Public Document Pack

Cherwell
DISTRICT COUNCIL
NORTH OXFORDSHIRE

URGENT BUSINESS AND SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Council

20 October 2014

Agenda Item Number	Page	Title	Officer Responsible	Reason Not Included with Original Agenda
11.	(Pages 1 - 174)	Approval of Main Modifications of Cherwell Local Plan – Further Supplementary Information	Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy	Documents still in preparation at date of agenda despatch

If you need any further information about the meeting please contact Natasha Clark, Democratic and Elections natasha.clark@cherwellandsouthnorthants.gov.uk, 01295 221589

This page is intentionally left blank

Cherwell District Council

Proposed Main Modifications to the (Submission) Local Plan (Part 1)

Schedule of Issues and Further Proposed Modifications October 2014

Further Proposed Modifications (October 2014):

Modified text - Deleted text shown as ~~struck through~~

Additional text shown underlined

<table>
<tr><th>Mod No.</th><th>Page No.</th><th>Policy Paragraph</th><th>Summary of Issues Raised in Representations</th><th>Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)</th><th>Reason for Further Proposed Modification</th></tr>
<tr><td>1</td><td>-</td><td>Contents Page: Policies and Tables</td><td>The original term Green Buffer better reflects the will to prevent the coalescence of settlements than the proposed amendment to urban–rural fringe term.

Support additional employment allocations given the significant increase in housing proposed.

Loss of greenfield land is an inevitable consequence of providing land for development given the lack of brownfield alternatives</td><td>No further modification recommended.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>Page 2</td><td>Executive Summary p.viii</td><td>Table 1</td><td>Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.

Support for additional employment allocation on land east of junction 11 of the M40

Increased allocation of employment land at North East Bicester has not been justified. Due regard has not been given to the potential to allocate a proportion of the additional employment land to the former RAF Bicester. The Technical Site and Flying Field should be allocated as a strategic employment site which is suitable for meeting some of the increased demand for B1 and B8 purposes that has been identified for this area of Bicester

The modification is considered to be inconsistent with the economic aspirations of the local plan and cannot be considered to be</td><td>Strategic Employment Sites<table><tr><th>Site</th><th>Employment Area (gross) (ha)</th><th>Policy no.</th><th>Section</th></tr><tr><td>Bicester</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>North West Bicester Eco-Town</td><td>10</td><td>Bicester 1</td><td>C.2 'Bicester'</td></tr><tr><td>Graven Hill</td><td>26</td><td>Bicester 2</td><td>C.2 'Bicester'</td></tr><tr><td>Bicester Business Park</td><td>29.5</td><td>Bicester 4</td><td>C.2 'Bicester'</td></tr><tr><td>Bicester Gateway</td><td>18</td><td>Bicester 10</td><td>C.2 'Bicester'</td></tr><tr><td>Land at North East Bicester</td><td>15</td><td>Bicester 11</td><td>C.2 'Bicester'</td></tr><tr><td>South East Bicester</td><td>40</td><td>Bicester 12</td><td>C.2 'Bicester'</td></tr><tr><td>Banbury</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table></td><td></td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Mod No.</th><th>Page No.</th><th>Policy Paragraph</th><th>Summary of Issues Raised in Representations</th><th>Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)</th><th>Reason for Further Proposed Modification</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>positively prepared without further consideration of the opportunities to provide additional employment land at the Former RAF Upper Heyford site</td><td><table>
<tr><td>Land West of M40</td><td>~~42~~ 35</td><td>Banbury 6</td><td>C.3 'Banbury'</td></tr>
<tr><td>Land north east of junction 11</td><td>49</td><td>Banbury 15</td><td>C.3 ‘Banbury’</td></tr>
<tr><td colspan="4">Rural Areas</td></tr>
<tr><td>Former RAF Upper Heyford</td><td>approx 120,000 sq.metres</td><td>Villages 5</td><td>C.5 'Our Villages and Rural Areas'</td></tr>
</table></td><td>Correction</td></tr>
<tr><td>3</td><td>Executive Summary, p. ix & p. x</td><td>Building Sustainable Communities</td><td>Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.

The SA should have considered the potential for development in the Green Belt.

The Local Plan does not meet Oxford’s needs.

Questions the need to increase delivery of housing in Banbury to 7319 homes

The 2014 SHMA has not been subject to scrutiny and consultation. Its findings have already been called into question by CPRE, who consider that it is based on a deeply flawed methodology. The Plan should revert to the growth rate proposed in the submitted Plan.

All Modifications relating to the 2014 SHMA should be deleted

Proposals to identify and allocate Former RAF Upper Heyford and adjoining land as a strategic site for a new settlement in the rural</td><td>No further modification recommended.</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			areas are welcomed. General support for meeting the objectively assessed needs of the District & for continuing with existing distribution strategy. The evidence from the SHMA on Oxford's housing needs has not been taken forward. It is expected that the Council will need to accommodate some of Oxford's unmet housing needs. New sites must be found, such as land at Bicester, Deddington and Bloxham. Reference should be included in the Executive Summary for a review in order to meet Oxford's needs. The proposed distribution of housing does not take into account the reasonable alternative of new housing development in the Green Belt, other than a limited potential review around Kidlington. Support for the principle of the increase in new homes at North West Bicester from 5,000 – 6,000. But the upper limit is arbitrary and the site is capable of delivering a greater number of homes. There should be no restriction on the amount of housing that can come forward during the Local Plan period at NW Bicester. The delivery of homes at North West Bicester Eco Town (Bicester 1) should be the subject of a Phasing and Implementation Brief.		

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
4	Executive Summary p. x	Table 3	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.	No further modification recommended.	
5	Executive Summary, p. x	Banbury and Bicester	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.	No further modification recommended.	
6	Executive Summary p. x, p.xi	Table 4	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites. Concerns from Stagecoach about the provision of bus services.	No further modification recommended.	
7	Executive Summary p. xi	The Villages and Rural Areas	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.	No further modification recommended.	
8	Executive Summary p. xi	The Villages and Rural Areas	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.	No further modification recommended.	
9	Executive Summary p. xi	The Villages and Rural Areas	Views on the categorisation of some villages Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.	Policy Villages 1 identifies the most sustainable villages (Category A) and their 'satellite' villages (Category B) ~~in the District~~ where minor development within built-up limits will, in principle, be supported (typically sites of less than 10 dwellings). Development within less sustainable villages (Category C) ~~It distinguishes these villages from those (in Category B) where development~~ will be restricted to infilling and conversions. The Housing Trajectory in Section E provides of small site 'windfall' allowance for such proposals. Policy Villages 2 provides for a further 750 homes to be provided at the most sustainable Category A villages. This will principally involve the identification of sites of 10 or more dwellings within or outside the built-up limits of those villages. This is in addition to sites already approved across the rural areas as shown in the Housing Trajectory. Sites will be identified in a Local Plan	Correction and clarification

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				Part 2, through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans and through the determination of applications for planning permission. The policy is supported by the latest Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).	
10	Executive Summary p. xi	Table 5	Views on the categorisation of some villages Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.	No further modification recommended.	
11	15	Introduction to the Local Plan 1.3	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites. Transport and Infrastructure will require further consideration.	No further modification recommended.	
12	17	Introduction to the Local Plan: The Planning Context for the Local Plan 1.22a	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites. The Local Plan does not meet Oxford's needs	No further modification recommended.	
13	17	Introduction to the Local Plan: The Planning Context for the Local Plan	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites. The Local Plan does not meet Oxford's needs	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		1.23			
14	17	Introduction to the Local Plan: The Structure of the Local Plan 1.23a	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites. The Local Plan does not meet Oxford's needs.	No further modification recommended.	
15	21	Introduction to the Local Plan: Duty to Cooperate New para 1.49dd	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites. The Local Plan does not meet Oxford's needs	No further modification recommended.	
16	26	Strategy for Development in Cherwell: The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District A.11 – Bullet point 2	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.	No further modification recommended.	
17	27	Strategy for Development in Cherwell: The Spatial Strategy for Cherwell District A.11- Bullet point 5	Varying views about the level and location of development proposed across the District and the allocation of sites.	No further modification recommended.	
18	36	Policies for Development in	The former Hella site in Banbury is suitable for housing development.	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Introduction B.26	There is too much employment land allocated to Banbury and Bicester. Lack of a considered approach that aligns with the SHMA 2014 / Cambridge Econometrics and the Oxfordshire Innovation Engine. The employment land allocated will not be delivered based on past rates of delivery. Varying views about the amount of employment land that should be allocated		
	38	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 1 B.41	Allocate smaller sites in the rural areas. Employment land should be allocated at Shipton on Cherwell. The Technical Site and Flying Field at Bicester Airfield should be allocated as a strategic employment site. The allocation of land at south east Bicester is supported. The allocation of employment land and Policy SLE1 are proactive and progressive and supported. The allocation of more employment land at Banbury is supported and needed considering the increase in housing. Development of land at Junction 11 of the M40 at Banbury is sustainable and supported.	…The sites identified in the Employment Trajectory in the Local Plan cover 2365 hectares (gross)…	Correction

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Varying views about the amount of employment land that should be allocated		
20	39	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 1 B.46	Policy SLE 1 should direct more employment to the rural area and allow for the potential allocation of new rural employment sites in the Local Plan. Land should be allocated at Junction 9 and 10 of the M40 for employment to cater for logistics. Varying views about the amount of employment land that should be allocated	No further modification recommended	
21	39	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 1 Policy SLE 1: Employment Development	B8 use class development should be restricted due to impact and lack of job creation. Support for the more permissive approach to employment in the rural areas. Supports the criteria which allows for the re-development of existing sites in the rural area. More employment development at Banbury and Bicester would conflict with the approach in the SHMA which shows growth around Oxford. Omission of site at Waterworks Lane & Charbridge Lane Support for urban focus but concerns from Stagecoach about bus services Proposal for employment land near junction 10 of M40 Varying views about the amount of employment land that should be allocated	…~~*Rural Areas*~~ Unless exceptional circumstances are demonstrated, employment development in the rural areas should be located within or on the edge of those villages in Category A (see Policy ~~V~~Villages 1)…	Clarification

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
22	41	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 2 B.55	Welcome deletion of reference to Bicester Village Outlet Shopping Centre ("BV") and subsequent recognition that BV performs a different role to the other centres listed in paragraph B.55.	No further modification recommended.	
23	41	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 2 New para B.55a	The need to restrict development at Bicester Village in order to protect the town centre.	In addition to the more traditional retail parks, food stores and local centres, Bicester Village Outlet centre shopping centre is recognised as providing a specialist role which complements the town centre. As the District's most visited tourist destination, Bicester Village serves both national and international catchments and makes a significant contribution to the local economy. The Council supports the expansion of Bicester ~~v~~Village to complement, and help improve connectivity with, the existing town centre.	Clarification in response to representaions.
24	42	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 2 Policy SLE 2: Securing Dynamic Town Centres	No representation received	…The Council will require an impact assessment if the proposal is over 2000 sq. metres (gross) in Banbury, 1500sq metres (gross) in Bicester and 350 sq. metres (gross) elsewhere. Evidence in the Council's Retail Study will also be considered in determining applications if information is not provided by the applicant which is considered to supersede this evidence. Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16.	Clarification

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
25	44	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 4 New paragraph B.68a	Developer contributions should be used for a south east link road at Banbury. Potential need for a link road Policy SLE4 should cater for Upper Heyford as well as Banbury Bicester in terms of providing for developer contributions. Minor Policy wording changes suggested.	New development in the District ~~at Banbury/Bicester~~ will be required to provide financial and/or in-kind contributions to mitigate the transport impacts of development. This will support delivery of the infrastructure and services needed to facilitate travel by sustainable modes ~~in and around the town~~ whilst also enabling improvements to be made to the local and strategic road and rail networks. "….. This will include the South West Bicester Perimeter Road (Vendee Drive, already completed) and new strategic highway improvements including ~~, potentially , on peripheral routes in Bicester,~~ a possible new relief road to the south east and east of Bicester, ~~improvements to Windsor Street in Banbury~~ , works to the A34 south from Bicester, and improvements to Motorway Junctions 9 and 10 of~~n~~ the M40 of which Junction 9 is programmed for early delivery. There will also be improvements to the Windsor Street/Upper Cherwell Street Corridor in Banbury, to Hennef Way junctions, and to the Bridge Street/Cherwell Street junction in Banbury. The potential for a link road on the eastern side of the M40, to mitigate the impact of traffic on the approach to Junction 11 along Hennef Way, will be explored with the County Council and Highways Agency. These improvements will collectively enable additional development capacity to be provided within the two towns…. "	Clarifications and in response to on-going liaison with, and representation from, Oxfordshire County Council
26	45	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 4	No representation received	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		B.72			
27	46	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 4 SLE 4: Improved Transport Connections	There should be more emphasis on walking and cycling links. Revised wording suggested. Developer contributions required fro transport schemes	…We will support key transport proposals including: • Transport Improvements at Banbury and Bicester in accordance with the County Council's Local Transport Plan and Movement ~~Studies~~ Strategies.	Clarification in response to representation from Oxfordshire County Council
28	49	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 1 B.89a	Level of growth is unrealistic. Will adversely affect the community, environment and countryside. The housing need is overstated and the SHMA is flawed and has not been independently reviewed. The economic growth levels are unrealistic. Lower figures should be reinstated. Infrastructure, services and facilities will struggle to cope. Some support for the housing figures and strategy and for more housing development in the rural areas. Some calls for higher housing figures to meet wider Oxfordshire needs particularly those of	The Council is committed to meeting housing needs and accelerating delivery. Cherwell's housing needs are identified in the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) 2014. The SHMA identifies a need for 1,140 dwellings per annum equating to 22,800 dwellings from 2011 to 2031. The SHMA analysis includes an assessment of housing need based on demographic trends having regard to past shortfalls in housing delivery to 2011, consideration of 'committed economic growth', modelling of the level of housing provision that might be required to meet affordable need in full and wider evidence of market signals. The SHMA states (para' 9.58), "*For Cherwell District the evidence indicates a need for 1,142 dwellings per annum (2011-2031) to support the Strategic Economic Plan. This is based on supporting Committed Economic Growth...*"	Point of emphasis in response to the representation from Oxford City Council.

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Oxford City. Detailed objection from Oxford City with detailed plan changes suggested without prejudice to its position. Includes comments on Duty to Cooperate, plan review, City Deal, the Oxfordshire Growth Board and the Oxon Strategic Economic Plan.		
29	49	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 1 B.89b	The Plan should seek to meet Oxford's needs / concern that Oxford's SHMA needs have not been taken into account A review of the Local Plan should not be put off. Some concern that two years for a review is too long Needs to be a strategic Green Belt review. More precise timescale for the review of the Local Plan / Green Belt review is needed. Support for the proposed increase in housing numbers as representing the objectively assessed need Opposition /support expressed for a Green Belt review around Kidlington to accommodate local housing provision. Concern that Oxford's housing needs (SHMA) have not been taken into account CDC has failed the Duty To Cooperate with regard to Oxford's needs. Commitments to joint working should be strengthened.	Cherwell District Council will continue to work under the 'Duty to Co-operate' with all other Oxfordshire Local Authorities on an on-going basis to address the objectively assessed need for housing across the Oxfordshire housing market area and to meet joint commitments such as the Oxford and Oxfordshire City Deal (2014). As a first step Cherwell District Council has sought to accommodate the housing need for Cherwell District in full in the Cherwell Local Plan. Cherwell District Council recognises that there is a possibility that Oxford may not be able to accommodate the whole of its new housing requirement for the 2011-2031 period within its administrative boundary. The urban capacity of Oxford is as yet unknown and untested but is the subject of on-going work. Cherwell District Council will continue to work jointly and proactively with the Oxfordshire local authorities and through the Oxfordshire Growth Board to assess all reasonable spatial options, including the release of brownfield land, the potential for a new settlement and a full strategic review of the whole of the Oxford Green Belt. These issues are not for Cherwell to consider in isolation. These options will need to be undertaken in accordance with national policy, national guidance, the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) regulations, and the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) to establish how and where any unmet need might best be accommodated within the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area. This jJoint work will need to comprehensively consider how spatial options could be supported by necessary infrastructure to ensure an integrated	Point of emphasis and clarification in response to the representation from Oxford City Council.

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Oxford City suggests detailed additions to the Plan text notwithstanding its overall objections. It also proposes new policies. The housing target in Policy BSC1 will require a substantial increase in the rate of housing delivery potentially requiring a reviewed strategy including consideration of the Green Belt The Oxford and Oxfordshire City Deal commits CDC to the acceleration of housing delivery. The County Council suggests that that the process for meeting unmet housing need requires the production of a comprehensive, integrated approach to planning for housing, employment and infrastructure. A partial or full review of the Plan may be needed to meet additional need for Oxford.	approach to the delivery of housing, jobs and services. ~~clearly take time to complete its various stages with f~~Full public consultation will be central to a 'sound' process and outcome. If this joint work reveals that Cherwell and other Districts need to meet additional need for Oxford, this will trigger a partial review of the Local Plan, to be completed within two years from the adoption of this Local Plan and taking the form of the preparation of a separate Development Plan document for that part of the unmet need to be accommodated in the Cherwell District. The Council will engage in joint working on supporting technical work such as countywide Sustainability Appraisal as required to support the identification of a sustainable approach to meeting agreed, unmet needs.	
30	49	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 1 B.90	Detailed wording changes reflecting the NPPF. The SHMA 2014 is deeply flawed and unjustified Reference to protecting the Green Belt is inconsistent with proposals to review the Green Belt Green Belt review at Kidlington should not be separated from the needs of the Housing Market Area. References to local Green Belt reviews should be replaced with a timetable for a strategic review	The Council is committed to meeting the district's objectively assessed needs and, as described above, to working with partner authorities (including the Oxfordshire Growth Board) to determine how any other unmet needs arising from the SHMA can be sustainably accommodated within the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area. The housing strategy of this Local Plan seeks to deliver growth in accordance with the NPPF's Core Planning Principles including: - providing a positive vision for the future of Cherwell: a strategic growth and investment approach to the towns; an enlarged settlement in the centre of the District, further development at the villages to sustain them - proactively driving and supporting sustainable economic	Point of emphasis in response to the representation from Oxford City Council.

