers to creating an active frontage and/or removal of the lower level vegetation. The landowner for PR6a is working closely with the owners of site PR6b to provide a joined up approach to the Oxford Road. It is clear that there will need to be removal of sections of the existing vegetation to allow the access junctions to be constructed. Depending on the highway requirements within the road corridor some widening may also be needed. In addition, a large proportion of the existing vegetation on both sides of the road is of low quality and will need to be better managed and supplemented with new planting to provide a long term benefit.</p> <p>With 3-5 storey development on either side of the road, even if set back behind the existing or new planting the character and appearance of the Oxford Road will change. This should be reflected in the DB.</p>	Highways requirements need to be balanced against protection of trees (both for ecological and arboricultural reasons) and tree loss avoided where at all possible. If there are transport solutions which avoid tree loss they should be pursued. That the character and appearance of the Oxford Road will change is reflected in the Development Brief.	None	
Savills (promoter for 6a)	<p>The access locations are broadly agreed but there shouldn't be a differentiation between primary and secondary accesses. In terms of the secondary vehicular access, it shouldn't need to be defined as 'left in left out' - the type and form of the junction will be subject to modelling. There is also no need for a third signal controlled crossing over Oxford Road at the northern end of the site. Crossing of Oxford Road is catered for through the existing crossing one adjacent to the Station entrance, and the proposed signal crossing in the vicinity of the PRoWs. Furthermore the existing Park and Ride junction could be reconfigured to include pedestrian/cycle crossing rather than introduce an additional crossing and associated delay. The identification of the strategic cycle route crossing the Oxford Road is also not necessary.</p>	Policies PR6a and PR6b require, for each site, the provision of two points of vehicular access from and to existing highways. The local highway authority (LHA) advised that these accesses would need to be aligned, i.e. two cross road junctions. Discussions on the matter with the land promoters for the two sites have highlighted that they wished not to locate their accesses in this way. The land promoter's position has been discussed with the LHA, who have accepted a compromise position that is now shown in the Development Brief, i.e. the LHA is willing to forgo the requirement for two crossroad junctions provided that one access is a crossroad junction and is the primary access and the second access for each site is a left in left out access. The alternative to this compromise position would be to go back to two crossroad junctions. The remainder of the proposals to which Savills refer have been worked through with the local highway authority and are fully supported by the local planning authority; they are considered necessary and important both from a highway and pedestrian safety perspective and for urban design reasons.	None	
Savills (promoter for 6a)	We support the concept of the improved railway crossing for the Northern Gateway connection. We also support the opportunities identified within para 4.2.5 Movement and Access (including integrating street layout and walking/cycling routes with PR6a to provide connections to facilities).	Noted	None	
Savills (promoter for 6a)	For consistency with PR6a we also request that Figure 17: A-A is amended. The 1.8m cycleways are not in line with that requested by Oxfordshire County Council. The cross section should also allow for variation along the sites frontage.	We agree that Fig 17 should be consistent across the two Development Briefs	Page 39, Figure 17 to be amended to reflect what is shown in the equivalent figure for the PR6a Development Brief.	Section amended as per PR6a

Savills (promoter for 6a)	In terms of street hierarchy, reference should be to Oxfordshire Design Guide for continuity between the two PR6 sites. In terms of parking provision, as with Site PR6a, provision should be in the form of a bespoke standard agreed with Oxfordshire County Council and CDC, which takes into consideration the emerging County Council standards, and Oxford City standards.	We note the comments and would be interested to read more of the bespoke parking standard referred to. However, it is not considered appropriate to refer to guidance or standards which have not yet been adopted. Section 6.4.6 requires car parking provision and design to accord with Oxford City parking standards (this being a development to meet Oxford's unmet need) and have regard to the Cherwell Residential Design Guide and to Manual for Streets. It is not considered necessary to change this.	None	
Savills (promoter for 6a)	Connectivity - We support the references made in the DB to ensuring safe and convenient access between PR6b and the local centre and primary school which will be provided at Site PR6a. In particular the primary school should be located at the heart of the PR6a development so that it is best placed to serve the residents of both PR6a and PR6b.	Connectivity - noted. School location - there is little if any difference to PR6b whether the school is located centrally at PR6a or more to the north at PR6a.	None	
Savills (promoter for 6a)	We are concerned that at paragraph 4.2.4 Bullet 4 reference is made to a pond which "provides opportunities to support Great Crested Newts". As drafted, this text appears to suggest the introduction of GCN into this pond. To avoid confusion or misinterpretation we suggest the deletion of the last sentence.	We agree that the sentence may be misleading as currently worded. It would be appropriate to amend the wording.	4.2.4, 4th bullet - change "provides opportunities to" to "may"	Text of 4.2.4 amended



	<p>As the responsible parties for commissioning the design and environmental team who will take the site forward, we want to ensure appropriate guidance and objectives are in place and the Development Brief is an excellent means of achieving that. Conversely however, it is important for the Council to distinguish between strategy and principles on the one hand, and design detail on the other. The former is essential and the latter would be overly prescriptive: it is merely one way of achieving an outcome over another and this stifles creativity and innovation. By way of example, we would highlight the objective of providing two accesses into the site, but the prescription that one be left in/left out. The former is a helpful and clear framework for the team to work within, but the latter should be left to the specialists within the design team and the Highway Authority to determine what or how the junctions will operate. We appreciate there will be views on this, but in the absence of detailed design or technical work, the Brief must avoid prescription and focus on principle. It is in this spirit that we submit our comments.</p>	<p>Policies PR6a and PR6b require, for each site, the provision of two points of vehicular access from and to existing highways. The local highway authority (LHA) advised that these accesses would need to be aligned, i.e. two cross road junctions. Discussions on the matter with the land promoters for the two sites have highlighted that they wished not to locate their accesses in this way. The land promoter's position has been discussed with the LHA, who have accepted a compromise position that is now shown in the Development Brief, i.e. the LHA is willing to forgo the requirement for two crossroad junctions provided that one access is a crossroad junction and is the primary access and the second access for each site is a left in left out access. The alternative to this compromise position would be to go back to two crossroad junctions. The remainder of the proposals to which Savills refer have been worked through with the local highway authority and are fully supported by the local planning authority; they are considered necessary and important both from a highway and pedestrian safety perspective and for urban design reasons.</p>	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>We are pleased to have been consulted in the formulation of the Brief, but we must reluctantly point out that the process cannot be described as 'jointly prepared'. The Brief as presented is primarily the Council's vision with some input. Indeed, we were not consulted upon the final draft that was issued for public consultation. Joint preparation is a requirement of the planning policy in respect of the Brief and rightly so as it must take in to account the depth and variety of technical knowledge that we have about the site as well as ensure that the Council's aspirations can be shared fully by the landowners and expressed in such a way that they are deliverable. We would recommend that the Council re-engages with us to ensure the meaning of the Policy is implemented. Should the Council wish to proceed with the Development Brief as drafted, then its status under the terms of the policy may mean the document is more advisory rather than instructive. This is material in respect of our next point regarding Design Principles.</p>	<p>We note the comments but would point out that the land promoter had been consulted on the previous draft and their comments were taken on board in formulating the final draft issued for public consultation, not least in terms of the layout, with the land promoter's layout being employed except where there are clearly policy reasons why certain elements will not be acceptable. The process that has been followed has been previously discussed and agreed with the land promoter. It has also been agreed in a Planning Performance Agreement between the parties that as far as possible the content of the Development Brief will be jointly agreed but that where disagreement remains the Council will have the final say. The Council will of course continue to engage with the land promoter. The Council's chief concern is to implement the Policy. The Council would respectfully disagree with the land promoter as to the status of the Development Brief and would encourage the land promoter to refer back to the agreed PPA.</p>	None	

Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>As described in section 1.2.1., the Development Brief should provide a framework to “guide” the development of PR6b. From our perspective, this guidance should play a key role in constructively shaping the development but should not present prescriptive design requirements.</p> <p>The Brief is being set out at the earliest stages of the design of the new development and therefore we cannot know everything about the site, its potential and its constraints. The Development Brief should therefore provide a set of guiding principles which have the breadth to allow for appropriate responses to opportunities and limitations as they inevitably arise.</p>	<p>We welcome the land promoter’s agreement that the Development Brief should shape the development. We appreciate the land promoter’s desire for there to be less detail. Most other commenters consider the Brief not detailed enough and it is notable that the land promoter considers it too detailed. The Development Brief strikes the appropriate balance, setting sufficient parameters to enable a successful development to be delivered, whilst allowing flexibility in respect of the details. Development Briefs are defined as documents that provide information on the type of development, the design thereof and layout constraints relating to a particular site; A development brief allows stakeholders and residents to influence the design of a development from the outset. It sets the parameters for a development in order to guide future planning applications and includes: an explanation of how the site meets national and local policies and guidance. a development brief: ‘...sets out the vision for a development. It is grounded firmly in the economic, social, environmental and planning context. Apart from its aspirational qualities, the brief must include site constraints and opportunities, infrastructure including energy and transport access and planning policies. It should also set out the proposed uses, densities and other design requirements.’</p>	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>In terms of the status of the Development Brief, the document provides the following clarification in that “the development brief does not have the status of a Supplementary Planning Document and does not introduce new planning policy”. Combined with the lack of joint preparation as required by policy means that we consider the document to be an endorsed design guide for PR6b and would cite paragraph 5 of the National Planning Practice Guidance relating to Design: Process and Tools. In that context, the guidance is clear that it should highlight possible solutions rather than prescribe them: “Good local design guides are concise, positive documents which are accessible and use tools such as illustrations and checklists to highlight key design issues and possible solutions”</p>	<p>We would again disagree in relation to the suggested lack of joint preparation. The Development Brief strikes an appropriate balance between the land promoter’s desire for less detail and other commenters’ desire for more. It sets out a vision and objectives for the site (Section 5), and a set of development principles (Section 6) for built environment (6.3), access and connectivity (6.4) and green infrastructure (6.5). The Development Brief accords with the National Planning Practice Guidance that has been quoted. If it was less detailed, it would lack teeth and would be less effective.</p>	None	

Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>As we come to know our site in more depth, we hope, in consultation with the community, Council and other stakeholders, to be able to guide the design in the most appropriate and creative way. The comments we submit in part 2 of this document are aimed at ensuring as many possible solutions remain on the table and to not be constrained by an anticipated solution, designed now with limited information or consultation. The more detailed requirements currently included in the Brief should be removed or simplified, so that they are less prescriptive and instead act as guiding principles with the recognition that other attractive solutions may emerge.</p>	<p>This has been the process followed in the preparation of the Development Brief. We understand the land promoter's desire for less detail but would respectfully suggest that the Development Brief strikes an appropriate balance, and does what Development Briefs are expected to do. Contrary to the land promoter's suggestion, the Development Brief does allow for different solutions, e.g. "could include" (page 29, 4th bullet), "the urban block structure and internal street network shown on Fig. 154...is indicative and expresses general principles (page 31), "there is an opportunity for..." (page 35, 2nd bullet), "alternatively..." (page 35, 3rd bullet, where different options are set out). Certain solutions are ruled out only where they would be unacceptable in highway safety terms or where they would conflict with the Cherwell Residential Design Guide and/or would not be supported at the planning application stage; for the Development Brief to be clear on these points not only fulfils the role of Development Briefs but it provides certainty to all parties not least the developer.</p>	<p>Page 31, 2nd paragraph - amend amend "Fig. 145" to "Fig. 15" and "Fig. 154" to "Fig. 14"; 3rd paragraph - amend "Fig. 154" to "Fig. 14"</p>	<p>Text amended to correct typos</p>
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>Whilst the Brief should of course be a planning consideration, a design that is appropriate and aligns with planning policy should take precedence. Rather than insist that "each of the site allocation policies requires planning application(s) for the site to be in accordance with a Development Brief for the site", we would argue that it is far more effective to say, "planning applications shall state how they are in accordance with the Development Brief and where they differ, shall set out detailed justification for any departure, with reference the Adopted Partial Review and national guidance."</p>	<p>The objective of the Development Brief is to guide landowners and developers to an appropriate design solution that aligns with planning policy. The text of the Development Brief cited by the respondent reflects the requirement of Policy PR6b: "The application(s) shall be supported by, and prepared in accordance with, a comprehensive Development Brief for the entire site..." The respondent will appreciate that the Development Brief cannot set new policy or deviate from policy. We would disagree with the suggested wording that would require planning applications to "state how they are in accordance with the Development Brief" - the Council considers this to be superfluous and unnecessary requirement. We would agree that, where an applicant wishes to deviate from what is required by Policy PR6b and/or the Development Brief it would need to set out detailed justification for any departure, but does not consider it necessary for this to be stated in the Development Brief.</p>	<p>None</p>	

Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>Access Strategy</p> <p>We are currently working in collaboration with PR6a and Oxfordshire County Council Highway Authority to develop a joint access strategy. As a result of this work, which will arrive at the most appropriate solution, we do not consider it within the scope of the Development Brief to speculate on junction types. It need only refer to the requirement for two junctions that balance the needs of all users, particularly those using sustainable transport options. We therefore ask that any references to 'left in/left out' junctions is deleted and these matters are left to transport planners to determine, having regard to the need to convey cyclists and pedestrians safely along and across the corridor as a priority, whilst also ensuring bus services flow freely as possible.</p>	<p>The access strategy set out in the Development Brief has been prepared jointly with Oxfordshire County Council, who have advised on the necessary junction types. As stated above, it had been intended that the Development Briefs would require two crossroad junctions but in order to allow the land promoters / developers more flexibility we have compromised on the need for both access points to be crossroads, only requiring one on the condition that the second access for each site is left in left out, in order to convey cyclists and pedestrians safely along the corridor as a priority and to ensure bus services flow freely as possible. We would invite Turnberry to discuss this further with CDC and OCC.</p>	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>Character Areas: As a gateway to Oxford, we are in agreement with the Development Brief that PR6b provides the "opportunity to provide higher density and mixed use in close proximity to Oxford Road and Oxford Parkway Station".</p> <p>The site is an urban extension to Oxford, providing housing to meet Oxford's unmet housing need, and therefore the character of the development should be aligned more closely to that of Oxford than the wider Cherwell district.</p> <p>However, we find the prescriptive nature of the character areas and their storey height limitations arbitrary: there is no detailed urban design analysis or townscape impact assessment expressed in support of these character areas - they simply represent the views of one designer at a point in time. The character areas add nothing to the Development Brief and are not based on any objective evidence base. We would ask that the character areas plan is removed in line with the text at page 31 asks that the site 'considers' 'at least two' character areas. This is the correct approach in terms of responding to the constraints and opportunities the site presents: these matters should be left to the designers and public involvement in placemaking.</p> <p>We would also recommend that storey heights be limited up to 4 storeys with variety and 5 storeys in key locations being a more appropriate stipulation.</p>	<p>We would respectfully disagree with the suggested change - the effect of the change would be to allow for an unlimited number of character areas which would negate the purpose of having character areas and would dilute the character of the development. Storey heights have not been arrived at arbitrarily or by one designer, but have been discussed between multiple designers and planners. The Development Brief has been consulted upon and has provided a genuine opportunity for public involvement in placemaking. We would also note that planning application(s) for the site will be considered and determined by the local planning authority.</p>	None	