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			The Duty To Cooperate has not been complied with, Changes needed to reflect cross-boundary working through the Oxfordshire Growth Board	development by meeting the SHMA's Committed Economic Growth scenario - seeking to secure high quality design and a good standard of amenity by developing new neighbourhoods and achieving regeneration and redevelopment of key sites - taking account of the different roles and character of Cherwell's places by promoting the vitality of Bicester, Banbury and Kidlington and their ability to serve their hinterlands, protecting the Oxford Green Belt and concentrating development in sustainable rural locations to protect the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside and to support thriving rural communities - encouraging the effective re-use of existing land and buildings and bring forward sites that contain land of lesser environmental value such as at Graven Hill (Bicester 2), Canalside (Banbury 1), Bolton Road (Banbury 8), Higham Way (Banbury 19) and at Former RAF Upper Heyford (Villages 5) - promoting strategic, mixed use developments, ~~while seeking to~~ conserving~~e~~ heritage assets in a manner appropriate to their significance such as those of national importance at Former RAF Upper Heyford, ~~while~~ actively encouraging wildlife potential such as at ~~-~~South East Bicester (Bicester 12) and Gavray Drive (Bicester 13), and making the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling and supporting community well-being such as at the North West Bicester Eco-Town (Bicester 1).	In response to representations
31	50	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy	General support for the strategy. More referencing of Parishes preparing Neighbourhood Plans	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		BSC 1 B.91			
32	50	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 1 B.92	Request for review of Parish & ward boundaries Reinstatement of text regarding Green Buffers Delay in the provision of development capacity and the need for an additional strategic site at Shipton-on-Cherwell Additional strategic sites are required within Banbury to meet the objectively assessed housing need. General support for the strategy.	No further modification recommended.	
33	50	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 1 B.94	General support for the strategy.	No further modification recommended.	
34	50	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 1 Policy BSC1: District Wide Housing Distribution	The increase in the housing requirement is in line with the objectively assessed need. Lower housing requirements should be reinstated. The SHMA is flawed / has been extensively criticised / is not consistent with national policy.. The need has been grossly overstated. There has been no independent review of the SHMA.	No further modification recommended	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			SHMA makes dubious adjustments to official statistics. The assessment is based on forecasts in the SEP which are aspirational and promoted. LEP economic growth forecasts need to be tested. The new introductory text titled 'Duty to Cooperate' provides no meaningful commitment to an early Plan review to address the wider objectively assessed housing needs of the housing market area. The District will not be able to cope with this level of growth. There will be negative impacts on people's lives, the environment, countryside and infrastructure. The increase in housing would have an adverse impact on ecology and the environment, especially at Banbury & Bicester The higher figures will mean that the 5 year supply cannot be met. Developers will be able to pick any site to develop. Concern about market saturation. A flexible approach to delivery is required. There are already flooding issues. The reliance on non-strategic sites to be delivered through the Local Plan Part 2, Neighbourhood Planning and planning applications does not give certainty nor		

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			necessarily direct it to the most sustainable locations. How will homes be apportioned? Support increase in housing provision generally and early review of local plan. But Kidlington and the rural areas will only accommodate 17% of the housing growth (19% in the submitted plan). Small scale development should be facilitated at the villages to meet local need. 2170 dwellings are required in the rural areas. Concern that rural requirements beyond Former RAF Upper Heyford need to be higher. Market signals need to be reflected. The household projections in the SHMA are a wholesale replacement rather than an adjustment to the official base. At 2.7 times the official government projections, the SHMA numbers are not a reasonable adjustment to official figures. The Local Plan process has been pre-empted. Bicester should not be targeted Needs to be a strategic review of the Green Belt The increase in housing will damage the Green Belt at Kidlington Delay adoption of the plan until greater certainty exists as to how housing needs across the market area are to be addressed.		

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Further sites also needed at Broughton Road, Banbury. Proposed changes seem rushed and fail to give proper regard to cross-boundary issues. Likely to result in under delivery and will increase the affordability gap. The Plan does not reflect the urgent need to boost housing and help meet unmet needs. There are more sites than needed. Developers will 'cherry pick' Detailed wording provided by Oxford City, committing to an early review of the Plan.		
35	51	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 2 B.98	Support for development brownfield sites, Additional development could be delivered at Former RAF Upper Heyford	No further modification recommended	
36	51	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 2 B.99	Support for density of at least 30 dwelling per hectare The proposed density is too high	No further modification recommended	
37	51	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy	Wording needs to be changed to reflect the NPPF	In considering development on smaller sites, the effective use of previously developed land within urban areas, and within those villages identified by the Local Plan as being suitable places for additional residential development (Policy Villages 1), will particularly be encouraged provided that it is not of	In response to representation

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		BSC 2 B.100		high environmental value~~should generally be considered over greenfield sites~~.	
38	51	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 2 Policy BSC2: The Effective and Efficient Use of Land – Brownfield Land and Housing Density	Support for encouraging the re-use of previously developed land Land promoted at Islip	No further modification recommended	
	51	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 3 B.102	The SHMA is flawed. Should revert to lower rate of growth. All SHMA related modifications should be deleted References to the former SHMA should be deleted.	No further modification recommended	
40	54	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 4 B.119	Support for the affordable housing targets as stated in the SHMA 2014	No further modification recommended	
41	54	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable	Policy on mix applauded but should apply to existing stock. Attrition of small-medium sized family homes should be discouraged.	No further modification recommended	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		communities: Policy BSC 4 B.120			
42	54	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 4 B.121	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended	
43	54	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 4 B.122	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended	
44	54	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 4 B.124	Support from the County Council on the importance of increasing the supply of specialist housing for older people and people with disabilities	No further modification recommended	
45	55	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 4 Policy BSC 4: Housing Mix	Need assurance that health facilities will be provided The SHMA is flawed. Should revert to lower rate of growth. All SHMA related modifications should be deleted. Needs confirmation that a flexible approach will be taken to housing mix in the context of market signals	No further modification recommended	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			The policy could also refer to a positive approach towards key worker housing in relation to employment development		
46	57	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 6 Policy BSC 6: Travelling Communities	The reasons / criteria for the categorisation of 'A' and 'B' villages are unclear The sequential test for travelling distances should be removed	No further modification recommended	
47	57/58	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 7 B.142	Objection to no school provision at Canalside New development will increase pressure on existing schools and infrastructure Need to ensure that sufficient capacity will be provided County Council advice that there will need to be significant expansion of secondary school capacity at Banbury, that options are still being explored but that a new establishment is likely to be needed. Recognition of the secondary school need at Banbury is supported. A Statement of Common Ground is offered. County Council advice on further Primary School provision County Council advice on site provision	No further modification recommended	
48	60	Theme Two: Policies for Building	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 9 Para B.157			
49	60	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 9 Policy BSC 9: Public Services and Utilities	This modification reflects the emerging joint working across all districts to proactively plan for Superfast Broadband connections.	No further modification recommended	
50	65-66	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities : Policy BSC 12 B.170	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended.	
51	68	Theme Two: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development Introduction B.175	Strategic sites will lead to coalescence with surrounding villages. The modification is not positive and makes it difficult to identify where the line is between the urban rural fringe and green buffer leaving it open to challenge.	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Green buffers are an unnecessary layer of constraint and should be deleted. Green buffers on the edge of Bicester are unjustified.		
52	70	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development Policy ESD 2	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended.	
53	70	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 2 B.185	The requirement for an energy statement should be deleted and Policy ESD2 amended to apply only to non-residential development as a result of the Housing Standards Review.	No further modification recommended.	
54	70	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 2 B.185a	Clarification sought that the reference to "additional guidance required" has taken into account previous representations that allowable solutions would be considered under building regulations.	No further modification recommended.	
55	70	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development Policy ESD 2	Support for the modification as it reflects changes to national policy.	No further modification recommended other than typographical correction: **Energy Hierarchy and Allowable Solutions** In seeking to achieve carbon emissions reductions, we will promote an 'energy hierarchy' as follows: • Reducing energy use, in particular by the use of sustainable design and	Typographical correction

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		ESD 2: Energy Hierarchy		construction measures; • Supplying energy efficiently and giving priority to decentralised energy supply; • Making use of renewable energy; • Making use of allowable solutions	
56	71	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 3 B.189	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended.	
57	71-72	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development Policy ESD 3 ESD 3: Sustainable Construction	Support for the modification as it reflects changes to national policy Nationally described standards are the appropriate way forward. Departure from national standards should only be aspirational and on the basis of a full understanding of costs and technical matters. This is not contained in the evidence base. No justification for strategic site allocations to support enhanced standards and costs of development. Revised policy wording is suggested. The policy should not replicate emerging legislation and should be deleted.	No further modification recommended.	
58	73	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring	There should be no general expectation of a feasibility assessment for all strategic	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Sustainable Development Policy ESD 4 ESD 4: Decentralised Energy Systems	developments. Significant delay and costs to new housing development will be caused. The reduction in threshold with no explanation highlights the lack of evidence to support an onerous requirement. District heating/ Combined Heat and Power is unfeasible for any low density led development. Inconsistent with national policy The policy should be deleted. The criteria for the policy should use heat mapping densities so that opportunities are not missed for decentralised energy, or abortive work carried out where it would be unviable. Presume this would include the potential for connection to the Ardley ERF for development in the Bicester/Upper Heyford area.		
59	74	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development Policy ESD 5 ESD 5: Renewable Energy	There should be no general expectation of a feasibility assessment for all strategic developments. Significant delay and costs to new housing development will be caused. The reduction in threshold with no explanation highlights the lack of evidence to support an onerous requirement.	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Inconsistent with national policy The policy should be deleted. The criteria for the policy should use heat mapping densities so that opportunities are not missed for decentralised energy, or abortive work carried out where it would be unviable.		
60	80	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 9 New Para B.224a	Concern that if Oxford cannot accommodate its needs there will be pressure for more housing at Banbury. The plan should meet Oxford's unmet need; joint working should take place now. Joint working on a high level assessment to determine broad spatial options is not likely to need all stages of HRA. The paragraph pre-empts joint working and should be deleted.	No further modification recommended.	
61	88	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 14 B.256	A Green Belt review is necessary now to meet both Cherwell and Oxford's needs. There are no special circumstances to justify small scale local review. The review should include Green belt boundaries passing through villages. Further housing will support potential employment development. Moderate scale/ strategic review of the Green Belt is needed.	Government policy indicates that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. The Local Plan's housing requirements and development strategy can be achieved without the need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in the district. In terms of local housing need, small scale affordable housing schemes to meet specifically identified local housing need may be met through the release of rural exception sites as part of the development control process, in accordance with Policy Villages 3. Kidlington's local housing needs are being examined in more detail through the preparation of a Kidlington Framework Masterplan which will provide evidence for Local Plan Part 2 and, potentially, a Neighbourhood Plan. Initial findings from this work and the updated SHLAA suggest a small scale Green Belt review of the boundaries around the village may be required as part of Local Plan Part 2, to accommodate Kidlington's local housing need, but in line with government guidance this would only be carried out in exceptional	Clarification in response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Green Belt review should only be concerned with Kidlington's housing needs, and all options for meeting its needs should be assessed. Such a review should form part of this draft plan. Stratfield Farm, Kidlington is available for development and deliverable. Oxford's unmet housing need should be addressed in this plan and joint working undertaken now. The text should set out a timetable for strategic joint review of the Green Belt should this be necessary to meet SHMA needs. Wording suggested.	circumstances. A recent Employment Land Review (2012) identified a need for additional employment land in the Kidlington area. It is not anticipated that this land can be accommodated on sites outside of the Green Belt. A specific need has also been identified for the Science Park at Begbroke. Therefore, exceptional circumstances are considered to exist to a small scale local review of the Green Belt to meet employment needs (see Policy Kidlington 1: Accommodating High Value Employment Needs.	
62	89	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 14 ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt	Objection to small scale Green Belt review and deletion of the modification. Green Belt review around Kidlington will be detrimental to the community and environment. Infrastructure and services will not cope. How will new housing be limited to local needs, it is more likely to meet inflated SHMA needs. Modification is contrary to government advice which indicates unmet need is not a reason for development in the Green Belt.	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			There is no quantification of local need. This needs to be undertaken before developments go ahead. There are no special circumstances to justify small scale local review. Change is unjustified as the Kidlington Masterplan is unpublished and has had no public consultation. Moderate scale review of the Green Belt is needed, to support economic growth and the achievement of sustainable development. Review of the boundary around Begbroke Science Park is supported. Stratfield Farm, Kidlington is available for development and deliverable. Oxford's unmet housing need should be addressed in this plan and joint working undertaken now. The text should set out a timetable for strategic joint review of the Green Belt should this be necessary to meet SHMA needs. Wording suggested. Concern at the prospect of Oxford's needs being met in the Green Belt.		

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
63	90	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 15 B.260	Land south of Salt Way should be retained in the green buffer. Green buffers should be provided between Bloxham, Milton and Adderbury villages, Bloxham and Milcombe, Bloxham and the Barfords, Bloxham and Tadmarton. The policy is unnecessary repetition of ESD13 and ESD 16 and should be deleted. The policy is not justified by the evidence base and is inconsistent with the modifications with development proposed within integral parts of the green buffer.	No further modification recommended.	
64	90	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 15 Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth	The term “urban-rural fringe” is inappropriate use of English to hide the buffer zone reduction. The buffer zone between Banbury and Twyford will no longer avoid coalescence. The policy is unnecessary repetition of ESD13 and ESD 16 and should be deleted. The policy is not justified by the evidence base and is inconsistent with the modifications with development proposed within integral parts of the green buffer. Cotefield Business Park should be removed from the green buffer.	No further modification recommended.	
65	90	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring	The policy unnecessarily restrains development in conflict with a positively	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 15 Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth	prepared approach to policy making. Green buffers on the edge of Bicester are not justified. The policy is unnecessary repetition of ESD13 and ESD 16 and should be deleted. The policy is not justified by the evidence base and is inconsistent with the modifications, with development proposed within integral parts of the green buffer. Green buffers are inconsistent with the NPPF, and will apply an unnecessary and arbitrary restriction which could hinder delivery of housing in Category A villages. The policy is not positively prepared or justified and should be deleted.		
66	105	Bicester: Bicester in 2031 C.26	The SHMA has a flawed methodology.	No further modification recommended.	
67	106	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 1 – North West Bicester Eco-Town C.33	Varying views about the rate of delivery at North West Bicester envisaged in the Local Plan. Support and objection to an increase in numbers at North West Bicester.	No further modification recommended.	
68	107	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 1 – North	Varying views about the type of B-use classes on the site. Employment should not be provided elsewhere	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		West Bicester Eco-Town C.35	in the town only the site. The number of jobs at north west Bicester should match the number of homes.		
69	108	Bicester: Strategic Development: Employment C.41	The number of jobs at north west Bicester should match the number of homes. The mix of B use classes is not deliverable.	No further modification recommended.	
70	108	Bicester: Employment C.42	The number of jobs at north west Bicester should match the number of homes.	No further modification recommended.	
71	108-109	Bicester: Policy Bicester 1 North West Bicester Eco-Town	The number of jobs at north west Bicester should match the number of homes. Allow for code level 4 homes and the current national definition of zero carbon. Need for burial ground not proven. Policy wording changes suggested.	**Policy Bicester 1** **NW Bicester Eco-Town** **Development Area:** 390 hectares **Development Description**: A new zero carbon (as defined in the Eco-towns Supplement to PPS1) mixed use development including 6,000 homes will be developed on land identified at North West Bicester. Planning permission will only be granted for development at North West Bicester in accordance with ~~following approval by Cherwell District Council of~~ a comprehensive masterplan for the whole area to be approved by the Council as part of a ~~set out in the emerging~~ North West Bicester ~~Masterplan~~ Supplementary Planning Document. The ~~Cherwell District~~ Council will expect the masterplan and ~~outline~~applications for planning permission ~~application and accompanying masterplan~~ to meet the following requirements:	Clarification and improved policy wording In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 33				**Employment** • Land Area – a minimum of 10 ha, comprising business premises focused at Howes Lane and Middleton Stoney Road, employment space in the local centre hubs and as part of mixed used development. • Jobs created – At least 3,000 jobs (approx. 1000 jobs on B use class land on the site) within the plan period. • Use classes – B1, with limited B2 and B8 uses • It is anticipated that the business park at the South East corner of the allocation will generate between 700 and 1000 jobs in use classes B1, B2 and B8 early in the Plan period. • A Carbon Management Plan shall be produced to support all applications for employment developments. • An economic strategy to be produced to support the planning applications for eco-town proposals demonstrating how access to work will be achieved and to deliver a minimum of one employment opportunity per new dwelling that is easily reached by walking, cycling and/or public transport • Mixed use local centre hubs to include employment (B1(a), A1, A2, A3, A4, A5, C1, D1 and D2 • New non-residential buildings will be BREEAM Very Good with the capability of achieving BREEAM Excellent. **Housing**	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 34				• Number of homes – Up to 6,000 (3,293 to be delivered within the plan period) • Affordable Housing – 30% • Layout to achieve Building for Life 12 and Lifetime Homes standards • Homes to be constructed to be capable of achieving a minimum of Level 5 of the Code for Sustainable Homes on completion of each phase of development including being equipped to meet the water consumption requirement of Code Level 5 • The provision of extra care housing • Have real time energy monitoring systems, real time public transport information and Superfast Broadband access, including next generation broadband where possible. Consideration should also be given to digital access to support assisted living and smart energy management systems. **Infrastructure Needs** • Education – Sufficient secondary, primary and nursery school provision on site to meet projected needs. It is expected that four 2 Forms of Entry primary schools and one secondary school will be required. There should be a maximum walking distance of 800 metres from homes to the nearest primary school. • Health – to provide for a 7 GP surgery to the south of the site and a dental surgery. • Burial Ground – to provide a site of a minimum of 4 ha for a burial ground which does not pose risks to water quality (this may contribute to the Green Infrastructure requirements) • Green infrastructure – 40% of the total gross site area will comprise green space of which at least half will be publicly accessible and consist of a network of well managed, high quality green/open spaces which are linked to the open countryside. This should include sports pitches, parks and recreation areas, play spaces, allotments,	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				the required burial ground (possibly a woodland cemetery) and SUDS. • Planning applications shall include a range of types of green space and meet the requirements of Policy BSC11. • Access and Movement – proposals to include appropriate crossings of the railway line to provide access and integration across the NW Bicester site. Changes and improvements to Howes Lane and Lords Lane to facilitate integration of new development with the town. • Community facilities – to include facilities for leisure, health, social care, education, retail, arts, culture, library services, indoor and outdoor sport, play and voluntary services. The local centre hubs shall provide for a mix of uses that will include retail, employment, community and residential provision. Education, health care, community and indoor sports facilities will be encouraged to locate in local centres and opportunities for co location will be welcomed. Provision will be proportionate to the size of the community they serve. Each neighbourhood of approximately 1000 houses to include provision for community meeting space suitable for a range of community activities including provision for older people and young people. A site of 0.5 ha for a place of worship to be reserved for future use . • The submission of proposals to support the setting up and operation of a financially viable Local Management Organisation by the new community to allow locally based long term ownership and management of facilities in perpetuity. • Utilities – Utilities and infrastructure which allow for zero carbon and water neutrality on the site and the consideration of sourcing-waste heat from the Ardley Energy recovery ~~from Waste~~ facility. The approach shall be set out in an Energy Strategy and a Water Cycle Study. The Water Cycle Study shall cover water efficiency and demand management, water quality and how it will be protected and improved, WFD compliance, surface water management to avoid increasing flood risk and water services infrastructure improvement requirements and their delivery, having regard to the Environment	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				Agency's guidance on Water Cycle Studies. Zero Carbon (see PPS definition) water neutral development is sought. Development proposals will demonstrate how these requirements will be met. • Waste Infrastructure – The provision of facilities to reduce waste to include at least 1 bring site per 1000 population positioned in accessible locations. Provision for sustainable management of waste both during construction and in occupation shall be provided. A waste strategy with targets above national standards and which facilitates waste reduction shall accompany planning applications. **Monitoring** • Embodied impacts of construction to be monitored, managed and minimised (ET21) • Sustainability metrics, including those on zero carbon, transport, water and waste to be agreed and monitored for learning, good governance and dissemination (ET22). **Key site specific design and place shaping principles** • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16. • High quality exemplary development and design standards including zero carbon development, Code Level 5 for dwellings at a minimum and the use of low embodied carbon in construction materials, as well as promoting the use of locally sourced materials. • All new buildings designed to incorporate best practice on tackling overheating, taking account of the latest UKCIP climate predictions. • Proposals should enable residents to easily reduce their carbon footprint to a low level and live low carbon lifestyles. • Layout of development that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities. • A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods. • New footpaths and cycleways should be provided that link with	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				existing networks, the wider urban area and community facilities with a legible hierarchy of routes to encourage sustainable modes of travel • A layout which makes provision for and prioritises non-car modes and encourages a modal shift from car use to other forms of travel. • Infrastructure to support sustainable modes of transport will be required including enhancement of footpath and cyclepath connectivity with the town centre, employment and rail stations. Measures to ensure the integration of the development with the remainder of the town including measures to address movement across Howes Lane and Lords Lane • A well designed approach to the urban edge, which relates development at the periphery to its rural setting and affords good access to the countryside, minimising the impact of development when viewed from the surrounding countryside • Development that respects the landscape setting and that demonstrates enhancement, restoration or creation of wildlife corridors to achieve a net gain in biodiversity • Consideration should be given to maintaining visual separation with outlying settlements. Connections with the wider landscape should be reinforced and opportunities for recreational use of the open countryside identified. ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment. • Careful consideration of open space and structural planting around the site to achieve an overall improvement in the landscape and visual impact of the site • No development in areas of flood risk and development set back from watercourses which would provide opportunity for green buffers. Proposals should include a Flood Risk Assessment. • Maximisation of the sustainable transport connectivity in and around the site	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				• Consideration and mitigation of any noise impacts of the railway line. • Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for, including the provision of a bus route through the site with buses stopping at the railway stations and at new bus stops on the site • Contributions to improvements to the surrounding road networks, including mitigation measures for the local and strategic highway network, consistent with the requirement of the Eco-town PPS to reduce reliance on the private car, and to achieve a high level of accessibility to public transport services, improvements to facilities for pedestrians and cyclists and the provision and implementation of a Travel Plan to maximise connectivity with existing development • Provision of a Transport Assessment • Measures to prevent vehicular traffic adversely affecting surrounding communities. • Significant green infrastructure provision, including new footpaths and cycleways, enhancing green modal accessibility beyond the site to the town centre and Bicester Town Railway Station, and adjoining developments. Public open space to form a well connected network of green areas suitable for formal and informal recreation • Preservation and enhancement of habitats and species on site, particularly protected species and habitats and creation and management of new habitats to achieve an overall net gain in biodiversity including the creation of a local nature reserve and linkages with existing BAP habitats • Sensitive management of open space provision to secure recreation and health benefits alongside biodiversity gains~~.~~ • A Landscape and Habitats Management Plan to be provided to manage habitats on site and to ensure this is integral to wider landscape management. • Careful design of employment units on site to limit adverse visual impact and ensure compatibility with surrounding development • The provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity • The retention and respect for important existing buildings and	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				heritage assets with a layout to incorporate these ~~where possible~~ and consideration of Grade II listed buildings outside the site • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Provision of sustainable drainage in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), taking account of the recommendations of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5 • An assessment of whether the site contains best and most versatile agricultural land, including a detailed survey where necessary. • A soil management plan may be required to be submitted with planning applications. • Undertake a staged programme of archaeological investigation	
72	112	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 2 – Graven Hill C.50	Support for the allocation in principle Need for additional highway infrastructure Question the assumed rate of delivery Support from promoter of additional land for increase in allocation from 1900 to 2100 homes Housing numbers from the Submission Local Plan should be reinstated. The SHMA has a flawed methodology.	No further modification recommended.	
73	112	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 2 – Graven Hill C.50	Support for the allocation in principle Need for additional highway infrastructure Question the assumed rate of delivery Support for inclusion of land at Langford Park Farm from the promoter	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
74	113	Bicester: Policy Bicester 2 Graven Hill	Support for the allocation in principle Need for additional highway infrastructure Question the assumed rate of delivery. An eastern ring road is required. Revised policy wording suggested including from English Heritage and Oxfordshire County Council Support from the site promoter of land at Langford Park Farm Additional drainage and water supply infrastructure is likely to be required	**Development Area: 241 hectares** **Development Description:** This predominantly brownfield site to the south of Bicester is proposed for a mixed use development of 2,100 dwellings, significant employment land providing for high quality job opportunities, associated services, facilities and other infrastructure including the potential for the incorporation of a rail freight interchange. **Employment** • Land Area for employment – 26ha • Jobs created – approximately 2000 jobs • Use classes – Mixed B1, B2 and B8 uses (primarily B8 uses) **Housing** • Number of homes – Approximately 2,100 • Dwelling mix – to be informed by Policy BSC4: Housing Mix • Affordable/social – 30% • The provision of extra care housing and the opportunity for self build affordable housing **Key Specific Design and Place Shaping Principles** • Contribution to improvements to the surrounding local and strategic road networks, good accessibility to and improvement of public transport services, including financial or in-kind contributions to bus services and bus stop infrastructure, engineered pedestrian and cyclist connectivity to the A41 underpass to facilitate potential routes to the town centre, improved facilities for pedestrians and cyclists to cross the A41, and the provision of a Travel Plan to maximise connectivity with existing development	In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				• Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Provision of a buffer between new development and the sewage works including a nature reserve • Development should take account of the flood compensation works within the site • Protection of the character, appearance and setting of Langford Park Farm • ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~. Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment • Biodiversity protection and enhancement measures should be implemented in any future development. Protected species surveys for bats and great crested newts will be required, and sufficient mitigation measures agreed prior to planning permission being granted. • An archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact of the development on archaeological features.	
75	115	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 3 – South West Bicester Phase 2 C.56	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended.	
76	115	Bicester: Policy Bicester 3 South West Bicester Phase 2	Objection to additional homes Support for allocation Housing numbers from the Submission Local	**Development Area: 29 hectares** **Development Description:** 726 homes with associated services, facilities	In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Plan should be reinstated. The SHMA has a flawed methodology. Concern about impact on Bignell Park Revised policy wording suggested including from site promoter	and other infrastructure. **Housing** • Number of homes– Approximately 726 • Dwelling mix – to be informed by Policy BSC4:Housing mix • Affordable/social – 30% • The provision of extra care housing and the opportunity for community self build affordable housing. **Infrastructure needs** •Education – 2 FE Primary School, contributions towards secondary school provision •Health – to be provided at North West Bicester •Open Space - to include general greenspace, play space, allotments and outdoor sports provision as outlined in Policy BSC 11: Local Standards of Provision – Outdoor Recreation. •Access and Movement– link to Phase 1 ~~shuttle~~ bus service to Bicester Town Railway Station and Park and Ride at Phase 1. •Community facilities – ~~local centre,~~ convenience store, a community facility/ enhanced ~~or contributions towards the enhancement of~~ community facilities as part of phase 1. •Utilities – extension of Phase 1 connections. Off site improvements to utilities may be required. **Key site specific design and place shaping principles** •Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 •A distinctive residential neighbourhood for Bicester that integrates well with the existing phase one development at South West Bicester •Layout of development that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity with direct vehicular (including cycle) and pedestrian linkages between South West Bicester Phases 1 and 2 and to existing networks •A transport assessment and Travel Plan to accompany development proposals •A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities, with a legible hierarchy of routes, with new footpaths and cycleways provided on site that link to existing networks beyond the site •Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided by ensuring that the bus routes and bus stops to be provided within the site are accessible by pedestrians and cyclists~~for with~~via effective footpaths and cycle routes. ~~to bus stops including the provision of a bus route through the site with buses stopping at the railway stations and new bus stops on the sit~~e •Development that respects the setting of Chesterton Conservation Area and the wider landscape setting •Retention of hedgerows and the preservation and enhancement of the biodiversity value of the site, with the enhancement, restoration and creation of wildlife corridors provided for through an ecological survey •Development set back from the minor watercourse along the site's northern boundary to meet Environment Agency requirements •A surface water management framework and the incorporation of infiltration Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SuDS) to reduce surface water, control drainage and protect a Minor Aquifer (subject to further ground investigation) •Public open space to form a well connected network of green areas suitable for formal and informal recreation •Retention of the existing Public Right of Way which crosses the site •Provision of opportunities for Green Infrastructure links beyond the development site to the wider town and open countryside •A well designed approach to the urban edge, which relates development at the periphery to its rural setting and Chesterton village and affords good access to the countryside •Development proposals should seek to protect cultural heritage and archaeology, including in the conversion of any important farm buildings where possible especially in regard to the conversion of Whitelands Farm and associated buildings, located to the southwest of the allocation. •The provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity •Land to be provided for and assist in facilitating a~~A~~ community woodland / green buffer to be provided between Chesterton village and the Development	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				Area (Policy ESD 15: Green Boundaries to Growth) •Provision of sustainable drainage in accordance with 'Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)'. taking account of the recommendations of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment •Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5. •An assessment of whether the site contains best and most versatile agricultural land, including a detailed survey where necessary •A soil management plan may be required to be submitted with planning applications.	
117	117	Bicester: Policy Bicester 4 Bicester Business Park	Revised policy wording suggested by English Heritage	**Key Site Specific Design and Place Shaping Principles** • Provision for safe pedestrian access from the A41 including facilitating the crossing of the A41 to the north and west, and the provision and upgrading of footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks to improve connectivity generally and to develop links between this site, nearby development sites and the town centre. • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment	In response to representation from English Heritage
78	119	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 5 – Strengthening Bicester Town Centre	The town centre boundary should be extended within the Local Plan Part1 and not deferred to Part 2. Policy wording regarding Bicester Village should be less restrictive.	Bicester Village will have a role in the improvement of central Bicester by continuing to bring tourists to the town and also potentially through involvement in further re-development proposals. Bicester ~~v~~Village is therefore included within the 'Area of Search'. Any further development at Bicester Village would be required to complement and help improve connectivity with the existing town centre and not ~~to~~ undermine its ~~the~~ vitality	Clarification and in response to representation.

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		C.68	The need to restrict development at Bicester Village in order to protect the town centre. Wording suggested.	and viability ~~of the existing centre~~. Conditions will be attached to planning permissions if necessary.	
79	120	Bicester: Policy Bicester 5 - Strengthening Bicester Town Centre	The town centre boundary should be extended within the Local Plan Part1 and not deferred to Part 2. Policy wording regarding Bicester Village should be less restrictive. Housing numbers from the Submission Local Plan should be reinstated. The SHMA has a flawed methodology.	No further modification recommended.	
80	121	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 6 – Bure Place Town Centre Redevelopment Phase 2 Policy Bicester 6 Bure Place Town Centre Redevelopment Phase 2	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended.	
81	122	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 7 – Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		C.80			
82	125	Bicester: Policy Bicester 10 Bicester Gateway	Does not adequately provide for the mix of uses that are essential to 'second generation' business parks: i.e those not solely employment uses but include a range of amenities for employees. Ancillary use should be permitted including a hotel. Wording suggested. The County Council requests 'Safeguarding of land for future highway capacity improvements to peripheral routes in consultation with the Highways Authority'.	Access and Movement —Potential for safeguarding of land for future highway capacity improvements to peripheral routes if required by the Highways Authority to meet the growth needs of this Local Plan and could be viably delivered.	In response to the County Council's representation
83	126	Bicester: Policy Bicester 10 Bicester Gateway	Support for the amended bullet point 22. But it is not clear whether preliminary ecological surveys have been carried out to inform the proposed extension to this allocated site. Consideration should be given to the potential for cumulative impacts on Bicester Wetlands Reserve and Local Wildlife Sites, and there are protected species recorded onsite. Boundary of site should be amended to the south.	No further modification recommended.	
84	126	Bicester: Policy Bicester 10 Bicester Gateway	Revised policy wording suggested including from English Heritage. Varying views about the type of B use class jobs that should be provided. Proposal for a buffer between development and the nature reserve.	• Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • No built development will be located in Flood Zone 3b and the principles set out in Policy ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management will be followed. • ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact	•

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Suggestions from the County Council regarding measures for improving connectivity and ecological mitigation	assessment • A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities • Planting of vegetation along strategic route ways to screen the noise • Flood plain land in the eastern parts of the site to be used for informal recreation and ecological benefit in order to enhance Bicester's green infrastructure network, in the form of "blue corridors" which provide public open space near watercourses and provide a natural wetland buffer between the development and the adjacent nature reserve.	
85	127	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 11 – North East Bicester Business Park C.97	Varying views about the type of B use class jobs that should be provided.	No further modification recommended.	
86	127	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 11 – North East Bicester Business Park C.97	Site boundary amendments are proposed to the north east. Development opposed due to impact on conservation area at Bicester airfield.	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
87	127	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 11 – North East Bicester Business Park	Site boundary amendments are proposed. Minor wording changes are proposed. Land at the airfield should be allocated for employment uses.	**Key site specific design and place shaping principles** • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • Layout of development that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing development, including adjoining employment areas, nearby residential areas and the town centre • Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for including providing bus stops for the site • Provision of new footpaths and cycleways to connect with the existing footpath/cycleway links around the site including along Skimmingdish Lane, to Launton Road and to services and facilities in Bicester's wider urban area. • Retention and enhancement of existing Public Rights of Way, and the provision of links from the development and Bicester's urban area to the wider Public Rights of Way network. A green buffer with planting immediately adjacent to the Care Home and beyond this, B1a development to surround the Care home in order to protect residential amenity. • A detailed Transport Assessment to be undertaken and Travel Plan to be provided focusing on maximising access by means other than the private car including demonstration of the provision of adequate cycle parking. Consultation with the Local Highways Authority regarding potential future improvements to Skimmingdish Lane and any design implications for the development frontage. • A high quality, well designed approach to the urban edge which functions as a high profile economic attractor but which also achieves a successful transition between town and country environments • Buildings that provide for an active frontage to Skimmingdish Lane and a strong gateway at the site entrance • The site lies adjacent to a designated Local Wildlife Site and a proposed Local Wildlife Site. Ecological surveys must be undertaken to identify habitats and species of value and any mitigation measures required. Features of value, including existing mature hedgerows and	In response to representations from English Heritage and the Environment Agency