	<p>Oxford Road</p> <p>The character of Oxford Road is an important consideration for the development of both PR6b and PR6a. The width of Oxford Road and the location of pedestrian and cycle routes in relation to the main road is yet to be confirmed. The speed limit and layout of the road is still under consideration, whilst the requirement to provide an active frontage as well as retain mature trees along Oxford Road, are all combining to produce tensions within the Development Brief, which are not acknowledged or engaged with. The public realm strategy for Oxford Road is yet to be agreed, so flexibility in the principles for this area of the development is important. Indeed, some of the vegetation along Oxford Road is of poor quality on both sides of the road and the proposed interventions should be seen as an opportunity to potentially enhance rather than simply preserve these features.</p> <p>However, we would like to clearly state that whatever the solution for Oxford Road, fully segregated cycle and pedestrian lanes, separate from the bus lane and from each other, will be a key feature. We will also look at junction designs and bus stops to ensure the safest possible interaction between all road users. We are coordinating with PR6a in this respect and look forward to developing a solution with the assistance of the three Councils.</p>	<p>We agree that the character of Oxford Road is an important consideration. The Development Briefs set out the design principles for the location of pedestrian and cycle routes, and for the public realm. Tree retention and active frontage are not mutually exclusive principles. We agree that some of the interventions should be seen as an opportunity to enhance rather than preserve, but the respondent will appreciate that there are also requirements, e.g., in terms of biodiversity, which will be aided by retention where possible.</p>	<p>None</p>	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>Page 1, page 24 - replace "Detailed design requirements..." with "Design principles..."</p>	<p>We understand the reason for the suggestion</p>	<p>Text to be amended to "Development Principles which provide further detail to underpin the delivery of this development framework are set out in the next chapter." 1st para also to be amended to say Development Principles rather than Design Principles for consistency with later chapters of the brief.</p>	<p>Text amended</p>
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>Page 1, page 3, page 6 - change "The Development Brief has been jointly prepared by Cherwell District Council and the site owners and their representatives" to "The Development Brief has been by Cherwell District Council in consultation with the site owners and their representatives"</p>	<p>We would disagree - text to remain as drafted.</p>	<p>None</p>	

Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	The Development Brief is more of a design guide as it has not been jointly prepared. Page 3 - Please replace "Each of the site allocation policies requires planning application(s) for the site to be in accordance with a Development Brief for the site" with "Planning applications shall state how they are in accordance with the Development Brief and where they differ, shall set out detailed justification for any departure, with reference the Adopted Partial Review and national guidance."	We would disagree for the reasons set out above.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Given the uncertainty about the final width of Oxford Road, it is not certain that these trees can be retained in their entirety. Figure 1, 12, 13, 14, 18 - Change "Annotating area of Retained Trees along eastern edge" to "Annotate Oxford Road frontage trees a different colour and key as follows: 'Retained group of trees where possible'"	Most of the trees shown on the Oxford Road frontage are proposed new trees. There are 1 or 2 retained trees indicated between the northern access and public walking and cycle route beyond it, and there is a group of trees between the existing public right of way and the southern access which would need to be retained, albeit that the Development Brief does allow for thinning out (page 33, 2nd bullet, and page 48, 2nd bullet). The suggested replacement text would lack teeth and ineffective.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Simplify Primary vehicular access point* (all movements) Secondary vehicular access point* (left in left out) to "Vehicular access point" Whilst the asterisks caveat this as subject to highway testing, we feel that specifying junction types is an unnecessary level of detail and one we cannot support.	As set out above, this has been worked up with OCC and represents a compromise position that gives more flexibility to the land promoter / developer.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Strategic cycle route located to the east of the tree line - The annotation should indicate that this location is not fixed	If Figure 17 is referred to, we would note that Figure 17 is entitled "indicative proposals for..."	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	'New improved pedestrian bridge' (in key) - Replace with text on plan: 'Improved railway crossing for Northern Gateway connection'	Agreed	Figure 12 - amend "new improved pedestrian bridge" to "Improved railway crossing"	Changed on all relevant drawings, both in key and on the drawing

Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	New public walking and cycle route (including yellow arrow on map) - Delete as this is addressed above	Public walking and cycle routes are one of the key components of the Development Brief and responds to the requirements of part 8(c) of Policy PR6b. There is no justification for deleting this element of the Brief.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Page 14 - "land ownerships are subject to change and planning circumstances may require the sites to be brought forward separately" Change to 'sites will be brought forward separately'	That the sites may be brought forward separately is not precluded by the text as drafted - there is no good reason why it needs to be amended	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Page 21 - "Opportunity to create a contemporary residential urban extension to the existing built-up area of Oxford which... maintains site features including mature trees" Many references on this page contradict or create competing tensions in terms of the Oxford Road frontage. Further collaboration is needed to establish a set of clearer principles for Oxford Road	Page 21 sets out opportunities. The development principles are set out at Section 6 of the Brief	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	"Opportunity to provide wildlife corridors over/under the A34 and A4260 to Stratfield Brake District Wildlife Site." This is not likely to be viable given the nature of critical infrastructure which isolates PR6b from land to the north – delete.	The text sets out an opportunity. Whether it is achieved or delivered is a separate matter, but it remains an opportunity.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	"Opportunity to provide higher density and mixed use in close proximity to Oxford Road and Oxford Parkway Station." Add: "and other important nodes." Potential accesses and important junctions all provide potentially important nodal points which can be celebrated.	Density is dealt with in more detail later in the brief. No other important nodes are shown on the drawing.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Figure 11 - Active Frontage indicated along the eastern edge of the site - Change annotation to "area of potential active frontage". Whilst active frontage will be included, the details of Oxford Road are unconfirmed and therefore it cannot be prescribed for the whole edge of the site.	Figure 11 sets out site opportunities, not requirements. An active frontage along Oxford Road is certainly an opportunity. The respondent's reasons for changing this text are not well founded.	None	

Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Page 23 - "opportunity to provide southbound bus lane" Delete - this bus lane is already existing.	Noted. Text to be amended to accord with the change suggested by Savills to the same wording in the Development Brief for PR6a	Text to be amended as per the change being made to the PR6a Development Brief here.	text of page 23 amended
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Figure 15 - character areas - Delete in favour of more appropriate text on page 31	We would disagree, for the reasons set out above	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Pages 33, 35 - Change from "The majority of buildings in the character area are to be 2-3 storeys in height with 4-5 storey buildings appropriate only at key locations in the eastern part of the character area such as at movement nodes and at corners or vista stops, where particular emphasis is required. The scale is to be sensitive to adjacent building heights and uses." to "The majority of buildings in the character area are to be up to 4 storeys in height with up to 5 storey buildings appropriate only at key locations. The scale is to be sensitive to adjacent building heights and uses."	We would disagree, for the reasons set out above	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	"Subject to the siting of accesses and connections, high and moderate quality trees on the Oxford Road frontage are to be retained, thinned out, supplemented or replaced by new tree planting and ground vegetation removed to enable visibility into the site while retaining habitat connectivity" The quality of these trees may merit replacement and the quality of the solution may merit replacement in of itself.	Again we would disagree. The suggested change would allow for the removal of the high and moderate quality trees. This is unacceptable. The respondent suggests that the quality of 'high quality trees' "may merit replacement". The comment would make sense if the quoted text just referred to trees in the broad sense, but this is not the case.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Page 34, precedent images - these should be related to the appropriate text	Change is unnecessary as the photos are general precedents relevant to the character area, rather than a specific requirement.	no change	



Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	6.4.2, page 38, The existing text describing the vehicle access is far too detailed, setting out junction hierarchy and types. The text should not refer to primary and secondary access. There should be no reference to the type of junction. The text itself describes how the location, size and type of junction is subject to determination in collaboration with OCC. Therefore, the details are unconfirmed and it is unnecessary to include junction restrictions in the Development Brief.	The Development Brief is intended to provide guidance, and the text builds in the appropriate caveats. It would be inappropriate and unnecessary to make the changes suggested. The junction hierarchy is a direct response to the emerging plans of the land promoters and their desire for flexibility.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Page 40 - Change from "The northern access will provide a direct link to Oxford Parkway station/park & ride" to "The northern access will connect to the existing infrastructure which provides access to Oxford Parkway station"	Agreed, although with a variation of the proposed wording.	Change to " The northern access will enable a direct link to..."	Text amended
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Page 44 - "Detailed designs should promote cycle and pedestrian safety and are to be agreed through the pre-application process..." Cycle and pedestrian safety needs to be prioritised.	This is considered a given and is a change we would be happy to make.	Page 44, 1st bullet - after 'Detailed designs' add "should promote cycle and pedestrian safety and"	text of 6.4.5 amended
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Page 47 - Change from "As a minimum the important groups of trees identified on Fig. 10 are to be retained" to "Subject to an agreed public realm strategy for Oxford Road, the important groups of trees identified on Fig. 10 are to be retained"	We would disagree for the reasons set out above.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Change from "The November 2021 Environment Act has introduced a statutory requirement for 10% biodiversity net gain for new development. <del>In recognition of this forthcoming legislation, in October 2019, the Council's Executive endorsed seeking a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain through engagement with the planning process</del> " to "The November 2021 Environment Act has introduced a statutory requirement for 10% biodiversity net gain for new development. <b>The Council encourages a minimum of 10% biodiversity net gain, until wider legislation and policy changes take place</b> "	The point is noted. However, the statements at para 47 are factual and do not in themselves stipulate a requirement.	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	Page 48 - "Subject to the siting of accesses and connections, <b>and the public realm strategy for Oxford Road</b> , high and moderate quality trees on the Oxford Road frontage are to be retained, thinned out, or supplemented by new tree planting..."	We would disagree for the reasons set out above.	None	

Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>Location of the primary school</p> <p>The school is an important shared piece of infrastructure between the two sites, so the location in the PR6a development brief is important to our site. As a result of this shared nature, the school should be located centrally for ease of access. Locating the school to the north of the site, as currently indicated in Figure 1 of PR6a's Development Brief, would make it distant from many parts of PR6b. We support PR6a in their designers' assessment as to the optimum location of the school. We are happy to participate in a meeting with the Education Authority if this would assist.</p>	<p>A central location for the school would be preferable from an urban design perspective, but unfortunately the constraints presented by the site's changing levels, the archaeology and the extent of the developable area in the central location mean that a central location for these uses is not achievable without harming the archaeological remains or encroaching into the Green Belt. The northern location is not constrained in these ways and is also where the adopted planning policy shows the local centre to be located.</p>	None	
Turnberry (promoter for 6b)	<p>Oxford Road Frontage</p> <p>As already stated, we are working together on this frontage. The confusing references to active frontage, retaining trees, widening highway etc. apply to both Development Briefs and we do not consider that the Briefs as currently written will support the optimum outcome as they simply introduce competing tensions. We would recommend that the three Councils engage with PR6a and b to arrive at most appropriate and safest solution for this important corridor. Both PR6a and b are united in ensuring that cyclists and pedestrians benefit from fully segregated facilities on or adjacent to Oxford Road and that careful consideration of friction points at junctions and bus stops will be carefully considered.</p>	<p>We support the request for continued engagement and collaboration. We disagree with the land promoters for PR6a and PR6b that there are competing tensions. We are pleased that the land promoters are carefully considering potential friction points at junctions.</p>	None	
OCC	<p>Although from a strategic point of view it would be better if the two sites on either side of Oxford Road, PR6a and PR6b, were developed together, it is acknowledged that the developers appear to have different timeframes for these. However, we expect the developers to work together to minimise disruption, particularly disruption to the road network, and seek that the development briefs provide for a comprehensive development of both sites.</p>	Agreed	None	
OCC	<p>Green Belt</p> <p>The entire site was removed from the Green Belt when it was allocated and there is no adjoining Green Belt land. Nevertheless, the connection to countryside land in the Green Belt to the east, through PR6a, or perhaps north and through Stratfield Brake, will be important to future occupiers. This appears to be adequately addressed in the draft development brief, particularly in 6.5.3 'Definition and Treatment of Green Belt boundary'.</p>	Agreed	None	

OCC	<p>Specialist Housing</p> <p>Policy BSC 4 of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 (adopted July 2015) requires housing sites such as this to 'provide a minimum of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings as part of the overall mix' and includes some flexibility on the requirement. Policy BSC 4 envisages Land Use Class C3 uses. The development brief should be amended to make it clear that provision for specialist housing is expected on this site.</p> <p>The County Council has a particular interest in affordable extra care housing, and it may be that the extra care dwellings on this site could be part of the affordable housing provided on this site.</p>	Noted	None	
OCC	<p>We suggest adding a new paragraph on under 5.1 on page 24 following the paragraph which details the requirements of Policy PR6a as follows:</p> <p>'A minimum of 45 self-contained extra care dwellings are required as part of the overall mix of the 670 homes in accordance with Policy BSC 4 of the Cherwell Local Plan Part 1. Whether extra care dwellings are part of the affordable housing requirement on the site will be determined through the planning application process.'</p>	<p>This is correct but not imperative for the development brief to state this under 5.1. It may be appropriate for para 7.1 to be amended, but is also important for there to be consistency across the briefs. The Local Plan policy requirement stands irrespective of whether it is reiterated in the development brief.</p>	None	
OCC	<p>Safeguarded Aggregate Rail Depot</p> <p>Approximately 320m north east of the allocation site there is a safeguarded aggregate rail depot under Policy M9 of the Minerals and Waste Core Strategy. This is operated by Hanson. We appreciate that this is shown in Figure 9. It is also referenced in 3.2.4 of the development brief, and although it is good that it is mentioned, it should also be referenced in 4.1 under 'site constraints' and shown on Figure 10. Awareness of this constraint is necessary when designing development nearby, especially as Figure 11 identifies a potential indicative green corridor supporting ecological habitat and walking/cycling alongside the Rail Depot boundary.</p>	Noted	Add reference to aggregate rail depot to figure 10 and section 4.1.	Add depot to figure 10. Text amended