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				important trees, should be preserved, retained and enhanced and the proposals should result in a net gain in biodiversity • Development that respects the landscape setting, and that demonstrates the enhancement, restoration of creation of wildlife corridors, and contributes towards creation of a green infrastructure network for Bicester • ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment • A comprehensive landscaping scheme to limit visual intrusion into the wider landscape, particularly given the need to conserve the open setting, character and appearance of the Former RAF Bicester Conservation Area • Conserve or enhance the setting of the RAF Bicester Conservation Area and adjoining Scheduled Ancient Monument • Preparation of an archaeological and cultural heritage assessment to inform development proposals • A high quality design and finish, with careful consideration given to layout, architecture, materials and colourings and careful consideration given to building heights to reduce overall visual impact. • The provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity • Adoption of a surface water management framework to maintain run off at Greenfield rates • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • A Flood Risk Assessment should be undertaken. Use of SuDS in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS). Detailed site analysis and ground investigation should be undertaken to establish if infiltration techniques are acceptable; it is likely that attenuation techniques will be more appropriate due to the	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				underlying geological composition and groundwater vulnerability, taking account of the recommendations of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment and the Assessment for the site. Appropriate buffers should be provided alongside surface watercourses. • No built development will be located in Flood Zone 3b and the principles set out in Policy ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management will be followed. • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5 • An assessment of whether the site contains best and most versatile agricultural land, including a detailed survey where necessary. • A soil management plan may be required to be submitted with planning applications.	
88	128/129	Bicester: Policy Bicester 12 South East Bicester	Concern over impact ecological impact. To deliver a net gain in biodiversity, creation of BAP priority habitat should be carried out across the CTA. The wildlife corridor to Gavray Drive Meadows and the CTA should be maintained. Additional drainage and water supply infrastructure is likely to be required Revised wording proposed. Support for increase in employment land. Objection to B8 uses.	**Infrastructure Needs** • Health – No on site requirements are anticipated • Open space – to include general greenspace, play space, allotments and outdoor sports provision as outlined in Policy BSC11:Local Standards of Provision – Outdoor Recreation • Access and Movement – contributes to improvements to the surrounding local and strategic road networks. Safeguarding of land for future highway capacity improvements to peripheral routes in consultation with the Highways Authority • Community facilities – Mixed use local centre to include a multi-use community hall, convenience store and small scale employment premises compatible with the location ~~Primary School- to include land for the provision of a school on site and contributions to secondary education provision~~Schools – to include the provision of a primary school on the site and financial or in-kind contributions towards	In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 51				secondary education provision". • Utilities – off site improvements to utilities may be required. **Key site specific design and place shaping principles** • The development of a comprehensive masterplan for the allocated site in consultation with the Council, Oxfordshire County Council, English Heritage, the Local Nature Partnership (Wild Oxfordshire) and local communities. • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • Commercial buildings with a high quality design and finish, with careful consideration given to layout, architecture, materials, colourings and to building heights to reduce overall visual impact • ~~Development proposals should seek to protect cultural heritage and archaeology, in particular Wretchwick Deserted Medieval Settlement, a Scheduled Ancient Monument, and incorporate an appropriate landscape buffer in consultation with English Heritage, to maintain the SAM's open setting. In consultation with English Heritage, appropriate public access and interpretation facilities should be provided.~~ • Development proposals should protect cultural heritage and archaeology, in particular the grade II listed Wretchwick Farmhouse and Wretchwick Deserted Medieval Settlement, a Scheduled Ancient Monument, and incorporate an appropriate landscape buffer in consultation with English Heritage, to maintain the SAM's open setting. In consultation with English Heritage, appropriate public access and interpretation facilities should be provided". • Provision of open space in accordance with Policy BSC 11: Local Standards of Provision – Outdoor Recreation, particularly to allow for access to the monument • Retention and enhancement of hedgerows and the introduction of new landscaping features that will ensure the preservation and enhancement of biodiversity resulting in an overall net gain. Development should demonstrate the enhancement, restoration or	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				creation of wildlife corridors • A well designed approach to the urban edge, which relates development at the periphery and affords good access to the countryside • The provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity. • A proposal that is well integrated, with improved, sustainable connections between existing development and new development on this site • New footpaths and cycle ways should be provided ~~for~~ that link to existing networks and the wider urban area. This includes links from the site into Bicester town centre and to facilitate access to railway stations, secondary schools, other community facilities and places of employment. Connectivity with Launton Road, Langford Village and London Road should be improved. • A legible hierarchy of routes should be established to encourage sustainable modes of travel and the development layout should maximise the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and incorporate cycle routes • Protection of the line and amenity of existing Public Rights of Way. Connectivity and ease of access from the development to the wider Public Rights of Way network. • Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for, including a through route for buses between the A4421 Charbridge Lane and the A41 Aylesbury Road, with effective footpaths and cycle routes to bus stops, including a financial contribution towards the provision of a bus service ~~route~~ through the site and new bus stops ~~on the site~~ with effective footpaths and cycle routes to bus stops from dwellings and commercial buildings. • A transport assessment and Travel Plan to accompany development proposals • Public open space to form a well-connected network of green areas suitable for formal and informal recreation • Provision of opportunities for Green Infrastructure links within and	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 53				beyond the development site to the wider town and open countryside including appropriate improvements to connectivity between areas of ecological interest • Adequate investigation of, protection of and management of protected habitats and species on site given the ecological value of the site, with biodiversity preserved and enhanced • The preparation and implementation of an Ecological Management Plan to ensure the long term conservation of habitats and species within the site, to be agreed with the Council. • A scheme, to be agreed with the Council, for the protection of existing wildlife habitats and species during construction of the development • Ensure that there are no detrimental impacts on downstream Sites of Special Scientific Interest through hydrological, hydro chemical or sedimentation impacts • The northern section of the site within the Conservation Target Area should be kept free from built development. Development must avoid adversely impacting on the Conservation Target Area and comply with the requirements of Policy ESD11 to secure a net biodiversity gain. • ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment. • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5 • A flood risk assessment should include detailed modelling of the watercourses. Development should be excluded from flood zone 3 plus climate change and public open space/recreation areas located near watercourses to create “blue corridors”. • Take account of the Council’s Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				• The incorporation of SUDS (see Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)), taking account of the recommendations of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Detailed site specific analysis and ground investigation to determine whether infiltration SuDS techniques are acceptable; due to underlying geology and groundwater vulnerability attenuation techniques are likely to be required. • Development that considers and addresses any potential amenity issues which may arise – including noise impact from the rail line to the far north. The introduction of buffers/barriers/screening and the location of uses should be carefully considered to mitigate potential nuisances • The provision of a scheme, to be agreed with the Council, for the appropriate retention and re-use of existing farm buildings • An assessment of whether the site contains best and most versatile agricultural land, including a detailed survey where necessary. • A soil management plan may be required to be submitted with planning applications. • An archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact of the development on archaeological features	
89	130	Bicester: New Policy Bicester 13 – Gavray Drive New para C.101a	Petition containing some 1,480 signatures received. Objection raised to the proposed allocation. The land at Gavray Drive has been recognised for many years to be of historical and ecological value and is part of the Ray Conservation Target Area as well as containing a Local Wildlife Site. The allocation of the site is as a result of the increased in housing figures from the SHMA. Most of the site is designated as a Conservation Target Area therefore the site cannot be both for housing and for conservation. It is now important that the land is correctly identified as	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 55			a Local Wildlife Site. Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site is noted for its biodiversity. The site has been allocated without consulting with the local community. Land at Gavray Drive should be preserved and designated a Local Green Space. Concern over impact ecological, environmental and historical impact of development at Gavray Drive. The amount of land allocated at Gavray Drive should be reduced. Revised wording proposed. Lack of Infrastructure. Support for allocation from site promoter.		
90	130	New para C.101b	Petition containing some 1,480 signatures received. Objection raised to the proposed allocation. The land at Gavray Drive has been recognised for many years to be of historical and ecological value and is part of the Ray Conservation Target Area as well as containing a Local Wildlife Site. The allocation of the site is as a result of the increased in housing figures from the SHMA. Most of the site is designated as a Conservation Target Area therefore the site cannot be both for housing and for conservation. It is now important that the land is correctly identified as a Local Wildlife Site. Gavray Meadows Local	~~The western part of the site may include improved grassland (a BAP priority habitat).~~ The central and eastern section of the site contains lowland meadow, a ~~There is an additional~~ BAP priority habitat ~~which is a lowland meadow in the centre of the site~~. There are a number of protected species located towards the eastern part of the site. There are several ponds and a small stream, known as the Langford Brook, which runs from north to south through the middle of the site. A range of wildlife has been recorded including butterflies, great crested newts and other amphibians, reptiles, bats and birds. There are risks of flooding on some parts of the site therefore mitigation measures must be considered. There is also a risk of harming the large number of recorded protected species towards the eastern part of the site. Impacts need to be minimised by any proposal. Approximately a quarter of	Clarification in response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Wildlife Site is noted for its biodiversity. The site has been allocated without consulting with the local community. Concern over impact ecological, environmental and historical impact of development at Gavray Drive. The site could not be developed without a net impact on biodiversity. The development should be deleted. Land at Gavray Drive should be preserved and designated a Local Green Space. Lack of Infrastructure	the site is within Flood Zones 2 and 3 therefore any development would need to be directed away from this area.	
91	130	Bicester: Policy Bicester 13 Gavray Drive	Petition containing some 1,480 signatures received. Objection raised to the proposed allocation. The land at Gavray Drive has been recognised for many years to be of historical and ecological value and is part of the Ray Conservation Target Area as well as containing a Local Wildlife Site. The allocation of the site is as a result of the increased in housing figures from the SHMA. Most of the site is designated as a Conservation Target Area therefore the site cannot be both for housing and for conservation. It is now important that the land is correctly identified as a Local Wildlife Site. Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site is noted for its biodiversity. The site has been allocated without consulting with the local community.	**Policy Bicester 13 – Gavray Drive** Development Area: 23 hectares Development Description - a housing site to the east of Bicester town centre. It is bounded by railway lines to the north and west and the A4421 to the east **Housing** • Number of homes - 300 dwellings • Affordable Housing - 30% **Infrastructure Needs** • Education – Contributions sought towards provision of primary and secondary school places; • Open Space – to include general greenspace, play space, allotments and sports provision as outlined in Policy BSC11: Local Standards of	In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 57			Concern over impact ecological, environmental and historical impact of development at Gavray Drive. Wording changes required to protect site. Land at Gavray Drive should be preserved and designated a Local Green Space. Number of houses should be reduced to 250. Wording changes including deleting reference to no development within the Conservation Target Area. Additional drainage infrastructure is likely to be required	Provision – Outdoor Recreation. A contribution to off-site formal sports provision will be required. • Community – contributions towards community facilities • Access and movement – from Gavray Drive. **Key Site Specific Design and Place Shaping Principles** • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • A high quality development that is locally distinctive in its form, materials and architecture. A well designed approach to the urban edge which relates to the road and rail corridors. • That part of the site within the Conservation Target Area should be kept free from built development. Development must avoid adversely impacting on the Conservation Target Area and comply with the requirements of Policy ESD11 to secure a net biodiversity gain. • Protection of the Local Wildlife Site and consideration of its relationship and interface with residential and other built development • Detailed consideration of ecological impacts, wildlife mitigation and the creation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife corridors to protect and enhance biodiversity. The preparation and implementation of an Ecological Management Plan to ensure the long- term conservation of habitats and species within the site to be agreed with the Council in-consultation with local biodiversity interest groups. • ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment. • The preparation of a structural landscaping scheme, which incorporates and enhances existing natural features and vegetation. The structural landscaping scheme should inform the design	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 58				principles for the site. Development should retain and enhance significant landscape features (e.g. hedgerows) which are or have the potential to be of ecological value. A central area of open space either side of Langford Brook, incorporating part of the Local Wildlife Site and with access appropriately managed to protect ecological value. No formal recreation within the Local Wildlife Site. • Provision of public open space to form a well connected network of green areas within the site, suitable for formal and informal recreation • Provision of Green Infrastructure links beyond the development site to the wider town and open countryside • Retention of Public Rights of Way and a layout that affords good access to the countryside • New footpaths and cycleways should be provided that link with existing networks, the wider urban area and schools and community facilities. Access should be provided over the railway to the town centre. • A linked network of footways which cross the central open space, and connect Langford Village, Stream Walk and Bicester Distribution Park. • Ensure that there are no detrimental impacts on downstream Sites of Special Scientific Interest through hydrological, hydro chemical or sedimentation impacts • A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities • A legible hierarchy of routes to encourage sustainable modes of travel. Good accessibility to public transport services with local bus stops provided. Provision of a transport assessment and Travel Plan • Additional bus stops on the A4421 Charbridge Lane will be provided, with connecting footpaths from the development. The developers will contribute towards the cost of improving bus services in the wider South East Bicester area. • Provision of appropriate lighting and the minimisation of light pollution based on appropriate technical assessment	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				• Provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity. • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5 • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Consideration of flood risk from Langford Brook in a Flood Risk Assessment and provision of an appropriate buffer. Use of attenuation SuDS techniques (and infiltration techniques in the south eastern area of the site) in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and taking account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment • Housing must be located outside Flood Zone 3 and the principles set out in Policy ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management will be followed. • The provision of extra-care housing and the opportunity for community self-build affordable housing • An archaeological investigation to inform an archaeological mitigation scheme as required • An archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact of the development on archaeological features • A detailed survey of the agricultural land quality identifying the best and most versatile agricultural land and a soil management plan.	
92	132	Banbury C.109	Support for the allocation of employment land at junction 11 of the M40 from the site promoters. Concern from the Town Council about large scale class B8 development Concern from South Northamptonshire District Council about the landscape and transport	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			impact of development at Junction 11.		
93	135	Banbury: Meeting the Challenge of Ensuring Sustainable Development in Banbury C.124	Objection to the removal of the reference to the need for a green buffer south of Salt Way. Views to the south west of Banbury over land south of Crouch Hill remain a key vista. Wording suggested.	No further modification recommended.	
94	135	Banbury: Banbury in 2031 C.125	All modifications relating to the SHMA should be deleted.	No further modification recommended.	
95	136-137	Banbury: Policy Banbury 1: Canalside	Objection to the reduction in homes proposed at Banbury Canalside. Objection to there being no provision for a school site. Resultant impact on existing infrastructure.	No further modification recommended.	
96	139	Banbury: Policy Banbury 1: Canalside	Support for the relocation of businesses to other sites within the town centre and preservation of older industrial buildings. Wording proposed re older building and industrial premises.	The proposals for Canalside mean that nearly all existing land uses, buildings and businesses could be removed in the long term. One of the Council's key priorities is to ensure that businesses remain in Banbury or the District. The actual amount of land needed to accommodate operational businesses at Canalside is not significant and there are several options available to businesses. In terms of locations where businesses may wish to relocate to this could include within vacant units/premises elsewhere or in new buildings elsewhere. This could include on existing employment sites (through intensification) such as on the former SAPA and Hella sites, or in/on new buildings/sites allocated in the Council's Local Plan or Local Plan Part 2 such as on land near the motorway., The re-development of Canalside will provide businesses with the opportunity to expand and invest for the future and the Council's Economic Development team will assist any businesses to relocate. The redevelopment of	In response to representation from English Heritage

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				Canalside is a long term plan and therefore it is possible some businesses may want to remain on a temporary basis for some time. All of the existing businesses could be relocated but the Council will encourage existing businesses which are offices, retail units and community uses which are conducive to the aims of this Policy and the SPD to remain and occupy new buildings on the site, potentially helping them to expand and prosper in this town centre location. ~~A~~ a number of the older buildings and the site of former industrial premises, offer considerable opportunities for re-use or re-development for industrial enterprises. Some of the industrial uses (B use classes) could remain and 700 dwellings can be delivered on the site with some of these remaining on the site. The particular uses and businesses that remain will be explored further in the SPD for the site which will include further consultation with landowners and businesses.	
97	140	Banbury: Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Objection to reduced site area and propose a greater number of houses. Evidence does not support the Council's approach.	No further modification recommended.	
98	140	Banbury: Policy Banbury 2: Hardwick Farm, Southam Road (East and West)	Requirement for contribution towards secondary education should be removed, or worded consistently across site policies. Support developer contribution requirement to secondary education.	No further modification recommended.	
99	144	Banbury: Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2 C.137	No comments received on main modification	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
100	145	Banbury: Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2	Support for increase in housing. Concern over increased traffic congestion. Contributions should be sought for a southern link road. Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2 Education – Access should be safeguarded through Banbury 4 to the 8.42 hectares of land reserved in Banbury 12 for a new secondary school. Additional drainage and water supply infrastructure is likely to be required.	**Infrastructure** • Education – contribution to expansion of Phase 1 school and contributions to secondary education provision. Provision of vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access directly from the site into site 'Banbury 12'	In response to a representation from the County Council
101	147	Banbury: Policy Banbury 4: Bankside Phase 2	Support for enhancement of public rights of way. Wording suggested.	• Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Consideration of potential linkages to the Bankside Phase 1 community park and linear park identified under Policy Banbury 11 • Retention and enhancement of existing Public Rights of Way, and the provision of links from the development and Banbury's urban area to the wider Public Rights of Way network including the Oxford Canal Towpath • Provision of vehicular, cycle and pedestrian access directly from the site into site 'Banbury 12' • ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment • An archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact of the development on archaeological features	In response to a representation from the County Council

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
102	147	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields C.146	Support for increase in housing Extension to the site proposed for residential, care home and recreational use.	No further modification recommended.	
103	148	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	Extension to the site proposed for residential, care home and recreational use. Additional drainage and water supply infrastructure is likely to be required	No further modification recommended.	
104	149	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 6 – Employment Land West of M40 C.147	No comments received on this main modification.	No further modification recommended.	
105	150	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 6 – Employment Land West of M40 C.148	Support for reservation of land for a new inner relief road connection. Potential for extended Banbury 6 to be linked to Banbury 19 by a spine road.	No further modification recommended.	
106	150-151	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 6 – Employment Land West of M40	Concern over increased traffic congestion. Revised wording suggested.	**Development Area:** ~~42~~ 35 hectares (in total) **Development Description:** Located on the eastern edge of Banbury in an important position adjoining the M40, this strategic site provides for ~~42~~ 35 hectares of mixed employment generating development. A variety of employment types will be sought to reflect the need for diversity and resilience in the local economy expressed in the Economic Development Strategy.	Corrections and in response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 64				**Employment** Land area – ~~42 ha (6 hectares already built)~~ Jobs – approx 2,500 (35~~6~~ hectares) **Key site specific design and place shaping principles** • A high quality commercial district for the east of Banbury that has high connectivity to major transport routes and is well integrated with the adjacent commercial uses • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • Layout of development that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing development, including adjoining employment areas, nearby residential areas and the town centre • Provision of new footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks • Protection of the amenity of the public footpath network including satisfactory treatment of existing footpaths on the site and diversion proposals where appropriate. Development should seek to connect the site to the existing footpath network to the west and east. • Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for • Contributions to the cost of establishing bus services to this area, linking with residential parts of Banbury, to reduce the over-dependence on the car as a means of travel for work journeys within the town, and consequent congestion on Banbury's strategic road network • Satisfactory access arrangements including a detailed transport assessment and Travel Plan given the location of the site close to the strategic road network • Development that reserves the potential for a future highway connection to bypass the town centre	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				• A high quality, well designed approach to the urban edge which functions as an high profile economic attractor but which also achieves a successful transition between town and country environments • ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment • Development that respects the landscape setting, that demonstrates the enhancement, restoration or creation of wildlife corridors, and the creation of a green infrastructure network for Banbury • A comprehensive landscaping scheme including on-site provision to enhance the setting of buildings onsite and to limit visual intrusion into the wider landscape, particularly given the key views afforded into the site from higher ground in the wider vicinity • Adequate investigation (through an ecological survey) treatment and management of protected habitats and species onsite to preserve and enhance biodiversity including habitat creation. • A high quality design and finish, with careful consideration given to layout, architecture, materials and colourings to reduce overall visual impact • The height of buildings to reflect the scale of existing employment development in the vicinity • Provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity. • An archaeological survey will be required due to close proximity to heritage assets. • Development must not adversely affect the significance of the Banbury No 9 Filling Factory Scheduled monument on the east side of the M40 or the associated archaeological remains of the filling factory on the west side of the motorway, which although not scheduled, are regarded by English Heritage as being a national importance and which therefore should be considered in the same	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				way a Scheduled Monument. • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Full mitigation of flood risk in compliance with Policy ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management including the use of SuDS (Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)), specifically attenuation SuDS techniques, taking account of the recommendations of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment • Development should be rolled back to outside the modelled Flood Zone 3 envelope to create 'blue corridors' which provide public open space / recreation areas near watercourses • Adoption of a surface water management framework to reduce run off to greenfield rates • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5 • An assessment of whether the site contains contaminated land including a detailed site survey where necessary • An assessment of whether the site contains best and most versatile agricultural land, including a detailed survey where necessary. • A soil management plan may be required to be submitted with planning applications.	
107	152	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 7 – Strengthening Banbury Town Centre C.152	Concern over preservation of listed buildings.	No further modification recommended	
108	153	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 7 –	Support for the retail provision at Calthorpe Road.	No further modifications recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Strengthening Banbury Town Centre C.155			
109	153	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 7 – Strengthening Banbury Town Centre Policy Banbury 7 Strengthening Banbury Town Centre	No comments received directly relating to this proposed modification.	No further modifications recommended.	
110	154	Banbury: Policy Banbury 8 Land at Bolton Road	No comments received directly relating to this proposed modification.	No further modifications recommended	
111	154	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 8 - Land at Bolton Road C.158	Support for additional housing .	No further modifications recommended	
112	154-155	Banbury: Policy Banbury 8 Land at Bolton Road	Support for allocation. Minor Policy wording changes suggested.	**Key site specific design and place shaping principles** • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • A high quality landmark mixed use development in Banbury Town Centre that will support the regeneration of this area and its integration in to the wider town centre. • Pedestrian and cycle linkages that enable a high degree of integration and connectivity with existing networks, particularly	In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				between Parsons Street, North Bar Street and Castle Street integrating these areas through well considered connections, building configuration and public realm • Residential development that is designed to a very high quality considering the impact on the conservation area. • A transport assessment and Travel Plan to accompany development proposals • Provision of high quality routes to allow for accessibility to public transport services and sustainable modes of travel • A high quality design, with the use of high quality materials in light of the adjoining historical setting. • A design which respects and enhances the conservation area and the historical grain of the adjoining areas especially the Grade II listed building to the west of the site, • The creation of a high quality public realm with careful consideration of street frontages and elevation treatment to ensure an active and vibrant public realm. • Height and massing sensitive to the surroundings, ensuring there is no adverse effects on important views/vistas. • There is an opportunity for low key, high end development, formed along new lanes that connect the area to Parsons Street. • Architectural innovation is expected where large scale buildings and car parking areas are proposed to ensure that these objectives are met. • Provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity. • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • The incorporation of SuDS (Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)), taking account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				• An archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact of the development on archaeological features.	
113	162	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 12 - Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC C.180	The relocation site should be located within the boundaries of Banbury Town. The green buffer should be retained for agriculture and biodiversity. Development will reduce Adderbury to an urban village coalesced with Banbury, and will cause light pollution. Bicester Town Football Club should also be relocated by the Council. Oxfordshire County Council request 8.42 ha of the site to be reserved for a secondary school to meet town wide needs, if required.	Land to the south of Banbury Rugby Club at Oxford Road, Bodicote is available. The site is in a suitable location on a main transport corridor. The Local Plan identifies a site ~~which is likely to be~~ larger than required for ~~the~~Banbury United ~~f~~Football ~~c~~Club. The rest of the land may be suitable for a a possible new secondary school if required by the County Council. However, the County Council has yet to complete its evaluation of required school provision. Any land not needed ~~by the club~~ will be used to address existing shortfalls in town wide sports provision. There may also be the potential for some sharing of facilities with the adjacent rugby club. Sport England will be consulted on the proposed relocation of the football club. In developing proposals, consideration will need to be given to the detailed traffic and amenity impacts arising from the proposed use of the site.	In response to liaison with, and a representation from, the County Council.
114	162	Banbury: Policy Banbury 12 Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC	Minor Policy wording changes suggested. Education - 8.42 hectares of land should be reserved within the site for a new secondary school of up to 1,200 places to meet town wide needs. Proposed relocation site is supported by the club as it would provide much needed sporting facilties. Bicester Town Football Club should also be relocated by the Council. Oxfordshire County Council request 8.42 ha of the site to be reserved for a secondary school	**Land for the Relocation of Banbury United FC** An area of land to the east of the Oxford Road at Bodicote, to the south of Banbury Rugby Club, will be secured for the relocation of Banbury United Football Club and for sport and recreation use. Development proposals for relocation of the football club will need to be accompanied by: • An assessment of the potential effects on the local community • A transport assessment and travel plan to ensure the site is accessible by sustainable modes of transport and the traffic impact of the development is minimised • A detailed survey of agricultural land quality and a soil management plan to ensure that soils are retained on site or re-used off site	In response to liaison with, and a representation from, the County Council.