OCC	<p>Digital Infrastructure</p> <p>We suggest adding a new paragraph under 6.8 'utilities and infrastructure' on page 56 to address the importance of digital infrastructure and need for full fibre installation at the build phase. 'Advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social wellbeing. Consideration should be given to the fact that any new homes or commercial premises planned to be built have 21st century digital infrastructure installed at the build phase. Developers should be required to engage with a telecommunications network provider to provide a full fibre connection to each residential/business premise. This will help mitigate environmental impacts of any proposed development as people will be better able to work from home, reducing unnecessary journeys. Moreover, digital infrastructure provides the backbone for building a low carbon economy.'</p>	<p>This is more akin to policy than to the scope of the development brief. In addition, it is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9</p>	None	
OCC	<p>The County Council has a range of existing documents which should be referred to such as our cycling and walking design standards and active healthy travel strategy and our November 2021 street design guide. We appreciate that reference has been included to the March 2021 Oxfordshire Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy in section 6.1. Forthcoming documents should also be referenced, such as the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan.</p>	<p>It is not appropriate to refer to documents as yet unadopted. It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs; the changes made to PR7b and PR9 briefs have been made to this development brief but in the interests of consistency further changes would not be made</p>	None	
OCC	<p>The Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, which was approved in January 2022 following consultation which closed in November 2021, should be referred to in the development brief, along with the Oxford Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan, approved in March 2020. We seek amendment to the second bullet point under 4.2.5 as follows:</p> <p>'Opportunity to integrate the site layout with adjacent development sites including PR6b and movement links outside the site including an onwards link to the Oxford North site via high quality crossing of Oxford Road and the rail line, and an onward link over the A40 via the existing bridge adjoining Cutteslowe Park. Regard should be had to published guidance including the Oxford and Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans.'</p>	<p>Happy to amend the bullet point as suggested</p>	<p>4.2.5, amend the 2nd bullet point to read: "Opportunity to integrate the site layout with adjacent development sites including PR6b and movement links outside the site including an onwards link to the Oxford North site via high quality crossing of Oxford Road and the rail line, and an onward link over the A40 via the existing bridge adjoining Cutteslowe Park. Regard should be had to published guidance including the Oxford and Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans."</p>	<p>Amended 4.2.5 second bullet reads "Opportunity to integrate the site layout with adjacent development sites including PR6a and movement links outside the site including an onwards link to the Oxford North site via a high quality crossing of the rail line, and an onward link over the A40 via a high quality crossing of Oxford Road towards site PR6a and the existing bridge adjoining Cutteslowe Park. Regard should be had to published guidance including the Oxford and Kidlington Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans."</p>

OCC	<p>Bus Routes</p> <p>There are good existing bus services along the A4165 outside the site, and an existing southbound bus lane. Figure 19 shows a possible location of an additional bus stop near the centre of the site, which we support, subject to detailed assessment.</p>	Noted	None	
OCC	<p>Car &amp; cycle parking - We seek that the text in 6.4.6 be amended as follows:</p> <p>'Car parking provision and design will <b>have regard to the sustainable location of the site and</b> be in line with the Oxford City parking standards <b>low-car principles and therefore limited.</b> <del>having</del> <del>Regard should be had</del> to the Cherwell Residential Design Guide SPD Section 5.8 as well as the good practice recommendations in Manual for Streets. <del>Parking standards for the new development are to be agreed having regard to the sustainable location of the site, the extent to which different typologies of housing require dedicated car parking, having regard to need, unallocated parking and a site-wide Travel Plan.</del> Cycle parking <b>will need to be provided generously to encourage and facilitate cycle use.</b> <del>provision is to be in line with OCC's adopted cycle parking standards.</del></p>	Noted; happy to amend the middle of the three paragraphs (other than the words 'which could' as this reduces the strength of the requirement or objective, and the change re car parking requirements, where effectively the proposed change uses a different word to say the same thing)	6.4.6, 2nd paragraph - Amend to read: "Reflecting the site's accessibility to public transport and walking and cycling routes, there is an opportunity to provide a mobility hub, including provision of hire vehicles such as e-scooters and e-bicycles, automated vehicle idling points, potential AV, cargo bike storage and an electric car club, together with features such as locker and storage space enabling delivery consolidation, delivered in association with reduced car parking requirements across the site."	
OCC	<p><b>At the time of producing this development brief, Oxfordshire County Council's standards for car parking and cycle parking are being reviewed. It is expected that the car parking requirements will be lower in this area than currently, and the cycle parking requirements higher. These revised standards are likely to be available when an application on this site is determined, and therefore will need to be followed. To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site.'</b></p>	Noted; the CPZ is outside of the scope of planning, but as with PR7a we are happy to add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."	Add sentence at Paragraph 6.4.6 preceding 'Development principles' to state: "To avoid indiscriminate on-street parking, possibly by commuters, a controlled parking zone is likely to be needed on the site."	Text added to 6.4.6
OCC	<p>The brief should refer to the newly adopted Oxfordshire Street Design Guide. The document provides guidance relating to parking, including rear parking courts which OCC discourages. We seek the following amendment to 6.3.1:</p> <p>'Reduced levels of parking are to be provided, with parking for apartments and townhouses <del>located to the rear of properties in small parking courts or rear garages serving a maximum of 6 properties to</del> <b>be in line with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide.'</b></p> <p>We also seek amendment to 6.3.2:</p> <p>'Parking will be provided on street (<b>unallocated</b>) and on-plot to the side of semi-detached and end of terrace, or accessed from the rear <b>and will be in line with the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide.</b> <del>Parking to the front of properties is to be avoided.'</del></p>	It is important that the Cherwell Residential Design Guide takes primacy, and that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	

OCC	<p>We also seek amendment to 6.3.2:  'A range of parking solutions are to be used, responding to the plot and building typology and <b>with regard to the Oxfordshire Street Design Guide</b>, including planted rear parking courts for apartments, and on-plot parking to the side of houses or accessed from the rear. <del>Parking to the front of properties is to be avoided.</del>'</p>	Ditto	None	
OCC	<p>Vehicle Access Points  We support the indications of road access points as shown on Figures 13 and 18 and described in 6.4.2. These show a single main signalised access point which is a junction serving both PR6a and PR6b. An additional access point onto the A4165 is shown, being left-in and left-out. These are clearly asterisked as being 'subject to highway testing'. The design of access points is a key issue that will require detailed consideration. Figure 17 which provides an indicative cross-section might be misleading given that the access points on the A4165 will likely require some additional road width. It is noted that the figure is referred to as being indicative only.</p>	Agreed	None	
OCC	<p>Location of Primary School Site  No new school is anticipated on the PR6b site, instead there is a policy requirement for a primary school to be delivered on PR6a. Appropriate contributions will be sought towards the school. At this point in time, the County Council does not know whether the site shown in the development brief (Figure 13) is the best site available to meet all the County standards. We note the figure is clearly asterisked to indicate the school site location is subject to further detailed assessment. We expect that consideration will be given to how to best walk to the school from this development site as part of the development process.</p>	<p>The location of the primary school has been discussed in detail with OCC. Modelling discussed between CDC, OCC and the land promoter has shown only two locations workable from OCC's perspective, the central location preferred by the land promoter and the northern location shown in the Development Brief. Unfortunately, given the constraints in the centre of the site and the lack of flexibility possible to the layout of the school site, the central location is not possible. There are no inconsistencies in the Development Brief with regard to the school location - the early chapters reflect the LPPR proposals map, whereas Fig 1 and Chapter 5 onwards show the northern location that will be required if there remains insufficient flexibility on the layout of the school site.</p>	None	

OCC	<p>There is an incorrect reference to the 'Oxfordshire County Council Drainage Team' in 6.5.2. Oxfordshire County Council has a statutory role as Lead Local Flood Authority, while the Districts have other responsibilities for drainage. In addition, there is an incorrect reference to Figure 19, which is about movement and access and does not show drainage features. Therefore, please change the text as follows:  'The location and detail of the drainage attenuation features shall be agreed in detail with Oxfordshire County Council as Lead Local Flood Authority and with Cherwell District Council's Drainage Team.'</p>	Agreed	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Text of 6.5.2 amended
OCC	<p>It is noted that figures for the development framework identify 'drainage attenuation features (indicative location)', and 'indicative SuDS feature'. At this stage, the location of SuDS and drainage attenuation has not been the subject of detailed consideration, therefore the figures are indeed only indicative. In line with paragraphs 160 and 161 of the NPPF, we will expect a sequential, risk-based approach to the location of development, taking into account all sources of flood risk and the current and future impacts of climate change.</p>	Noted	None	
OCC	<p>It is welcomed that outline measures for biodiversity are identified in the development briefs.  It is noted that the development briefs indicate that Biodiversity Impact Assessments (BIA) will be undertaken at application stage. However, the District Council may wish to consider the benefits of undertaking the BIA at this stage, to inform the development briefs, as is indicated in LPPR policies for these sites.  A Biodiversity Impact Assessment, including application of the Biodiversity Metric 3.0, provides a robust tool to understand the losses and gains to biodiversity associated with different designs and layouts. The information it provides can help inform design evolution, the extent of the site that will be needed to provide on-site biodiversity gains, as well as any need for off-site delivery of biodiversity net gains.  Whilst Biodiversity Metric 3.0 would usually be informed by field survey of habitats within the development area, at earlier stages of a project where detailed survey data may not be available, it is possible to compile a dataset and use a range of assumptions to test the potential biodiversity losses and gains associated with different layouts. More detailed assessments would then be required to support the planning applications.</p>	Noted	None	

OCC	Reference should be included in the development briefs to the County Council's Innovation Framework which will be finalised shortly following consultation as part of the Local Transport and Connectivity Plan	It would not be appropriate to refer to emerging supplementary documents; in addition it is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	
OCC	Although we have not prepared alternative text, we would welcome the District Council further considering the text in 6.1 'sustainable construction and energy efficiency'. For example this should reference smart energy solutions, battery storage and travel planning for construction which aims to use local materials to minimise the need for long-distance transportation of materials.	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	
OCC	The text in 6.3 'character and layout' insufficiently addresses future trends. There should be flexibility in the design to allow adaptation to changing needs over time. For example, reference could be made to the potential for connected and automated vehicles, and e-bike and e-scooter hire schemes.	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	
OCC	The text in 6.4.1 'movement and access – general principles' should include a general principle to cater for future modes of transport set to become mainstream.	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	
OCC	The second paragraph in 6.4.6 'parking' should be amended as set out in our transport development control comments earlier, to reflect innovations.	It is important that there is consistency across the development briefs and this text was not included for PR7b or PR9	None	
OCC	The text in 6.5 'green infrastructure' should refer to the potential for green roofs and green walls.	The development brief refers to these at page 53	None	
OCC	The text in 7.1 sets out the information to accompany planning applications, but it is noted that the list is only an indication as requirements may change over time. For strategic scale developments such as these, an Innovation Plan may be needed.	The text preceding the bullet point list states that the checklist provides "an indication of documents required at application stage" and so is not to be read as definitive	None	



OCC	Page 2 - 'Cutteslowe' to be replaced with 'Cutteslowe' (same applies in Figures 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 18 and 21)	Noted	The relevant figures and text to be amended accordingly.	All drawings amended. Text is correct
OCC	Page 9, in the legend to Figure 3, Oxford N should read Oxford North	Agreed	Text to be amended accordingly	Amended
OCC	Figure 3 - make clear if this is proposed school location as per indicative plan in the LPPR or adjust to reflect Figure 13 (also applies to Figure 7)	Noted	Fig 3 to be amended to note that the locations for proposed local centres and schools reflect those set out in the LPPR.	Clarification added to page 9 and 13.
OCC	Figure 4 - update purple key to refer to 'Oxford City allocated sites' and include the St Frideswide Farm allocation (also applies to Figure 5, Figure 6, Figure 7)	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Drawings to be updated as per PR6a. Keys have been amended.
OCC	Page 31, last paragraph, there is a typo in the reference to a Figure - it should be 14 or 15 rather than 154	Noted	See above	Amended
OCC	Page 40 - 2nd bullet point - SR52 to be replaced with SP52	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	P40 amended
OCC	Page 42, Fig 18, the cross sections A-A, B-B and C-C are not shown in the legend	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Added to legend as per PR6a
OCC	Page 46 - the last document in the list - replace draft 2021 with 'approved January 2022'	Noted	The development brief will be amended accordingly	Text amended. Also amended for PR6a.
OCC	Page 52 - Fig 1921 should be either 19 or 21	Agreed	Page 52, first para, "Fig. 1921" to be amended to "Fig. 21"	Text amended
OCC	Page 56, penultimate bullet point - "6.4.26" appears to be a typo	Agreed	Text to be amended accordingly	Text amended
Jack Fursdon	Objects in principle to the development of the PR sites; land not in the Green Belt should be preferred and there are many brownfield sites in Oxford; the Council should look at buying land owned by Oxford University without having to provide all of the housing on them that is proposed	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	

Jack Fursdon	The Council's consultation only allows me to choose one development brief to comment on - the Council is trying to reduce the perceived dislike	This is a function of the Let's Talk website and not intentional on the part of the Council. Those responding to the Development Briefs email address could comment on however many they wished to.	None	
Jack Fursdon	The proposals would impact on local infrastructure (schools, health, roads), which is already at capacity	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Jack Fursdon	The housing will not be cheap enough for it to be genuinely affordable	This is not within the scope of the Development Brief	None	
David Gimson	As with PR6a and PR7, I think this development has many excellent features, but it that it need to be much bolder about reducing car use. Parking space is wasted space. The development needs the facility for deliveries and for car clubs, but should not have any parking spaces for private cars, which should be explicitly prohibited. Please be even bolder in planning for 2050, when climate change is likely to impose drastic limitations on private car use anyway. There is a very large untapped market for car free living, and Oxford is the place to meet this demand.	These comments are noted and reflected in the changes sought by OCC and in the parking strategies set out in the Development Brief and supported by the Cherwell Residential Guide	None	
Margaret Boggs	Yet more housing with no road improvements, medical facility improvement. I have been told that the Tories behaviour with regard to this giving away our precious green belt, more importantly the little space between Oxford city and Kidlington, has been suspect. Is that right?	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Nicholas Krol	I do not dispute that Oxford has an unmet housing need. However, it is the scale of the proposed housing in one locality that is worrying, and I believe it is unsustainable for the area.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	