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			to meet town wide needs, if required.	• An ecological assessment including appropriate mitigation • ~~A landscape and visual assessment including appropriate mitigation~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment • A lighting strategy designed to limit upward glare in order to avoid adverse effects on nearby residents and wildlife. Vehicular access to the football ground shall be provided from Oxford Road. The remaining land not required for the football club will be examined for its potential to be the location for a new secondary school, advised by the County Council.	
14a	164	Banbury: New site policy Banbury 15: Employment Land NE of Junction 11	Concern over further B8 warehousing Potential conflict between some of the specifications.	**Strategic Development: Banbury 15 – Employment Land NE of Junction 11** This strategic employment site in this highly prominent location adjoining the M40 motorway and close to Junction 11 is allocated for employment. This new employment site will ensure that the economic strengths of Banbury in manufacturing, high performance engineering and logistics can be maintained. The strategic road network and local distributor routes can be readily accessed from this area and be done so avoiding lorry movements through residential areas. Although an edge of town site, it is also within walking distance of the town centre and bus and railway stations. Development in this area provides an opportunity for high visibility economic investment and the bringing into effective use land that would otherwise be unsuitable for residential purposes. Policy Banbury 15 therefore seeks to deliver this land for economic development in the interest of delivering jobs and investment in a highly sustainable location.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
115	164	Banbury: New site policy Banbury 15: Employment Land NE of Junction 11	In principle support. Concern over landscape and traffic ~~-~~impact. Revised policy wording suggested and amendment to site boundary proposed.	**Policy Banbury 15 - Employment Land North East of Junction 11** **Development Area: 49** hectares (in total) **Development Description:** Located on the north eastern edge of Banbury in an important position adjoining the M40, ~~and~~ the A361 and the A422, this strategic site combines two parcels of land provides for 49 hectares of mixed employment generating development. A variety of employment types will be sought to reflect the need for diversity and resilience in the local economy expressed in the Economic Development Strategy. **Employment** • Jobs – approx – 3,500 • Use classes – B1 (Office), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage and Distribution) **Infrastructure Needs** • Open space - Incidental • Access and Movement – access to A361 and M40 via junction 11. Necessary contributions to other transport improvements will be sought, including improvements to bus services, walking and cycling routes. Contributions will also be required towards mitigation measures required to improve operation of Junction 11 (including a potential new link road) and Hennef Way junctions. ~~This is likely to include measures to allow for walking and cycling to the site which is currently relatively inaccessible. Changes to traffic management may be required including potential signalling at Junction 11 to allow the effective movement of traffic.~~ The location of the site and the need to cross M40 Junction 11 means that provision of walking opportunities to the site from the town centre will be challenging. There is good opportunity however, to achieve a high level of public transport use for journeys to work. • The development should contribute towards and facilitate an	In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				increased frequency of bus service at peak times, also link these bus services to Banbury residential areas **Key site specific design and place shaping principles** • A high quality commercial district for the east of Banbury that has high connectivity to major transport routes and is well integrated with the adjacent commercial uses • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • Layout of development that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing development, including adjoining employment areas, ~~nearby~~ residential areas and the town centre • Provision of new footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks to link the site with the Banbury urban area • Protection of the amenity of the public footpath network including satisfactory treatment of existing footpaths on the site and diversion proposals where appropriate • Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for to link the site with the Banbury urban area and provide an alternative to travel by car. • Satisfactory access arrangements including a detailed transport assessment and Travel Plan given the location of the site close to the strategic road network • A high quality, well designed approach to the urban edge which functions as an high profile economic attractor but which also achieves a successful transition between town and country environments • Development that respects the landscape setting, that demonstrates the enhancement, restoration or creation of wildlife corridors, and the creation of a green infrastructure network for Banbury • ~~A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment should be undertaken as part of development proposals~~Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				assessment and a heritage impact assessment • A comprehensive landscaping scheme including on-site provision to enhance the setting of buildings onsite and to limit visual intrusion into the wider landscape, particularly given the key views afforded into the site from higher ground in the wider vicinity • Include planting of vegetation along strategic route ways to screen the noise • Adequate investigation (through an ecological survey) treatment and management of ~~protected~~ priority habitats and protected species onsite to preserve and enhance biodiversity. • A high quality design and finish, with careful consideration given to layout, architecture, materials and colourings to reduce overall visual impact • The height of buildings to reflect the scale of existing employment development in the vicinity • Provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity. • ~~An archaeological survey will be required due to close proximity to heritage assets~~. • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Full mitigation of flood risk in compliance with Policy ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management including the use of SuDS (Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS)), specifically attenuation SuDS techniques, taking account of the recommendations of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment • Adoption of a surface water management framework to reduce run off to greenfield rates • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5 • An assessment of whether the site contains best and most versatile agricultural land, including a detailed survey where necessary.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
116	164	Banbury: New site policy Banbury 16 and 17	Revised policy wording suggested. Sites Banbury 16, 17 and 18 should be deleted and the green buffer re-instated. Need to address green space needs and nature conservation needs. Establishment of a nature reserve within or close to the development of at least 3 ha. Salt Way to be buffered by 25-50 metres of semi-natural grassland. Concern about landscape and traffic impact in the vicinity of Tudor Hall School The SHMA is flawed. Should revert to lower rate of growth.	No further modification recommended	
117	164	Banbury: New site policy Banbury 16 South of Salt Way - West	More attention required to green space and ecology required including new areas of natural green space linked to new allocations. Sites Banbury 16, 17 and 18 should be deleted and the green buffer re-instated. The site boundary and capacity of the site should be increased to accommodate 400 homes.	No further modification recommended	
118	164	Banbury: New site policy Banbury 16 South of Salt Way - West	Minor Policy wording changes suggested. More attention required to green space and ecology required. Sites Banbury 16, 17 and 18 should be deleted	**Policy Banbury 16 – South of Salt Way - West** **Development Area:** 8 hectares	In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			and the green buffer re-instated Additional drainage and water supply infrastructure is likely to be required	**Development** Description - Development of land at South of Salt Way – west will deliver up to 150 dwellings with associated facilities and infrastructure. **Housing** • Number of homes - Up to 150 dwellings • Affordable Housing - 30% **Infrastructure Needs** • Education – contributions will be required towards the expansion of existing primary schools and/or the provision of the new school at Wykham Park Farm. Contributions will ~~may~~ also be sought towards provision of secondary school places; • Open Space – to include general greenspace, play space, allotments and sports provision as outlined in Policy BSC11: Local Standards of Provision – Outdoor Recreation. Contributions towards off site provision for allotments and sports provision to be provided to the south of site Banbury 17 will be required in lieu of provision on site; • Community – contributions will be required towards the improvement of existing community facilities in the area; • Access and movements – A transport assessment and travel plan will be required to assess the transportation implications of the proposed development and to identify appropriate mitigation measures.– Access to be created off the Bloxham Road (A361). **Key Site Specific Design and Place Shaping Principles** • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • Development must respect the landscape setting and provide an appropriate development interface with Salt Way (any buffer is likely to be some 10-20 metres in accordance with the approach adopted at land east of Bloxham Road and south of Salt Way); • Existing natural features and additional structural planting will reinforce landscape framework upon which to structure development parcels; • Public open space to form a well connected network of green areas	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				within the site, suitable for informal recreation; • A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and allows for integration with land that comprises the South West Banbury area and existing communities in Banbury; • A linked network of cycle and footways to provide access into Banbury; • Layout of development that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity with existing development • A high quality locally distinctive residential district for the south west of Banbury that is designed with consideration to the landscape setting and well integrated with the adjacent residential area. • Consideration of the impact of development on Crouch Hill • A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities, • New footpaths and cycleways should be provided that link with existing networks, the wider urban area and community facilities with a legible hierarchy of routes to encourage sustainable modes of travel • The existing footpath extending from the southern corner of the site to Salt Way should be enhanced to enable a circular link from the new footpath/ bridleway to be provided at the southern edge of site Banbury 17 to Salt Way • Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for with effective footpaths and cycle routes to bus stops. ~~including the provision of a bus route through the site and new bus stops on the site.~~ • Bus stops should be provided on Bloxham Road, with good walking routes. The developers will be required to contribute towards the cost of improved public transport. • Provision of a transport assessment and Travel Plan to maximise connectivity with existing development, including linkages with and improvements to existing public transport • A well designed, 'soft' approach to the urban edge, which respects	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				the rural setting • ~~A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as well as a heritage assessment, should be undertaken as part of development proposals~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment • Retention of Public Rights of Way and a layout that affords good access to the countryside • Retention and enhancement of existing hedgerows and trees • Provision of Green Infrastructure links beyond the development site to the wider town and open countryside • Public open space to form a well connected network of green areas within the site, suitable for formal and informal recreation • Detailed consideration of ecological impacts, wildlife mitigation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife corridors to preserve and enhance biodiversity. Ecological Surveys to accompany any development proposal. • Planting of vegetation along strategic route ways to screen the noise • Development that retains and enhances significant landscape features (e.g. hedgerows) which are or may be of ecological value; and where possible introduces new features • Provision of appropriate lighting and the minimisation of light pollution based on appropriate technical assessment • Provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity. • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5 • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Full mitigation of flood risk in compliance with Policy ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management including use of SuDS	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				techniques in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and taking account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment • The provision of extra-care housing and the opportunity for community self-build affordable housing • A detailed survey of the agricultural land quality identifying the best and most versatile agricultural land and a soil management plan. • An archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact of the development on archaeological features.	
119	164	Banbury: New site policy Policy Banbury 17 – South of Salt Way – east	Minor Policy wording changes suggested. More attention required to green space and ecology required including new areas of natural green space linked to new allocations. Concerns over coalescence between Banbury and Bodicote, traffic impact, and impact on Salt Way. Additional drainage and water supply infrastructure is likely to be required	No further modification recommended	
120	164	Banbury: New site policy Banbury 17 South of Salt Way - East	Minor Policy wording changes suggested. More attention required to green space and ecology required. Sites Banbury 16, 17 and 18 should be deleted and the green buffer re-instated In order to facilitate the extension of Blessed George Napier Secondary School, it is requested that this policy is amended to	**Policy Banbury 17 – South of Salt Way – East** **Development Area:** 68 hectares (in total) Development Description - Development of land south of Salt Way - East will deliver a new neighbourhood of up to 1,345 dwellings with associated facilities and infrastructure as part of SW Banbury. The site is in more than one ownership (Land east of the Bloxham Road and land west of Bodicote) but the development area forms a coherent whole. An integrated,	In response to representations and clarification

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			provide 2.855 hectares of land for playing fields immediately south of the school. This would compensate for building on the school's existing playing fields in order to extend the facility to an up to 1,400 place school. Should the extension of Blessed George Napier Secondary School not be possible, it is requested that policy wording allows for the option of using the 2.855 hectares of land for a Studio School or University Technical College (UTC)	coordinated and comprehensive planning approach will be taken with a link road between the sites in separate ownerships. The site will require a masterplan to ensure this is delivered. **Housing** • Number of homes - Up to 1,345 dwellings (including 145 with permission) • Affordable Housing - 30% **Infrastructure Needs** • Education – an on site ~~land for a~~ primary school. Contributions will ~~may~~ also be sought towards provision of secondary school places. The potential for some land to be reserved to meet town wide secondary school education needs to be explored by the County Council. • Open Space – to include general greenspace, play space, allotments and sports provision as outlined in Policy BSC11: Local Standards of Provision – Outdoor Recreation; • Community – on-site provision including community and/or local retail facilities; • Access and movement – Principal access to be created off the Bloxham Road (A361). The layout should also ~~allow for~~ provide a ~~route for any future~~ an east-west link to join White Post Road for local traffic should that may be identified in the movement strategy of the Banbury Master Plan. • A transport assessment and travel plan will be required to assess the transportation implications of the proposed development and to identify appropriate mitigation measures. **Key Site Specific Design and Place Shaping Principles** • The development of a comprehensive masterplan for the allocated site in consultation with the Council, Oxfordshire County Council, the Local Nature Partnership (Wild Oxfordshire) and local communities.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				• Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • Development must respect the landscape setting and provide an appropriate development interface with Salt Way (any buffer is likely to be some ~~10~~ 20 metres wide in accordance with the approach adopted at land east of Bloxham Road and south of Salt Way); • Existing natural features and additional structural planting will reinforce landscape framework upon which to structure development parcels; • Public open space to form a well connected network of green areas within the site, suitable for formal and informal recreation. Formal recreation should be located and phased to come forward as part of development at the southern part of the site; Informal open space is to be located where the site adjoins Bodicote village in order to create a buffer to maintain separation between the two settlements and respect the setting of the Bodicote Conservation Area. • A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and allows for integration with land that comprises the South West Banbury area and existing communities in Banbury • A linked network of cycle and footways to provide access into Banbury; • Layout of development that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity with existing development • A high quality locally distinctive residential district for the south west of Banbury that is designed with consideration to the landscape setting and well integrated with the adjacent residential area. • A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities, • New footpaths and cycleways should be provided that link with existing networks, the wider urban area and community facilities with a legible hierarchy of routes to encourage sustainable modes of travel • A new footpath bridleway to be provided running from east to west along the southern boundary of the development area, incorporating	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 81				links with existing footpaths to form a new circular route around the development linking back to Salt Way • Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for with effective footpaths and cycle routes to bus stops including the provision of a bus route through the site and new bus stops on the site. • Provision of a transport assessment and Travel Plan including to maximise connectivity with existing development, including linkages with and improvements to existing public transport • In addition to the provision of a bus service through the site and associated bus stops, provision is required for buses to turn around during the early part of housing delivery. • Early delivery of the A361 to A4260 Link Road is required, along with associated junctions. The developer will be required to fund the cost of additional public transport to serve the site. • A well designed, 'soft' approach to the urban edge, which respects the rural,setting • ~~A Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as well as a cultural heritage assessment, should be undertaken as part of development proposals~~ Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment • Planting of vegetation along strategic route ways to screen the noise • Retention of Public Rights of Way and a layout that affords good access to the countryside • Retention and enhancement of existing hedgerows and trees including the boundary with the Salt Way • Public open space to form a well connected network of green areas within the site, suitable for formal and informal recreation • Provision of Green Infrastructure links beyond the development site to the wider town and open countryside • Detailed consideration of ecological impacts, wildlife mitigation and the creation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife corridors to preserve and enhance biodiversity. Ecological Surveys to	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				accompany any development proposal. • Development that retains and enhances significant landscape features (e.g. hedgerows) which are or may be of ecological value; and where possible introduces new features • Provision of appropriate lighting and the minimisation of light pollution based on appropriate technical assessment • Provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility and identity. • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5 • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Use of SuDS techniques in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and taking account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment. Development proposals to be subject to a Flood Risk Assessment. • The provision of extra-care housing and the opportunity for community self-build affordable housing • If necessary, the satisfactory incorporation of existing dwellings into the scheme • A detailed survey of the agricultural land quality identifying the best and most versatile agricultural land and a soil management plan. • the need to physically preserve the location of the Neolithic causewayed enclosure. The remainder of the archaeological features will require further investigation and recording ahead of any development. A programme of archaeological mitigation will be required ahead of any development of the site.	
121	164	Banbury - New site policy Banbury 18	Minor Policy wording changes suggested. More attention required to green space and ecology including new areas of natural green	No further modification recommended	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Land at Drayton Lodge Farm	space linked to new allocations. Sites Banbury 16, 17 and 18 should be deleted and the green buffer re-instated		
122	164	Banbury: New site policy Banbury 18 Land at Drayton Lodge Farm	Minor Policy wording changes suggested. More attention required to green space and ecology required. Additional drainage and water supply infrastructure is likely to be required	**Policy Banbury 18: Land at Drayton Lodge Farm** **Development Area:** 15 hectares **Development Description:** Located at the northern edge of Banbury, this residential strategic development site will provide approximately 250 dwellings with associated facilities and infrastructure in a scheme that demonstrates a sensitive response to this urban fringe location. Housing • Number of homes – Approximately 250 • Dwelling mix – to be informed by Policy BSC4:Housing Mix • Affordable Housing - 30% • The provision of extra care housing and the opportunity for community self build affordable housing **Infrastructure Needs** • Education – land for a primary school. ~~Contributions may also be sought towards provision of secondary school places;~~to include financial or in-kind contributions towards secondary education provision". • Open Space – to include general greenspace, play space, allotments and sports provision as outlined in Policy BSC 11: Local Standards of Provision – Outdoor Recreation; • Community – onsite provision for community and/or local retail facilities; • Access and movement – Principal access to be created off the Warwick ~~Bloxham~~ Road ~~(A361)~~.	In response to representation and correction

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 84				• A transport assessment and travel plan will be required to assess the transportation implications of the proposed development and to identify appropriate mitigation measures. **Key Site Specific Design and Place Shaping Principles** • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • An archaeological investigation to inform an archaeological mitigation scheme as required • A high quality development that is locally distinctive. • Careful design of the height and extent of built development to minimise adverse visual impact on the setting of Drayton village and Drayton Conservation Area • ~~Development proposals to be accompanied by a landscape and visual impact assessment together with a heritage assessment~~. Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment and a heritage impact assessment • Existing natural features and additional structural planting will reinforce landscape framework upon which to structure development parcels; • Public open space to form a well connected network of green areas within the site, suitable for formal and informal recreation. Formal recreation should be located and phased to come forward as part of development at the southern part of the site; • A linked network of cycle and footways to provide access into Banbury; • Layout of development that enables a high degree of integration and connectivity with existing development • A high quality residential area that is designed with consideration to the landscape setting and well integrated with the adjacent proposed residential area. • Retention of dwellings and the copse at the centre of the site with no new development in close proximity • The provision of a green buffer surrounding the existing dwellings	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				and along the western boundaries of the site • A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities including to land which has planning permission to the south and east. • New footpaths and cycleways should be provided that link with existing networks, the wider urban area and community facilities with a legible hierarchy of routes to encourage sustainable modes of travel • Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for with effective footpaths and cycle routes to bus stops on the Warwick Road. ~~including the provision of a bus route through the site and new bus stops on the site.~~ • Provision of a transport assessment and Travel Plan including to maximise connectivity with existing development, including linkages with and improvements to existing public transport • A well designed, 'soft' approach to the urban edge, which respects the rural,setting • Retention of Public Rights of Way and a layout that affords good access to the countryside • Retention and enhancement of existing hedgerows and trees • Public open space to form a well connected network of green areas within the site, suitable for formal and informal recreation • Provision of Green Infrastructure links beyond the development site to the wider town and open countryside • Detailed consideration of ecological impacts, wildlife mitigation and the creation, restoration and enhancement of wildlife corridors to preserve and enhance biodiversity • Development that retains and enhances significant landscape features (e.g. hedgerows) which are or may be of ecological value; and ~~where possible~~ introduces new features • Provision of appropriate lighting and the minimisation of light pollution based on appropriate technical assessment • Provision of public art to enhance the quality of the place, legibility	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				and identity. • Consideration of noise mitigation along the B4100 • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the requirements of policies ESD 1 – 5 • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Use of SuDS techniques in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS) and taking account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessments • The provision of extra-care housing and the opportunity for community self-build affordable housing A detailed survey of the agricultural land quality identifying the best and most versatile agricultural land and a soil management plan.	
123	164	Banbury: New site policy Banbury 19 – Land at Higham Way	Minor Policy wording changes suggested. More attention required to green space and ecology required.	No further modification recommended	
124	164	Banbury: New site policy Banbury 19 – Land at Higham Way	Minor Policy wording changes suggested. More attention required to green space and ecology required. Additional drainage infrastructure is likely to be required Potential for site to be linked to extended Banbury 6 by a spine road.	**Policy Banbury 19: Land at Higham Way** **Development Area: 3** hectares **Development Description:** Re-development would bring about environmental benefits in terms of using previously developed and vacant land within the town. **Housing** • Number of homes – Approximately 150 • Dwelling mix - approximately 70% houses 30% flats. • Affordable Housing – 30%	Corrections