Nicholas Krol	<p>Local services. Aside from several new schools being proposed, there has been no thought to extra services and infrastructure that will be needed to support 1,790 homes for the three sites. That would equate to a conservative estimate of 3,500-5,500 new habitans. The Parish population in 2011 was 13,723! I can only see a commitment to new schools. More importantly, however, new GP practices will be required as Kidlington currently only has Gosford Hill and The Key Medical Practice. Sainsburys, which is already very busy at peak times, will become unmanageable unless new small convenience stores are built as part of the developments. Until the proposals include a commitment to new services I cannot be in support. The impact on residents in Kidlington will be unimaginable.</p>	<p>Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites; this includes health care provision either at the local centres forming part of PR6a and PR8 or through redevelopment of Exeter Hall to accommodate existing practices</p>	None	
Nicholas Krol	<p>Roads. The proposals include out-of-date information. Oxfordshire County Council have stated that there is no longer funding for the A44-A40 link road via Loop Farm Roundabout (source: <a href="https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-andtransport/roadworks/future-transport-projects/a40-a44-strategic-link-road">https://www.oxfordshire.gov.uk/residents/roads-andtransport/roadworks/future-transport-projects/a40-a44-strategic-link-road</a>) . As a result there is no guarantee this will be built. With Oxford North currently being developed too, the scale of this proposed housing will put a strain on the current overused road infrastructure unless traffic management is put at the heart of these proposals. We will need more frequent buses and train services. However, buses to/from Kidlington/Oxford have recently massively reduced, with Oxford Bus Company no longer running the number 2 service. Can you give guarantees of a Rapid Bus service? Sustainable transport needs to be at the heart of these proposals. How are you expecting residents to move around?</p>	<p>Access and movement is a central component of the Development Brief. We note the comments made here. However, the issues highlighted here go beyond the remit of the Development, the role of which is to expound how the Local Plan policy will be delivered.</p>	None	
Nicholas Krol	<p>Trains. Similarly, including a 'proposed' station in North Kidlington. In the new Oxfordshire Rail Corridor Study, there is no mention of a station being built near Begbroke (source: <a href="https://www.networkrail.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Oxfordshire-Rail-Corridor-Study-.pdf">https://www.networkrail.co.uk/wp-content/uploads/2021/06/Oxfordshire-Rail-Corridor-Study-.pdf</a>). I would be in full support of such a station as it would promote sustainable ways of movement. But it is misleading to write this into a proposal until funding or preliminary plans have been made.</p>	ADD TEXT	None	

Nicholas Krol	Green Belt. Revising the Green Belt boundaries should only be done in exceptional cases. These three sites form part of a total of 4,400 houses across Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton. Green space to paramount to conserving nature, promoting wellbeing and sustainable growth. There has not been a strong enough argument here for me to support revising the Green Belt.	This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.	None	
Susanna Pressel	I'd love to see a new country park as a result of all 3 developments.	Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites, including open space and recreation.	None	
Susanna Robertson	The plan (page 22) highlights an "important connection" between the south-west corner of the proposed development (next to the railway line) and Lakeside. There is neither a supporting number on the plan nor any explanation or mention of Lakeside in the text. Page 21, 4.2.5, "Movement and Access" mentions Linkside Avenue in relation to creating connections with reference to 7 and 8 (page 23) on the plan (page 22). Any direct connection with Linkside would need houses to be purchased and demolished. Therefore, the connection proposed is between the development and Lakeside and should have been explicitly stated in the text and referenced on the plan. In keeping with Oxford City Council's policy to discourage car use and encourage walking and cycling, the connection with Lakeside should only be for pedestrian and cycle access.	No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.	None	

<p>Rosalyn Porter, Matthew Cheetham, Sunil Nair, Chris Parkinson, Julian Lawton Smith,</p>	<p>Oxford Cricket Club has passed on details of the Cherwell public consultation relating to land adjacent to our club's ground at Jordan Hill, OX2 8EF. Oxford Cricket Club is the leading cricket club in Oxford with four men's teams, two women's teams and 12 youth teams, and youth waiting lists. They run coaching and playing opportunities for 200 boys and girls from age five to 19, including a community outreach programme with a local secondary school with others to follow soon. I propose that part of the land inside the city and part of site PR6b should be set aside for two cricket grounds (with regulation size boundaries) to provide a long term future for the club, with all the benefits it brings to the community as well as being available for informal recreational use when not in use for formal sports. The draft development brief proposes that there should be space for "formal sports" within the area. I believe that this should be for cricket on the basis that there is already a flourishing premier league club (ourselves) in the area which has a growing women's and youth section and that other sports are already well provided for.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. The draft Development Brief states at page 24 that, "It is the Council's preference that in lieu of on-site formal sports provision an appropriate financial contribution be made towards new and improved facilities off-site."</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>Julian Lawton Smith</p>	<p>Another option might be to allocate part of the North Oxford Golf Club land to cricket, joining with our current venue at the Oxford University Press ground at Jordan Hill. New leasing arrangements would need to be made to ensure security of tenure over a long period. In any event, the importance of cricket as a major sport within Oxfordshire should be recognised and suitable facilities provided.</p>	<p>Ditto</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>Vernon King</p>	<p>Although I have selected PR6b in particular my general comments apply to all three development areas. Despite the public confirmation by Boris Johnston no less that Green Belt would "absolutely" be protected these developments are in conflict with that statement. Accordingly I object to these incursions on what should be our protected heritage. In the case of PR6b in particular, the proximity to the A34 has huge noise implications which in my opinion makes it totally unsuited for housing development. The loss of the golf course adds to the disruption this plan represents if it is implemented. Sorry.</p>	<p>This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.</p>	<p>None</p>	

Gareth Langley	<p>The proposal, in addition to PR6a, both encroach on heavily used cricket facilities, many others of which have been threatened, degraded or lost entirely in the past 10-15 years. This plans do not provide any concrete proposals for safeguarding the future of the adjacent sports facilities (which are not acknowledged), nor providing active, safe spaces for organised sport. The proposal presented makes no reference to the current sports facilities at Jordan Hill sports ground and indeed proposes the establishment of a public right of way through this space, without acknowledging the current use of this ground or providing a viable route that does not cut through the existing space at Jordan Hill. Given this is home to a large youth cricket section and is used extensively during the weekend and nights of the week through the summer months, the safety and security of this site needs to be maintained for the public, but also from a safeguarding perspective. This is an ideal opportunity to support existing clubs and expand the space available for recreational sport in North Oxford as part of the housing plan, and the current proposals are threatening the very opposite.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. The draft Development Brief states at page 24 that, "It is the Council's preference that in lieu of on-site formal sports provision an appropriate financial contribution be made towards new and improved facilities off-site." Appendix 4 of the LPPR, which sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites, including open space and recreation. This includes formal sport pitch provision at PR7a, including one cricket ground.</p>	None	
Mel Snelling	<p>While respecting the need for additional housing in the area I feel that these three proposals will result in too many new houses concentrated in a single area that already has significant hold ups at rush hour as people queue for the Cutteslowe roundabout, these queues very often backing up to the Kidlington Sainsbury's roundabout and along Bicester Road and through Kidlington Centre along the Oxford Road. With the main point for entrance and egress of PR6b and PR6a being on the A4260 between the Kidlington Sainsbury's and Cutteslowe roundabouts this will significantly exacerbate this problem. If the plan for Oxford United to build a new stadium at Stratfield Brake go ahead I foresee even greater traffic management problems. This is environmentally unfriendly as well as impacting the well being of those who have no choice but to travel this route morning and evening, increasing stress and taking more time out of busy lives.</p>	<p>This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.</p>	None	
Mel Snelling	<p>There is provision for a new primary school in the Cutteslowe area which presumably would serve the housing in PR6a, PR6b and PR7a but I can see nothing regarding provision of additional secondary school places or healthcare facilities and thus these and the other new housing proposed in the locality would put excessive strain on Gosford Hill school and the two medical practices in Kidlington.</p>	<p>Appendix 4 of the LPPR sets out the infrastructure requirements for all of the sites; this includes health care provision either at the local centres forming part of PR6a and PR8 or through redevelopment of Exeter Hall to accommodate existing practices</p>	None	