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				• The provision of extra-care housing and the opportunity for community self-build affordable housing **Infrastructure Needs** • Education – Contributions towards Primary School and secondary education provision • Access and Movement – Access via Higham Way. • Open space – as outlined in Policy BSC 11 **Key site specific design and place shaping principles** • Proposals should comply with Policy ESD16 • A distinctive residential proposition for Banbury that integrates well and helps make connections with the adjoining town centre and Railway Station • An appropriate location for higher density housing to include a mixture of dwelling styles and types • Taking advantage of the accessibility of the town centre, an age friendly neighbourhood with extra care housing and housing for wheel chair users and those with specialist supported housing needs • The potential inclusion of live/work units • A layout that maximises the potential for walkable neighbourhoods and enables a high degree of integration and connectivity between new and existing communities. New footpaths and cycleways should be provided that link to existing networks. • Provision of Green Infrastructure links beyond the development site to the wider town and open countryside • Open/urban spaces provided ~~located~~ in various locations within the site and new trees planted. • Development should promote biodiversity enhancement • The implementation of proposals in the Movement Strategy ~~tudy~~ including improved junction arrangements on Bridge Street and Cherwell Street to improve traffic capacity but also to facilitate pedestrian movement between the town centre and the site • Some car free or reduced levels of parking with innovative solutions	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				to accommodating the private car • Good accessibility to public transport services should be provided for • A transport assessment and Travel Plan to accompany development proposals • Appropriate treatment and remediation of contaminated land. • The completion of a flood risk assessment for the site • A sequential approach to development in relation to flood risk • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Provision of sustainable drainage in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), taking account of the recommendations of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment • Compliance with policies ESD 1-5 on climate change mitigation and adaptation. • A noise survey will be required to accompany any planning application.	
125	165	Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington New para C.188b	Support from the County Council due to a lack of spare education capacity Concern from CPRE about the modifications being based on SHMA 2014 which it considers to be flawed	No further minor modifications recommended	
126	165	Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington C.190	Objections to the review of the green belt around Kidlington. Use brownfield land instead Modifications are not sound a s they are based on the flawed 2014 SHMA More houses would put a strain on services and facilities.	As an urban area close to Oxford and a number of other villages, Kidlington is surrounded by Green Belt. The Local Plan's housing requirements and development strategy can be achieved without the need for a strategic review of the Green Belt in the district. The Oxfordshire District, City and County Councils are jointly considering how to accommodate any unmet needs arising from the wider Housing Market Area. Should it be agreed that this will require a strategic review of Green Belt affecting Cherwell, a partial review of the Local Plan would be triggered as set out at paragraph B.89b. With regard to Kidlington's own needs, ~~In terms of local housing need,~~ Policy Villages 1 and 2 provide some opportunity, small scale affordable housing schemes to meet specifically identified local housing need may be met	In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			There are no special circumstances to justify Green Belt review. Proposed industrial and residential developments at Oxford's Northern Gateway, Bicester and Woodstock will satisfy the need. Revised wording suggested by Oxford City. Needs to be a larger review of the Green Belt Kidlington Parish Council request reassurance on how local needs and the need for a local Green Belt review will be assessed and addressed through the masterplan process.	through the release of rural exception sites (Policy Villages 3), and the Kidlington Framework Masterplan will ~~also~~ help identify further opportunities. A Local Housing Needs Study will be commissioned in consultation with Kidlington Parish Council. If the village's local housing needs cannot be accommodated within the built up area a small scale local review of the Green Belt boundary around Kidlington will be undertaken as part of Local Plan Part 2, as indicated in Policy ESD 14.	
127	167	Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington Policy Kidlington 1: Accommodating High Value Employment Needs	The need for more employment land to be allocated at Kidlington. General support for amendment, associated ancillary uses also relate to other additional development at Begbroke Science Park and not just the airport. Detailed comments from Oxford City regarding Green Belt review Revised wording suggested	No further minor modifications recommended	
128	168	Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington C.199	Modifications to be unsound as they are based on the deeply flawed and unjustified Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 (SHMA) and are not consistent with national policy.	No further minor modifications recommended	
129	168	Policies for Cherwell's Places:	Modifications to be unsound as they are based on the deeply flawed and unjustified Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market	No further minor modifications recommended	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Kidlington Policy Kidlington 2: Strengthening Kidlington Village Centre	Assessment 2014 (SHMA) and are not consistent with national policy.		
130	170	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in the Villages and Rural Areas C.205	There is no contingency if the village school is unable to expand. Village Schools need to retain their rural character.	No further minor modifications recommended	
131	170	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Our Vision and Strategy for Our Villages and Rural Areas C.210	No comments received on main modification	No further minor modifications recommended	
132	171	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Our Vision and Strategy for Our Villages and Rural Areas C.212	No comments received on main modification	No further minor modifications recommended	
133	171	Our Villages and	No comments received on main modification	No further minor modifications recommended	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Rural Areas: What will Happen and Where C.212a			
134	171	Our Villages and Rural Areas: What will Happen and Where C.214	Revised policy wording suggested by Bloxham Parish Council regarding the provision of affordable housing and Neighbourhood Planning. Oxfordshire County Council suggests adding reference to providing funding for enhanced bus services along the main inter-urban routes, on a proportionate basis.	Our approach to providing development in the rural areas seeks to: • deliver a new settlement at former RAF Upper Heyford to enable conservation and environmental improvements and to contribute in meeting Cherwell wide and local housing needs • provide new housing for people in rural areas to meet, in particular, the needs of newly forming households • provide affordable housing in what are generally areas of higher housing cost • deliver housing at villages where local shops, services and job opportunities are available and accessible or where access to nearby towns would be sustainable in transport terms • consider the relationship between 'clusters' of villages • provide development to help sustain rural services and facilities including bus routes • avoid significant environmental harm • support the Neighbourhood Planning process.~~.~~	In response to representations
135	171 & 172	Our Villages and Rural Areas: What will Happen and Where C.215	Support/oppose village categorisation Support change to Category C villages to allow not only conversions but also infilling. Limiting residential development to that located within the built-up limits of settlements is not appropriate. There may be suitable opportunities to provide small-scaled evelopment on the edge of villages.	To this end, Policy Villages 1 provides a categorisation of the district's villages to ensure that unplanned, small-scale development within villages is directed towards those villages that are best able to accommodate limited growth. The Policy establishes which villages are, in principle, appropriate for conversions and infilling (Category C) and which are suitable for accommodating minor development (Categories A and B). Policy Villages 2 provides for additional planned development to be accommodated at the most sustainable villages (Category A) to meet district housing requirements and to help meet local needs. Policy Villages 3 seeks to respond to often acute issues of affordability in rural areas and allows for affordable housing to	Clarifications

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Concern about the categorisation of Bloxham	be provided in any of Cherwell's villages to meet locally identified needs in locations or on sites that might otherwise not be appropriate. Policy Villages 4 establishes a framework for addressing open space, sport and recreation deficiencies at the villages. Policy Villages 5 seeks to deliver the ~~-~~new and additional growth settlement at former RAF Upper Heyford.	
136	172	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation C.219a	The evidence that provides for the sustainability of village categorisation is flawed. The reference to under 10 should be removed and "up to and greater than 10" included within the policy. The Policy to restrict development within Policy 1 Villages generally to under 10 houses does not take reasonable account of site capacity. Concern about categorisation of Adderbury	Policy Villages 1 provides a categorisation of villages to guide the consideration of small-scale proposals for residential development within the built-up limits of settlements. Village categorisation helps understand which villages are in principle best placed to sustain different levels of residential development. The Policy ensures that unanticipated development within the built-up limits of a village is of an appropriate scale for that village, is supported by services and facilities and does not unnecessarily exacerbate travel patterns that are overly reliant on the private car and which incrementally have environmental consequences. Policy Villages 1 seeks to manage small scale development proposals (typically but not exclusively for less than 10 dwellings) which come forward within the built-up limits of villages. It also informs Policy Villages 2 which provides a rural allocation for sites of 10 or more dwellings at the most sustainable 'Category A' villages and which will guide the preparation of both the Local Plan Part 2 and ~~the preparation of~~ Neighbourhood Plans.	Clarifications / improvement to wording
137	173	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation C.221	Objection to the suggested categorisation based on availability of services and facilities. Concern about the potential unavailability of play facilities at Caversfield Concern about the categorisation of Finmere Concern about the categorisation of Bloxham Concern about the categorisation of Adderbury	No further modification recommended.	
138	173	Our Villages and	Satellite villages could become residential only	It is not proposed that clustering forms part of the development strategy In	Clarification

<table>
<tr><th>Mod No.</th><th>Page No.</th><th>Policy Paragraph</th><th>Summary of Issues Raised in Representations</th><th>Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)</th><th>Reason for Further Proposed Modification</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td>Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation

C.224</td><td>and residents driving to access all facilities.

Concern about the categorisation of Adderbury / Milton

Concern about the categorisation of Bloxham</td><td>‘Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas’ as the services and facilities in most satellite villages are too limited to sustainably accommodate the development of larger allocated sites. However, there is considered to be a role for satellite (‘Category B)’ villages to accommodate minor development which is set out in ‘Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation’ below.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>139</td><td>173</td><td>Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation

Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation</td><td>Concerns and support raised over the categorisation of some villages.

Minor development in the village categorisation table should be replaced by” considered on a site by site basis”.

There is discrepancy between proposed Modification 9 and proposed Modification 139 in regard to development in Category B villages. Modification 139 states that Category A and B villages could accept minor development, however Modification 9 shows minor development only in Category A villages.

Category C villages should not be restricted to infilling and conversions

Lower Heyford appears in both the Category A and Category B

Policy Villages 1 should separately identify the most sustainable villages in category A sustainability, as suitable for development of 10 or more dwellings subject to policy Villages 2 criteria

Concern about the categorisation of Milton</td><td>Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation

Proposals for residential development within the built-up limits of villages (including Kidlington) will be considered having regard to the categorisation below. Only Category A (Service Centres) and Category B (Satellite Villages) will be considered to be suitable for minor development in addition to infilling and conversions.

<table>
<tr><th>Category</th><th>Villages by Category</th><th>Type of Development</th></tr>
<tr><td>A</td><td>Service Villages

Adderbury, Ambrosden, Arncott, Begbroke, Bletchingdon (*), Bloxham, Bodicote, Chesterton, Cropredy, Deddington, Finmere, Fringford, Fritwell, Hook Norton, Kidlington, Kirtlington, Launton, ~~Lower Heyford~~, Milcombe, Sibford Ferris/Sibford Gower, Steeple Aston, Weston-on–the-Green(*), Wroxton, Yarnton</td><td>Minor Development

Infilling

Conversions</td></tr>
</table>
</td><td>Correction</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Mod No.</th><th>Page No.</th><th>Policy Paragraph</th><th>Summary of Issues Raised in Representations</th><th>Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)</th><th>Reason for Further Proposed Modification</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td></td><td></td><td>Concern about the categorisation of Milcombe

Concern about the categorisation of South Newington

Bloxham could accommodate more development</td><td><table>
<tr><td>B</td><td>Satellite Villages

Blackthorn, Claydon, Clifton, Great Bourton, Hempton, Lower Heyford, Middle Aston, Milton, Mollington, South Newington, and Wardington.</td><td>Minor Development

Infilling

Conversions</td></tr>
<tr><td>C</td><td>All other villages</td><td>Infilling

Conversions</td></tr>
</table>
(*) Denotes villages partly within and partly outside the Green Belt. In those parts that lie within the Green Belt, only infilling and conversions will be permitted.</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>140</td><td>174</td><td>Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation

C.226</td><td>Rural areas already contributed 35% of the recent growth, whereby further development would be unsustainable.</td><td>No further modification recommended</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>141</td><td>174</td><td>Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation

C.227</td><td>The modification will help control development in villages

Concern about the categorisation of Adderbury

Concern about the categorisation of Bloxham

The modification would result in increased risk of coalescence between settlements.

Greater clarity requested

Needs to be a more positive emphasis to development in rural areas</td><td>In assessing whether proposals constitute acceptable 'minor development', regard will be given to the following criteria:

• the size of the village and the level of service provision-
• the site's context within the existing built environment
• whether it is in keeping with the character and form of the village
• its local landscape setting
• careful consideration of the appropriate scale of development, particularly -in Category B (satellite) villages

In considering the scope of new residential development within the built-up limits of Kidlington, consideration will be given to its role as a larger service</td><td>In response to representations

Wording improvements</td></tr>
</table>

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				centre, ~~and~~ its urban character ~~as an urban area~~, ~~the~~ functions that existing gaps and spaces perform, ~~and~~ the quality of the built environment.	
142	174	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation C.228	There should be an acknowledgement of the acceptability of the redevelopment of previously used land in rural areas. The approach should be extended to the development of single dwellings Definition of infill would restrict the number of suitable development sites within the rural areas. Definition of infilling should be more flexible and also apply to the edge of villages to assist villages such as Merton Revised wording proposed allowing for further development with community support	No further modification proposed	
143	174	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation C.229	Some Category A settlements in Policy Villages 1 are not included in this paragraph: Begbroke / Bodicote / Fritwell / Hook Norton / Kidlington / Launton / Lower Heyford / Weston-on-the-Green. The change has created 2 separate lists of category A villages (with and without satellites) which is confusing. Concerned about categorisation of Milton and Adderbury Overdevelopment at Bloxham prevents it from	~~The category A villages which perform as 'service centres' with 'satellite' villages (forming a 'village cluster') are Adderbury, Ambrosden, Bloxham, Cropredy, Deddington, Kirtlington, Sibford Ferris/Sibford Gower, Steeple Aston and Yarnton. Arncott, Bletchingdon, Chesterton, Finmere, Fringford, Milcombe and Wroxton are Category A villages but do not have satellite villages.~~ Adderbury, Ambrosden, Arncott, Begbroke, Bletchingdon, Bloxham, Bodicote, Chesterton, Cropredy, Deddington, Finmere, Fringford, Fritwell, Hook Norton, Kidlington, Kirtlington, Launton, Milcombe, Sibford Ferris/Gower, Steeple Aston, Weston on the Green, Wroxton and Yarnton are Category A villages. The Category A villages which perform as 'service centres' for the 'satellite' villages (forming a 'village cluster') shown in the	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			performing a service centre function Object to use of the SHMA 2014	table at paragraph C.225 are Adderbury, Ambrosden, Bloxham, Cropredy, Deddington, and Steeple Aston.	
144	174	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation C.230	The village of Shipton should be included in the list of Category B villages. Concerned about categorisation of Milton and Adderbury	The category B villages are satellite villages associated with a larger service centre. The satellite villages are: Blackthorn, Claydon, Clifton, Great Bourton, Hempton, Lower Heyford, Middle Aston, Milton, Mollington, South Newington, and Wardington. They do not 'score' highly enough in their own right to be included as category A villages but are considered to be appropriate for minor development because of the benefits of access to a service centre within a village cluster. For example, Claydon, Great Bourton, Mollington and Wardington benefit from their relationship with Cropredy. As smaller settlements, the satellite villages have been given a separate 'B' Category as they would not be suitable for larger scale development provided for by Policy Villages 2.	
145	174	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 1: Village Categorisation New Para' C.230a	No comments received on main modification	All other villages ~~that are not service centres or satellite villages~~ are classified as category C villages.	
146	175	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth across the Rural Areas C.234a	Support/opposition for the increase in housing to 750 homes at Category A villages. Concern that housing figure is insufficient. Greater clarity requested Sites in rural areas should be identified in policy villages 2 and not left for identification in Part 2 of the Plan in order to meet district-wide housing need.	No further modification recommended	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Level of windfall allowance in rural areas should be increased. Increase housing provision for the rural areas to be accommodated at Kidlington, through Green Belt review. Kidlington should have a separate housing allocation. The Plan reinforces the patterns where villages and the rural areas are increasingly the preserve of the relatively wealth. Need to consider recent permissions and completions in villages before considering further development. Policy will result in shortage of affordable housing in villages and rural areas.		
147	175	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth across the Rural Areas Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas	Environment Agency suggests adding a new bullet point to the criteria for site assessment as follows: "Whether the development would have an adverse impact on flood risk." Support/opposition to the increased provision for the rural areas and the proposed assessment criteria. Rural development sites should be restricted to a maximum of 20 dwellings per sites. The Plan should identify the sites for the further 750 homes within or outside the built-up limits of the Category A villages and allocate	A total of 750 homes will be delivered at Category A villages. This will be in addition to the rural allowance for small site 'windfalls' and planning permissions for 10 or more dwellings as at 31 March 2014. Sites will be identified through the preparation of the Local Plan Part 2, through the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans where applicable, and through the determination of applications for planning permission. In identifying and considering sites, particular regard will be given to the following criteria: - whether the land has been previously developed land or is of lesser environmental value; - whether significant adverse impact on heritage or wildlife assets could be avoided - whether development would contribute in enhancing the built environment	In response to representation from the Environment Agency

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			them. The requirement for delivery of homes within the Category A should not be restricted to a total of 750 homes. There should be more development in the Category B villages Kidlington should have a separate allocation of housing to reflect its role as a service centre and location of significant employment The assessment criteria in could undermine neighbourhood plans. A number of representations have suggested the following amendment: Where a Neighbourhood Plan is not being prepared, when identifying and considering sites, particular regard will be given to the following criteria....." Policy may increase risk of coalescence between Settlements. Accept the need for a review of the Oxford Green Belt north of Oxford rather than to increase rural housing supply.	- whether best and most versatile agricultural land could be avoided - whether significant adverse landscape and impacts could be avoided - whether satisfactory vehicular and pedestrian access/egress could be provided - whether site is well located to services and facilities - whether necessary infrastructure could be provided - whether land considered for allocation is deliverable now or whether there is a reasonable prospect that it could be developed within the plan period - whether land the subject of an application for planning permission could be delivered within the next five years. - Whether the development would have an adverse impact on flood risk	
148	179	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford	The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford.	No further modification proposed	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		New para C.252a	Revised wording proposed. Should not rely on the 2014 SHMA which is deeply flawed.		
149	179	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford C.253	English Heritage welcomes and supports the updated text to the paragraph. Revised wording proposed. Failed to apply European Conventions on the protection of architectural and archaeological heritage. The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford.	No further modification proposed	
150	179	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford C.254	The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Minor wording changes are proposed. Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford. Supported as it confirms that Policy Villages 5 replaces Saved Structure Plan Policy H2. It would enable the consideration of additional housing development on the Upper Heyford site.	The site was previously subject to a policy from the Oxfordshire Structure Plan 2016 (Policy H2) which was saved by the South East Plan and retained upon the South East Plan's revocation. Policy Villages 5 below replaces Policy H2 in guiding the future redevelopment of the site and is intended to provide a positive policy framework within which opportunities to accommodate development are considered having regard to known constraints, principally heritage, ecology and transport impacts associated with additional development.	In response to a representation

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
151	179	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford C.255	The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford. Revised wording proposed. Suggested minor word changes to updated paragraph	No further modification recommended	
152	179	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford C.256	Modification should be more positive to facilitate redevelopment of the brownfield site and not to be constraint driven. The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford. Minor wording changes are proposed.	No further modification recommended	
153	180	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford C.257	The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford.	No further modification recommended.	
154	180	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy	Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford. Housing numbers	No further modification recommended	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford New para' C.258	from the Submission Local Plan should be reinstated. The SHMA has a flawed methodology. Objection to the strategy and the preferred locations. i.e. additional greenfield land. The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Access to public transport will need to be considered. Impact on existing infrastructure. Minor wording changes are proposed.		
155	180	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford New para' C.259	Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford. Housing numbers from the Submission Local Plan should be reinstated. The SHMA has a flawed methodology. The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Minor wording changes are proposed.	No further modification recommended	
156	180	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford New para' C.260	The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford. Delete reference to the 2005 Conservation Plan and the 2007 Planning Brief which have	Consultation with English Heritage will be required in formulating specific development proposals for the site, whilst regard should also be had to the following documents in preparing any such scheme: • Former RAF Upper Heyford Landscape Capacity and Sensitivity Assessment (2014) • Former RAF Upper Heyford Urban Capacity Assessment (2014) • The 2014 Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment	Correction

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			been superseded by the 2014 interim report English Heritage welcomes and supports proposed paragraph C.259. Suggestions for minor changes to the wording of the paragraph. Minor wording changes are proposed.	• The approved masterplan for the site approved in 2011 • RAF Upper Heyford Revised Comprehensive Planning Brief SPD (2007) • Former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Appraisal (2006) • Former RAF Upper Heyford Landscape Character Assessment of the Airbase South of the Cold War Zone (2006) • Former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Plan (2005) • Former RAF Upper Heyford Landscape and Visual Impact and Masterplan Report (2004) • Restoration of Upper Heyford Airbase – A Landscape Impact Assessment (1997)	
97	180	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford	Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford. Housing numbers from the Submission Local Plan should be reinstated. Only brownfield land should be developed on site and consideration is needed to assess the full capacity of the site. Opposed to the development of greenfield land to the south, east and west of the existing built up area. The SHMA has a flawed methodology. The whole flying field should be kept free from development. Tourism should be recognised as an important potential source of jobs. Fail to recognise the strategic importance of the site as an employment centre. Impact on the surrounding countryside and existing infrastructure. The affordable housing requirement needs to	**Former RAF Upper Heyford** **Development Area: 520 ha** **Development Description:** This site will provide for a settlement of approximately 1,600 dwellings (in addition to the 761 dwellings (net) already permitted) and necessary supporting infrastructure, including ~~a~~ primary and secondary education provision ~~school~~ and appropriate community, recreational and employment opportunities, enabling environmental improvements and the heritage interest of the site as a military base with Cold War associations to be conserved, compatible with achieving a satisfactory living environment. A comprehensive integrated approach will be expected. **Housing** • Number of homes – approximately 1,600 (in addition to the 761 (net) already permitted • Affordable housing – at least 30%	In response to representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
Page 103			be flexible. Other sustainable potential housing sites were not considered due to the absence of a Green Belt Review. The location of the Upper Heyford site is far less sustainable than the reasonable alternative of an urban extension to Oxford. Minor wording changes are proposed. Support/oppose the proposed additional housing on the site. Numbers should be increased/reduced to ensure sustainable development. The Increase in housing would adversely affect the historic environment. Support revision to the site's boundary as this will create a more 'complete' development. Opposed to the development of greenfield land to the south, east and west of the existing built up area. Case for preservation of substantial parts of the former airbase is overstated. Existing employment should be retained and increased as the settlement grows. Road infrastructure is inadequate - increase in capacity would have damaging consequences	**Employment** • Land Area – approx 120,000 sq. Metres • Jobs created – approx 1500 • Use classes – B1, B2, B8 • Any additional employment opportunities further to existing consent to be accommodated primarily within existing buildings within the overall site where appropriate or on limited greenfield land to the south of Camp Road. **Infrastructure Needs** All development proposals will be expected to contribute as necessary towards the delivery of infrastructure provision through onsite provision or an appropriate off-site financial contribution. ~~towards provision elsewhere in the wider site allocation, including the following:~~ • Education – provision of a 2.22 ha site for a new 1-1.5 form entry primary school and contributions to primary and secondary school place provision • Health – contributions required to health care provision • Open Space – sports pitches, sports pavilion, play areas, indoor sport provision • Community Facilities – nursery, community hall, local centre/hotel, , a neighbourhood police facility • Access and Movement – transport contributions and sustainable travel measures as detailed below, countryside access measures, fencing along the boundary of the new settlement and the Flying Field • Utilities – contamination remediation. Improvements to the water supply and sewerage network, as well as other utilities, may be required.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			for this predominantly rural environment. The supply and sewage treatment networks are unlikely to be able to support the demand anticipated from Former RAF Upper Heyford. Investigations will be required.	**Key site specific design and place shaping principles:** • Proposals must demonstrate that the conservation of heritage resources, landscape, restoration, enhancement of biodiversity and other environmental improvements will be achieved across the whole of the site identified as Policy Villages 5 • In order to avoid development on the most historically significant and sensitive parts of the site, new development is to be focused to the south of the flying field and on limited greenfield land to the south of Camp Road (and one greenfield area to the north of Camp Road, east of Larsen Road). • The areas proposed for development adjacent to the flying field will need special consideration to respect the historic significance and character of the taxiway and entrance to the flying field, with development being kept back from the northern edge of the indicative development areas. • The release of greenfield land within the allocated site Policy Villages 5 will not be allowed to compromise the necessary environmental improvements and conservation of heritage interest of the wider site. • The settlement should be designed to encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport rather than travel by private car, with the provision of footpaths and cycleways that link to existing networks. Improved access to public transport will be required ~~including considering the provision of linkages between the site and the train station at Lower Heyford~~ • Development should accord with Policy ESD 16 and include layouts that maximise the potential for walkable neighbourhoods with a legible hierarchy of routes • Retention and enhancement of existing Public Rights of Way, and the provision of links from the development to the wider Public Rights of Way network • Layouts should enable a high degree of integration with development areas within the Policy Villages 5 allocation, with connectivity between new and existing communities	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				• Measures to minimise the impact of traffic generated by the development on the surrounding road network will be required through funding and/or physical works, including to any necessary capacity improvements around Junction 10 of the M40, and to the rural road network to the west of the site and around Middleton Stoney including traffic calming and management measures. • Development ~~should~~ will provide for good accessibility to public transport services and a plan for public transport provision ~~should~~will accompany any planning application • Design and layout should reflect the management and mitigation of noise impacts associated with the development • A Travel Plan should accompany any development proposals • The construction of the settlement on the former technical core and residential areas should retain buildings, structures, spaces and trees that contribute to the character and appearance of the site and integrate them into a high quality place that creates a satisfactory living environment. • Integration of the new community into the surrounding network of settlements by reopening historic routes and encouraging travel by means other than private car as far as possible • The preservation of the stark functional character and appearance of the flying field beyond the settlement area, including the retention of buildings of national interest which contribute to the area's character (with limited, fully justified exceptions) and sufficient low key re-use of these to enable appropriate management of this area. • The achievement of environmental improvements within the site and of views to it including the removal of buildings and structures that do not make a positive contribution to the special character or which are justified on the grounds of adverse visual impact, including in proximity to the proposed settlement, together with limited appropriate landscape mitigation, and reopening of historic routes. • The conservation and enhancement of the ecological interest of the Flying Field through appropriate management and submission of an Ecological Mitigation and Management Plan, with biodiversity	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				preserved and enhanced across the site identified as Policy Villages 5, and wildlife corridors enhanced, restored or created, including the provision for habitat for great crested newts and ground nesting birds in particular. A net gain in biodiversity will be sought. • Development should protect and enhance the Local Wildlife Site (including the new extension to the south)Visitor access, controlled where necessary, to (and providing for interpretation of) the historic and ecological assets of the site • Provision of a range of high quality employment opportunities, capable of being integrated into the fabric of the settlement, and providing that the use would not adversely affect residents or other businesses and would not have an unacceptable impact on the surrounding landscape, historic interest of the site, or on nearby villages • New and retained employment buildings should make a positive contribution to the character and appearance of the area and should be located and laid out to integrate into the structure of the settlement • A full arboricultural survey should be undertaken to inform the masterplan, incorporating as many trees as possible and reinforcing the planting structure where required • New development should reflect high quality design that responds to the established character of the distinct character areas where this would preserve or enhance the appearance of the Former RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area • New development should also preserve or enhance the character and appearance of the Rousham, Lower Heyford and Upper Heyford Conservation Area, as well as the Oxford Canal Conservation Area, and their settings • Development on greenfield land within Policy Villages 5 should provide for a well-designed, 'soft' approach to the urban edge, with appropriate boundary treatments • Management of the Flying Field should preserve the Cold War character of this part of the site, and allow for public access. New built development on the Flying Field will be resisted to preserve the	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				character of the area • ~~Development proposals should be informed by A~~a Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment, as well as ~~and~~ a Heritage ~~Impact~~ Assessment, should be undertaken as part of development proposals and inform the design principles for the site. • Proposals should demonstrate an overall management approach for the whole site • A neighbourhood centre or hub should be established at the heart of the settlement to comprise a , community hall, place of worship, shops, public house, restaurant, and social and health care facilities. Proposals should also provide for a heritage centre given the historic interest and Cold War associations of the site • The removal or remediation of contamination or potential sources of contamination will be required across the whole site • The scale and massing of new buildings should respect their context. Building materials should reflect the locally distinctive colour palette and respond to the materials of the retained buildings within their character area, without this resulting in pastiche design solutions • Public art should be provided • Recycling and potential reuse of demolition materials where possible • The provision of extra care housing and the opportunity for self build affordable housing in accordance with Policies BSC 3 and BSC 4 • Public open space should be provided to form a well connected network of green areas, suitable for formal and informal recreation • Provision of Green Infrastructure links to the wider development area and open countryside • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Provision of sustainable drainage including SuDS in accordance with Policy ESD 7: Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS), taking account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment Development should be set back from watercourses. • Demonstration of climate change mitigation and adaptation measures including exemplary demonstration of compliance with the	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				requirements of policies ESD1 – 5 • Development on the site will be required to investigate the potential to make connections to and utilise heat from the ~~Ardley Energy from Waste~~Energy Recovery ~~f~~Facility to supply the heat demands of residential and commercial development on the site • In all instances development proposals will be subject to the other appropriate development plan policies. • An archaeological field evaluation to assess the impact of the development on archaeological features	
158	185	Section D: The IDP D.21	Objection to the removal of the primary school provision.	No further modification recommended.	
159	185	Section D: The IDP D.22	Number of new homes at NW Bicester could be increased.	No further modification recommended.	
160	185	Section D: The IDP D.22a	Objection to the housing increase proposed at Former RAF Upper Heyford. Housing numbers from the Submission Local Plan should be reinstated. The SHMA has a flawed methodology. No special circumstances demonstrated to justify small local reviews of the Green Belt. Developments at Oxford's Northern Gateway, Bicester and Woodstock will provide more than adequate need of Kidlington. Objection to the term "small scale" in relation to the review of the Green Belt. Local housing needs assessment of Kidlington is needed before undertaking any Green Belt	No further modification recommended.	

Formatted: Font: (Default) Arial, 10 pt

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			reviews. Minor wording changes are proposed.		
161	186	Section D: The IDP D.22c	Number of new homes at NW Bicester could be increased.	No further modification recommended.	
162	186	Section D: The IDP D.22c	Objection raised to the proposed site for the Banbury Football Club.	No further modification recommended.	
163	187	Section D: The IDP D.22c	Concerned about the housing number at Former RAF Upper Heyford. Housing provision for the rural areas and Kidlington should be increased with Kidlington/Begbroke having its own separate allocation of housing requirement. Any Green Belt review should reflect Oxford University's aspirations in relation to the Science Park.	No further modification recommended.	
164	190	Section E: Monitoring and Delivery E.11	Any loss of playing fields or recreational facilities should be relocated to other parts of the site.	No further modification recommended.	
165	190	Section E: Monitoring and Delivery E.12	The role and significance of Neighbourhood Planning has been diluted.	No further modification recommended.	
166	192	Section E: Monitoring and Delivery E.22	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
167	193	Section E: Monitoring and Delivery Table 15	Housing trajectory is overly optimistic and ambitious. Impacts of the proposed growth at Kidlington and rural areas.	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Different delivery rates at Former RAF Upper Heyford in the SHLAA and the Local Plan. More housing should be allocated in the rural areas. The Plan does not provide a 5 year supply of housing at adoption. Windfall developments questioned. New additional allocations should be included There should be no restriction on the amount of housing that can come forward during the Local Plan period at NW Bicester.		

<table>
<tr><th>Mod No.</th><th>Page No.</th><th>Policy Paragraph</th><th>Summary of Issues Raised in Representations</th><th>Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)</th><th>Reason for Further Proposed Modification</th></tr>
<tr><td>168</td><td>195</td><td>Section E: Monitoring and Delivery
Table 16</td><td>The total site area and land for employment uses needs reviewing.</td><td>Table 16: Employment Trajectory
<table><tr><th>Site</th><th>Total area of land covered by site Policy in the Local Plan (ha)</th><th>Area (ha) of total land allocated expected to provide for employment uses within the Plan period</th></tr><tr><td>North West Bicester (Bicester 1)</td><td>~~374~~390</td><td>10</td></tr><tr><td>Land West of M40 (Banbury 6)</td><td>~~48~~35</td><td>~~48~~35</td></tr><tr><td>Land north east of junction 11 (Banbury 15)</td><td>~~35~~49</td><td>~~35~~49</td></tr><tr><td>GRAND TOTALS</td><td></td><td>23~~4~~5.5 ha</td></tr></table></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>169</td><td>Appendix 5: Maps</td><td>5.1 District Policies Map</td><td>The green buffers and settlement boundaries needs reviewing.</td><td>Green buffer boundaries to be reviewed in relation to sites with planning permissions (commitments).</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>170</td><td>Appendix 5: Maps</td><td>5.2 Key Policies map: Bicester</td><td>The green buffers and settlement boundaries needs reviewing.

The Technical Site and Flying Field at Bicester Airfield should be allocated as a strategic employment site.</td><td>Green buffer boundaries to be reviewed in relation to sites with planning permissions (commitments).</td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>171</td><td>Appendix 5: Maps</td><td>5.3 Key Policies map: Banbury</td><td>The green buffers and settlement boundaries needs reviewing.</td><td>Amendment to the Key as follows:

~~Existing Retail Parks~~ to Committed/existing Retail Parks</td><td></td></tr>
</table>

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			Drafting error in the Key.	Green buffer boundaries to be reviewed in relation to sites with planning permissions (commitments).	
172	Appendix 5: Maps	5.4 Key Policies map: Kidlington	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
173	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester 1 North West Bicester	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
174	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester 2 Land at Graven Hill	The creation of an Eastern perimeter road should be located to the South East.	No further modification recommended.	
175	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester 5 Strengthening Bicester Town Centre	Concern regarding connectivity from and to Bicester Town Centre, particularly the London Road access.	No further modification recommended.	
176	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester 10 Bicester Gateway	Drafting error for Policy Bicester 10 Bicester Gateway.	Map correction for Policy Bicester 10 Bicester Gateway.	
177	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester 11 Employment Land at North East Bicester	The Technical Site and Flying Field at Bicester Airfield should be allocated as a strategic employment site.	No further modification recommended.	
178	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester 12 South East Bicester	Concern regarding the extension of South East Bicester. Risk of coalescence with Bicester and Launton. The green buffer around Launton should be extended.	No further modification recommended.	
179	Appendix	Bicester 12 South	No representation received on this	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
	5:	East Bicester	modification.		
180	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester 13 Gavray Drive	The River Ray Conservation Target Area boundary should be removed. The extent of the River Ray Conservation Target area has not been identified.	No further modification recommended.	
181	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester green buffer		No further modification recommended.	
182	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester - green buffer	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
183	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester -committed site	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
184	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester - committed site	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
185	Appendix 5: Maps	Bicester - committed site	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
186	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury 1 Canalside	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
187	Appendix 5:	Banbury 2 Land at Southam Road	Objection to the revised site boundary and inclusion of the land within the green buffer.	No further modification recommended.	
188	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury 4 Bankside Phase 2	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
189	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury 6 Employment Land West M40	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
190	Appendix	Banbury 12 (Land for	No representation received on this	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
	5: Maps	the Relocation of Banbury United Football Club	modification.		
191	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury 15 Employment Land NE of Junction 11	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
192	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury 16 Land South of Salt Way – West	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
193	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury 17 South of Salt Way – East	Drafting error for Policy Banbury 17 South of Salt Way East.	Map correction for Policy Banbury 17 South of Salt Way East.	
194	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury 18 Land at Drayton Lodge Farm	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
195	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury 19 Land at Higham Way	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
196	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury green buffers	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
197	Appendix 5: Maps	Banbury green buffers	Inconsistency when allocating strategic sites.	No further modification recommended.	
198	Appendix 5: Maps	West of Warwick Road, Banbury	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
199	Appendix 5: Maps	Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
200	Appendix 5: Maps	Theme Map - Economy	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
201	290	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Theme Three)		No further modification recommended.	
202	291	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Theme Three)		No further modification recommended.	
203	291	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Theme Three)		No further modification recommended.	
204	292	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Theme Three)		No further modification recommended.	
205	294	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Bicester)		No further modification recommended.	
206	295	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Banbury)		No further modification recommended.	
207	296	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Banbury)		No further modification recommended.	
208	296	Appendix 6: Monitoring		No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Framework (Banbury)			
209	296	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Banbury)		No further modification recommended.	
210	296	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Banbury)		No further modification recommended.	
211	296	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Banbury)		No further modification recommended.	
212	299	Appendix 7: List of Replaced and Retained Saved Policies		No further modification recommended.	
213	300	Appendix 7: List of Replaced and Retained Saved Policies	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
214	302	Appendix 7: List of Replaced and Retained Saved Policies	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
215	302	Appendix 7: List of Replaced and Retained Saved Policies	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
216	302	Appendix 7: List of	No representation received on this	No further modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Replaced and Retained Saved Policies	modification.		
217	304	Appendix 7: List of Replaced and Retained Saved Policies	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
218	304	Appendix 7: List of Replaced and Retained Saved Policies	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
219	304	Appendix 7: List of Replaced and Retained Saved Policies	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
~~220~~	304	Appendix 7: List of Replaced and Retained Saved Policies		No further modification recommended.	
221	304	Appendix 7: List of Replaced and Retained Saved Policies	No representation received on this modification.	No further modification recommended.	
222	307	Appendix 8: Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)	The new A4095 NW Strategic Link Road has not been included. New development for waste management infrastructure has not been included. Changes and improvements to Howes Lane	Modifications to the IDP relating to the all the issues raised. -	Changes to supporting evidence resulting from representations

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Proposed Modifications (STRIKETHROUGHS AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			and Lords Lane to facilitate integration of new development within the town Remove Item 26 of Kidlington and Rural Areas on Fire Service. Consideration needed on improvements to public transport and impact on existing road network. Consideration needed on the eastern perimeter road and western route at Bicester Assurance needed on school places. Library provision with community hub at Former RAF Upper Heyford Revised wording and corrections proposed.		Corrections
222	307	Appendix 8: Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)	Request amendments to the wording of Policy INF1 reflecting the agreement for a review of the plan to accommodate future infrastructure needs, if it is determined to be necessary	See Further Minor Modifications 315a and 318a	In response to representation
222	307	Appendix 8: Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)	Add reference to delivery of high quality public transport to all strategic site policies to Bicester town centre. Remove reference to Bicester 3 in site policy column (items 12a & 26f) Remove Banbury lines 52&53 as already secured	No further modification recommended	

Page 119

This page is intentionally left blank

Cherwell District Council

Proposed Minor Modifications to the (Submission) Local Plan (Part 1)

Schedule of Issues and Further Proposed Modifications October 2014

Further Proposed Modifications (October 2014):

Modified text - Deleted text shown as ~~struck through~~

Additional text shown <u>underlined</u>

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
223	Executive Summary, p. viii	2nd bullet point	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
224	Executive Summary p. ix	Dynamic Town Centres	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
225	Executive Summary, p. xii	Affordable Housing	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
226	16	Introduction to the Local Plan: The Role of the Local Plan 1.17	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
227	17	Introduction to the Local Plan: The Planning Context for the Local Plan 1.22c	Need to consider Oxford City's unmet housing need. Minor wording changes are proposed.	No further minor modification recommended.	
228	18	Introduction to the Local Plan: The Structure of the Local Plan Section E 'Monitoring Delivery of the Local Plan':	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
229	19	Introduction to the Local Plan: How the Local Plan has been Prepared 1.41	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
230	19	1.41a	No representation on this modification.	Change text as follows:- The Council consulted upon the Proposed	Update plan text.