<p>Mel Snelling</p>	<p>While accepting that the plan for PR6b includes retaining some of the trees, hedgerows and the pond currently at the site it seems crazy to move the North Oxford Golf course from this site to Frieze Farm. Environmentally the golf course represents a mature natural environment with large trees that will capture carbon and well established biodiversity. Moving this to Frieze Farm would turn the environmental clock back many years as it would take considerable time for species to re-establish at the PR6b site and for new species to establish at the Frieze Farm site. As far as I can tell, Frieze Farm has no or hardly any mature trees and little biodiversity so with regard to climate change it would seem to make much more sense to retain North Oxford Golf Club where it is and to build the new housing at Frieze Farm.</p>	<p>These comments are noted, but they relate to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>Peter Joyce</p>	<p>Cherwell District Council's draft development brief PR6b requires that there should be space for "formal sports, play areas and allotments" within the area. We consider that formal sports should include cricket grounds especially given the proposals for football nearby and the fact we have previously been moved from our ground in Roman Way to make way for what is now a training ground for Oxford United F.C. We propose that part of the land inside the city and part of site PR6b should be set aside for two cricket grounds (with regulation size boundaries) to provide a long term future for our club, with all the benefits it brings to the community as well as being available for informal recreational use when not in use for formal sports. The draft development brief proposes that there should be space for "formal sports" within the area. The benefits of this proposal would be firstly that it would provide a long term, or permanent home for a thriving cricket club for men and women and junior players, with all the sporting, health and social well-being benefits the club provides. Secondly, it would retain an important area of green space within the proposed developments, helping to retain a break among solid ranks of housing proposed in the plans. It would be available not only for formal sport, but for walking and casual recreation when not in use for training or matches. We appreciate that there is a great demand for housing in the area but ask for our views to be taken into account to aid our club which we fear is under threat simply because cricket is now viewed as a minority sport.</p>	<p>These comments are noted. The draft Development Brief states at page 24 that, "It is the Council's preference that in lieu of on-site formal sports provision an appropriate financial contribution be made towards new and improved facilities off-site."</p>	<p>None</p>	

<p>Claire Cullen</p>	<p>I object to a connecting road between this new development (on North Oxford Golf Club) linking with roads on Linkside Avenue and Lakeside. I was told this wouldn't be a possibility due to the junction at Linkside Avenue with Five Mile Drive, which is not designed to accommodate any more vehicle traffic. But your plans are confusing and seem to suggest a linking road! I have no objection to a cycle lane or a foot path linking the new development with Linkside Avenue. But not to increase in vehicles using it as a through road. It is currently a very quiet and calm road. This would certainly change if a linking road were allowed as the traffic on the Banbury Road during peak times would force residents in the new development to use Linkside Avenue as a quicker alternative route. Leading to more accidents in our neighbourhood.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>L F Monteith</p>	<p>We were dismayed to learn of the plans to create a cut through for cars, cycles or pedestrians through linkside avenue and lakeside. This is a quiet, residential cul de sac where children play in the street. There will be strong opposition to this from all residents if this goes forward as part of the plan.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	
<p>Lauren Wellard</p>	<p>I am shocked that all three of these developments are going ahead. Oxford University use there powers in the most appealing way. They don't care about the people of Oxford who value the countryside that is on their doorstep, and soon to be gone. These developments should be illegal during a climate crisis. They demonstrate that the councils or Uni do not care about the people of this city. This is GREEN BELT LAND. All those who have pushed this through should be ashamed. As well as the entire development I am specifically objecting to the 4.2.5 where its suggested that a though road could be added from lakeside to connect to the new development. If this is to be a route for everyday vehicles this will cause more traffic. WE ARE SUPPOSED TO BE THINKING OF THE ENVIRONMENT / discouraging driving... this will not help!!!!</p>	<p>This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR. In relation to the comment on Section 4.2.5: No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	<p>None</p>	



James Ruddick (Linkside)	<p>Highlights several issues associated with creating a thoroughfare through Linkside Avenue/Lakeside: 1. The road is home to families with children who use the road, increasing the volume of traffic would be detrimental to their health. 2. Neither the junction with 5 mile drive or the Lakeside turning is appropriate for more traffic, and the road currently has no markings making it dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians, and other road users. 3. The neighbourhood is currently a cul de sac as a blind loop, and opening one end would change the community based here. 4. Noise pollution - the road would inevitably lead to increase usage and increased noise pollution. 5. There are no crossings - several elderly and young people cross regularly to see their friends over the road, and any increase in traffic would make that hazardous requiring a crossing to be put in. 6. None of the development plans show this access route, with only 2 access routes shown onto Banbury Road and none from the South for vehicles, and is therefore a departure from what I thought was being represented. We haven't therefore had the required time to consult on this. 7. This goes against all the other Oxford Council plans to introduce Low Traffic Neighbourhoods as you'd be increasing the traffic in our neighbourhood. 8. The building of this estate removes a well used and appreciated sports facility used for golf and for Pilates (this is my business) and removal of it is detrimental to the health of our community, this access road would create further destruction.</p>	<p>The last comment, concerning the loss of the golf course, relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR. Although Section 4.2.5 identifies a connection to Linkside Avenue (among others) as an opportunity, this is not pursued from Section 5 onwards where the proposals for the site are detailed. The only linkage proposed by the Development Brief to the south boundary of the site is a walking and cycling route into the Jordan Hill site. No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Sarah	<p>I am a resident of Linkside Avenue I am writing with regards to proposed plans to open the cul de sac at the end of Linkside Avenue for access to the new development, PR6b. This will fundamentally change the character, traffic and parking levels, and safety of our street and neighbourhood, which have always been quiet and safe for small children and families, elderly residents, and residents with mobility issues, and I therefore register my strong objection to it. We already have to cope with new developments in nearly every piece of green space near our homes, along with the traffic and noise this will bring. Like other residents of my neighbourhood, I consider this to be absolutely unacceptable.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Gabriel Metayer	<p>We do not want access through Linkside Avenue or Lakeside from this development. This is a quiet street. It would completely change the environment of the street if this access were granted. There is no need as there is a plan for access through the Banbury road.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	

Sandy Monteith	<p>My family and I are strongly opposed to any form of connect through from the golf course to Linkside / Lakeside. There is enough movement of traffic and people from the existing residents. The new development would I am sure be likewise keen to have their own community, without cut-through movements from our location. The plan mentions only pedestrians and cyclists as a possibility but we have all heard of 'mission creep'. If vehicle traffic were to be proposed and allowed, you would simply and voluntarily be creating a 'rat-run' route that would destroy the calm and character of both existing residents of Linkside / Lakeside and the new proposed development. Building in this problem would be a travesty to cancel out the 'calm and peaceful' idyl that you describe in your development plan.</p>	<p>No connections are proposed to Linkside Avenue. The Development Brief shows the allotments to be provided at the south-western corner of the site adjacent to Linkside Avenue.</p>	None	
Igor Dyson	<p>Unconditionally objects to the ambition to grow Oxon's population at the proposed scale, by building more homes on existing Green Belt. -Some proposals to improve some aspects of existing, transport &amp; green infrastructure, are indeed most welcome; including sustainable transport for the existing population, planting more trees &amp; hedges, &amp; establishing corridors for wildlife. However, such improvements shouldn't be pretexts to delete more of our open countryside. By now, it's become clear that Oxford City wishes to de facto annexe this area of Cherwell District, to grow Oxford City's economy at a scale which will further hurt Oxon's rural character.</p>	<p>This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.</p>	None	
Igor Dyson	<p>The brief mentions developing a high-quality gateway to Oxford. Actually here, the existing character's already extraordinarily special, namely, the view east to Cherwell Valley &amp; beyond to Otmoor Reserve. This is iconic, open countryside, &amp; should be cherished as the envy &amp; equal of any historic vista elsewhere.</p>	<p>This relates to the principle of development, which has been established through the adoption of LPPR.</p>	None	