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				Submission Local Plan in August 2012, ~~and~~ Proposed Changes to the Proposed Submission Local Plan in March 2013 and Proposed Modifications in August 2014. The responses received have informed the Local Plan at all stages.	
231	21	Introduction to the Local Plan: Duty to Cooperate 1.49e	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
232	22	Introduction to the Local Plan: Other Policy Links and Additional Local Policy Guidance 1.52	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
233	25	Strategy for Development in Cherwell: Cherwell in 2031 A.6	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
234	35	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Introduction B.17	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
235	35	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Introduction B.19	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
236	35	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Introduction B.20			
237	36	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Introduction B.25	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
238	36	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Introduction	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		B.30			
239	38	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 1 B.45	No representation on this modification.	The Local Plan Part 2 will consider where further, smaller, allocations need to be made in the urban and rural areas to support the delivery of a flexible supply of employment land. Where new small sites are proposed we will consider the most appropriate use class for the location. Opportunities for developing small 'hubs' of activity to meet local needs will be explored. New employment uses will be supported where appropriate in residential areas, where they are proposed on existing employment sites and comply with other policies in the Local Plan. Employment development will be focused at the more sustainable villages. ~~'Policy for Villages 2: Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas' identifies the villages considered to be the most sustainable to accommodate planned new housing development.~~ These villages are also considered to be the most appropriate for any further planned employment development.	Correction
240	41	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Economy: Policy SLE 2 B.53			
241	44	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 3 B.64	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
242	45	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 4 B.71	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
243	46	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 4 SLE 4: Improved Transport Connections	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
244	47	Policies for Development in Cherwell: Theme One: Policies for Developing a Sustainable Local Economy: Policy SLE 5 SLE 5: High Speed Rail 2 – London to Birmingham	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
245	56	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 6 B.136	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
246	56	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 6 B.138	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
247	57	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 6 B.140	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
248	60	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 9 B.153	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
249	60	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities : Policy BSC 10 B.158	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
250	61	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 10 B.160	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
251	61	Theme 2: Policies for Building Sustainable	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		communities: Policy BSC 10 B.160			
252	61	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities : Policy BSC 10 B.162	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
253	62	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities : Policy BSC 11 B.164	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
254	65	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities Policy BSC 11: Local	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Standards of Provision – Outdoor Recreation			
255	65	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities : Policy BSC 12 B.169	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
256	66	Theme Two: Policies for Building Sustainable communities: Policy BSC 12 B.171	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
257	69	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 1 B.181	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
258	69	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 1 B.182	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
259	69	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 1 B.183	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
260	69	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development Policy ESD 1 ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Change			
261	70	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development Policy ESD 1 ESD 1: Mitigating and Adapting to Climate Change	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
262	70	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 2 B.184	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
263	71	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development : Policy ESD 2	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		B.187			
264	71	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 3 B.190	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
265	73	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 5 B.195	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
266	75	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development Policy ESD 6 ESD 6: Sustainable Flood Risk Management	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
267	76	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 6 B.205	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
268	76	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 6 B.208	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
269	80	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 8 B.220	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
270	80	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 9 B.224	No representation on this modification.	Appropriate measures as recommended by the HRA have been incorporated to avoid or minimise the effect of the plan proposals on the SAC in relation to water quality, natural groundwater flow, air quality and recreational use. A revised HRA was undertaken (2012) to accompany the Proposed Submission Local Plan to ensure that the plan proposals will not result in adverse effects on the SAC. Addendums to the HRA were published to accompany the focused consultation on proposed changes to the Plan (March 2013) and the Submission Local Plan (October 2013) which confirmed that there would be no likely significant effects on any Natura 2000 Sites as a result of the proposals within the Plan. A ~~further Addendum to the~~ HRA (Stage 1 Screening) re-affirming these conclusions accompanies the proposed modifications to the Plan.	To reflect that a Habitats Regulations Assessment (Stage 1 Screening) accompanies the proposed modifications rather than an Addendum.
271	80	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 9 B.225	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
271a	84	B.237	The text does not make the aims of the Conservation Target Areas clear or where additional information can be found.	Modify second sentence to read: The Target Areas have been identified to focus work to restore biodiversity at a landscape scale through the maintenance, restoration and creation of UK BAP priority habitats, and this is their principle aim. ~~and~~	For clarification, in response to representation from Natural England

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
				ŧThey therefore have a major role to play in achieving Strategic Objective 15 (Section A: Strategy for Development in Cherwell)."	
271b	84	B.239	The text does not make the aims of the Conservation Target Areas clear or where additional information can be found.	Amend first two sentences to read General targets for maintenance, restoration and creation of habitats have been set for each area, to be achieved through a combination of biodiversity project work undertaken by a range of organisations, agri-environment schemes and biodiversity enhancements secured in association with development. These targets are in the process of being made more specific in terms of the amount of each habitat type to be secured within each Conservation Target Area (see Wild Oxfordshire's website, http://www.wildoxfordshire.org.uk/biodiversity/conservation-target-areas/).	For clarification, in response to representation from Natural England
272	84	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 11 B.240	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
273	86	Theme Three: Policies for	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 13 B.245			
274	86	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 13 B.247	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
275	89	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 14 B.256	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
276	89	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 14	Need for allocation of significant development, potentially in the Green Belt.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		ESD 14: Oxford Green Belt			
277	89	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 15	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
278	90	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 15 B.260a	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
279	92	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 16 ESD 16: The Character of the Built and	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Historic Environment			
280	93	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 16 ESD 16: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
281	93	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 16 ESD 16: The Character of the Built and Historic Environment	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
282	94	Theme Three: Policies for	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 17 B.274			
283	96	Theme Three: Policies for ensuring Sustainable Development: Policy ESD 18 B.282	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
284	99	Policies for Cherwell's Places: Introduction C.6	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
285	101	Policies for Cherwell's Places: Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in Bicester	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		C.11			
286	116	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2	No representation on this modification.	Amend 18th bullet point of key site specific design and place shaping principles as follows:- Land to be provided for and assist in facilitating a~~A~~ community woodland/green buffer to be provided between Chesterton village and the Development Area (Policy ESD 15).	For consistency with recommendation to Main Modification 76.
287	116	Policy Bicester 3: South West Bicester Phase 2	No representation on this modification.	Insert the following to the site specific and place shaping principles:- • Take account of the Council's Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for the site • Development proposals to be accompanied and influenced by a landscape and visual impact assessment ~~together with~~and a heritage impact assessment.	For consistency with recommendation to Main Modification 76.
288	119	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 5 – Strengthening Bicester Town Centre C.64	Inconsistencies created within some of the Local Plan's retail policies are not addressed. Expansion of the town centre needs careful consideration.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
289	119	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 5 – Strengthening Bicester Town Centre C.66		No further minor modification recommended.	
290	119	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 5 – Strengthening Bicester Town Centre C.67	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
291	120	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 6 – Bure Place Town Centre Redevelopmen t Phase 2 C.74	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
292	121	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 7 – Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation C.77	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
293	122	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 7 – Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation C.82	Agreement that further work should be carried out as part of Local Plan Part 2.	No further minor modification recommended.	
294	122	Bicester: Strategic Development: Bicester 7 – Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport	Agreement that further work should be carried out as part of Local Plan Part 2.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		and Recreation C.84			
295	132	Banbury C.108	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
296	136	Banbury: What will happen and where C.128	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
297	137-138	Banbury: Policy Banbury 1: Canalside	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
298	149	Policy Banbury 5: North of Hanwell Fields	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
299	153	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 7 – Strengthening Banbury Town Centre	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		C.154a			
300	153	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 7 – Strengthening Banbury Town Centre C.154c	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
301	156	Banbury: Policy Banbury 9 Spiceball Development Area	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
302	161	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 11 - Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation C.175	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
303	162	Banbury: Strategic Development: Banbury 13 - Burial Site Provision in Banbury C.181	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
304	166	Policies for Cherwell's Places: Kidlington C.195	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
305	169	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Meeting the Challenge of Developing a Sustainable Economy in the Villages and Rural Areas C.201	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
306	172	Our Villages and Rural Areas: What will Happen and Where C.217	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
307	175	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth across the Rural Areas C.234	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
308	176	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 2: Distributing Growth across the Rural Areas C.235	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
309	179	Our Villages and Rural	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		Areas: Policy Villages 4: Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation C.249			
310	179	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 4: Meeting the Need for Open Space, Sport and Recreation C.250	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
311	179	Our Villages and Rural Areas: Policy Villages 5: Former RAF Upper Heyford C.251	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
Section D: The Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP)					

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
312	183	Section D: The IDP D.6	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
313	184	Section D: The IDP Policy INF 1	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
314	184	Section D: The IDP D.13	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
315	186	Section D: The IDP D.22b	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
Section E: Monitoring and Delivery of the Local Plan					
New Mod 315a	189	E.2	The County Council considers that it may be necessary to conduct an early review of the plan in response to emerging infrastructure needs. At such time that it is able to determine the scale and timing of needed infrastructure, it seeks to retain the flexibility of an early review to meet such needs if appropriate. OCC would request that this	Our monitoring report will measure and report on the effectiveness of policies within the Local Plan and associated documents. It will report on a range of data to assess whether: • policy targets have been met, or progress is being made towards meeting them • policy targets are not being met, or are not on track to being achieved, and the reasons for this • policies are having an impact in respect of national and local policy targets, and any other targets • identified in local development documents	In response to a representation from the County Council.

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			flexibility and agreement to a possible early review or other amendments as it pertains to infrastructure to be incorporated in section E of the plan (Monitoring and Delivery of the Local Plan). Given the expected further development of infrastructure requirements for the plan, the County Council would like to see Paragraph E.25 strengthened and positioned as a key part of the monitoring section, with specific reference to infrastructure requirements. At E.2 add a bullet point to "assess whether sufficient infrastructure is in place" insert wording to this effect which includes 'infrastructure requirements'.	• policies need adjusting or replacing because they are not working as intended • policies need changing to reflect changes in national policy or strategic needs • <u>appropriate infrastructure is being delivered to support growth.</u>	
316	191	Section E: Monitoring and Delivery E.15	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
317	191-192	Section E: Monitoring and Delivery E.18	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
318	192	Section E: Monitoring and Delivery E.20	Need to consider the importance of meeting the full objectively assessed need including any unmet need arising from Oxford City. Minor wording changes proposed.	No further minor modification recommended.	
New Mod 318a	192	E.25	The County Council considers that it may be necessary to conduct an early review of the plan in response to emerging infrastructure needs. At such time that it is able to determine the scale and timing of needed infrastructure, it seeks to retain the flexibility of an early review to meet such needs if appropriate. OCC would request that this flexibility and agreement to	Annual monitoring will inform future Local Plan reviews. These reviews may be in response to shortfalls in ~~on~~ the implementation of the Plan's policies and in the delivery of infrastructure, to changes in national policy or strategic needs, or due to ~~-~~the need to roll forward the plan period. Some small scale review of policy could in some instances be undertaken through preparation of other Development Plan Documents or their review. The possibility of an early Plan review to help meet unmet needs arising from elsewhere in the Housing Market Area is provided for at paragraph B.89b.	In response to a representation from the County Council.

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
			a possible early review or other amendments as it pertains to infrastructure to be incorporated in section E of the plan (Monitoring and Delivery of the Local Plan). Given the expected further development of infrastructure requirements for the plan, the County Council would like to see Paragraph E.25 strengthened and positioned as a key part of the monitoring section, with specific reference to infrastructure requirements.		
Appendix 1: Background to Cherwell's Places					
319	198	Appendix 1 Para' 1.9	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
320	198	Appendix 1 Para' 1.10	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
321	198	Appendix 1 Para' 1.12	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
322	198	Appendix 1 Para' 1.13	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
323	200	Appendix 1 New sub-heading	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
324	200	Appendix 1 New para 1.28	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
325	200	Appendix 1 New para 1.29	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
Appendix 2: Links Between Policies and Objectives					
326	202	Appendix 2 (Theme Three)	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
327	203	Appendix 2 (Bicester)	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
328	203	Appendix 2 (Banbury)	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
329	203	Appendix 2 (Banbury)	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
330	203	Appendix 2 (Banbury)	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
331	203	Appendix 2 (Banbury)	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
332	203	Appendix 2 (Banbury)	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
333	204	Appendix 2 (Our Villages and Rural Areas)	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	
Appendix 3: Evidence Base & Relevant Documents/Data Sources					
334	205	Appendix 3 Evidence Base & Relevant Documents/Data Sources	Support for the modification	No further minor modification recommended.	
Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework					
New Mod 334a	287	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Theme One)	New row needed for Policy PSD1.	New row to be inserted at the start of the table for Policy PSD1: Policy PSD1. Local Plan indicators: N/A. Target N/A.	Policy underpins all other policies in the Local Plan.
New Mod 334b	291	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Theme Three)	Target is needed for the new indicator for Policy ESD10.	Target to be included for the new indicator for Policy ESD 10: ESD10: Protection and enhancement of Biodiversity and the Natural Environment. Local Plan Indicators: Total LWS/LGS Target: An annual increase over the plan period.	For consistency with recommendation to Main Modification 202.
335	292	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework	No representation on this modification.	No further minor modification recommended.	

Mod No.	Page No.	Policy Paragraph	Summary of Issues Raised in Representations	Further Minor Modification Proposed (STRIKETHROUGH AND UNDERLINED TEXT)	Reason for Further Proposed Modification
		(Theme Three)			
335a	296	Appendix 6: Monitoring Framework (Banbury)	Minor wording changes are proposed.	Amend indicator and target for Banbury 11 to read: Indicator: Progress on delivering the Banbury linear park. Target: as set out in Policy Banbury 11.	Be more specific to the provisions of the policy.

Submission Cherwell Local Plan (January 2014) Proposed Modifications (October 2014)

Addendum to Topic Paper 2: Housing Village Categorisation Update 2014

Introduction

1. This addendum explains how in preparing Proposed Modifications to the Submission Local Plan updated information on village services and facilities, on population and on public transport services has been taken into account in reviewing village categorisation and Policy Villages 1. Further minor updates were made in October 2014 following representations received to the proposed modifications.

2. Topic Paper 2: *Housing* was prepared to assist the Examination of the Submission Local Plan (January 2014) and explained the process of preparing the Local Plan's policies for housing including those on village categorisation (Policy Villages 1) and on distributing housing growth across the rural areas (Policy Villages 2). A Technical Note on Village Categorisation and Village Clustering was included in the Topic Paper as Appendix 3. The Technical Note explains how Policy Villages 1 of the Submission Local Plan was prepared and how Cherwell's villages were categorised having regard to the following considerations:

   - Rural issues In Cherwell
   - Sustainability criteria including the provision of services and facilities, the distance to urban areas having regard to the availability of bus services, population size and the availability of potential sources of employment (established employment areas)
   - The weighting of different services and facilities as important amenities
   - Village clustering – the relationship between larger, service centre villages and 'satellite' villages
   - The Cherwell Rural Areas Integrated Transport and Land Use Study (CRAITLUS) – which assessed the transport sustainability of villages
   - The final balancing of services and facility provision against transport considerations

3. Policy Villages 1 of the Submission Local Plan included a proposed categorisation of villages having regard to the above considerations. It also proposed that different levels or types of 'windfall', residential development be 'allowed' for the three categories of villages identified. The assessment was also used as the starting point for Policy Villages 2 – Distributing Growth Across the Rural Areas before land availability considerations were taken into account.

4. The Category A villages in the Submission Local Plan (January 2014) are listed below in Table 1. In these villages, minor development, infilling and conversions were permitted within built-up limits.

Table 1 - A: Category A Villages in the Submission Local Plan, Jan 2014, Policy Villages 1

Adderbury	Ambrosden
Begbroke	Bloxham
Bodicote	Cropredy
Deddington	Fritwell
Hook Norton	Kidlington
Kirtlington	Launton
Steeple Aston	Sibford Ferris/Gower
Weston-on-the-Green (outside Green Belt)	Yarnton

5. The Category B villages in the Submission Local Plan (January 2014) are listed below in Table 2. In these villages, infilling and conversions were permitted within built-up limits. Satellite villages with a relationship with a larger service village were also included within category B:

Table 1 - B: Category B Villages in the Submission Local Plan, Jan 2014, Policy Villages 1

Arncott	*Satellite Villages*
Bletchingdon	Blackthorn
Chesterton	Claydon
Finmere	Clifton
Fringford	Great Bourton
Islip	Hempton
Middleton Stoney	Lower Heyford
Milcombe	Middle Aston
Wroxton	Milton
	Mollington
	South Newington
	Wardington

6. All other villages were considered to be category C villages in which only conversions were permitted within the built-up limits of villages.

7. The categorisation in Policy Villages 1 of the Submission Local Plan sought to ensure that unplanned, small-scale development within villages is directed towards those villages that are best able to accommodate limited growth. The Policy sought to ensure that unanticipated development within the built-up limits of a village would be of an appropriate scale for that village, would be supported by services and facilities and would not unnecessarily exacerbate travel patterns that are overly reliant on the private car and which incrementally have environmental consequences. Policy Villages 1 sought to manage small scale development proposals (typically but not exclusively for less than 10 dwellings) which come forward within the built-up limits of villages. It also informed Policy Villages 2.

8. The information presented in this addendum explains the reasons for the changes to village categorisation in the Proposed Modifications (August 2014) to the Submission Local Plan (January 2014). The revised categorisation has been used to inform the study area for the 2014 Update of the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).

National Policy

9. The Local Plan is informed by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and the National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG). The paragraphs in the NPPF most pertinent to village policy are as follows:

'*To promote sustainable development in rural areas, housing should be located where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. For example, where there are groups of smaller settlements, development in one village may support services in a village nearby. Local planning authorities should avoid new isolated homes in the countryside unless there are special circumstances*.' (Paragraph 28)

'*To promote a strong rural economy, local and neighbourhood plans should:*
promote the retention and development of local services and community facilities in villages, such as local shops, meeting places, sports venues, cultural buildings, public houses and places of worship.' (Paragraph 55)

10. The NPPG advises:

- It is important to recognise the particular issues facing rural areas in terms of housing supply and affordability, and the role of housing in supporting the broader sustainability of villages and smaller settlements.
- A thriving rural community in a living, working countryside depends, in part, on retaining local services and community facilities such as schools, local shops, cultural venues, public houses and places of worship. Rural housing is essential to ensure viable use of these local facilities.
- Assessing housing need and allocating sites should be considered at a strategic level and through the Local Plan and/or neighbourhood plan process. However, all settlements can play a role in delivering sustainable development in rural areas – and so blanket policies restricting housing development in some settlements and preventing other settlements from expanding should be avoided unless their use can be supported by robust evidence.

Housing Needs

11. The 2014 SHMA identifies a need for 1,140 homes per annum to be provided in Cherwell from 2011-2031. Housing is needed in rural areas to help meet local needs but also to make a sustainable contribution in meeting overall housing need. Village categorisation and village clustering helps ensure that development is located so that it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities in accordance with the NPPF and NPPG.

Updated Surveys of Village Services and Facilities

12. To help update the categorisation, new village surveys of services and facilities were undertaken in June 2014. The same criteria were used as for the previous survey in 2007:

- children's nurseries;
- primary schools;
- retail/services/businesses
- retail outlets (food);
- post offices;
- public houses;
- recreational facilities;
- community facilities;
- other services

13. Table 3 below provides the results of the new village surveys:

Table 3: Village Survey Results

Village Name	Nursery	Primary School	Retail Service (outlet)	Food Shop	Post Office	Public House	Recreational Facilities	Village/Community Hall	Other Services
Adderbury	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	Library
Alkerton	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
Ambrosden	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	Doctor's Surgery (not full time)
Ardley	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Arncott	0	0	√	√	0	√	√	√	0
Balscote	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
Barford St John	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Barford St Michael	0	0	0	√	√	√	0	√	0
Begbroke	√	0	√	√	0	√	√	√	0
Blackthorn	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0
Bletchingdon	0	√	√	0	0	√	√	√	0
Bloxham	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	Dental Practice, Doctor's Surgery, Secondary School
Bodicote	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	0

Broughton	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
Bucknell	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	√	0
Caulcott	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
Caversfield	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0
Charlton on Otmoor	√	√	0	0	√	√	√	√	0
Chesterton	√	√	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Claydon	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0
Clifton	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0	0
Cottisford	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0
Cropredy	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	GP Surgery
Deddington	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	Health Centre, Dentist, Library,
Drayton	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	√	0
Duns Tew	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Enslow	0	0	√	0	0	√	0	0	0
Epwell	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Fencott	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Fewcott	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
Finmere	0	√	√	0	0	√	√	√	0
Fringford	√	√	√	0	0	√	√	√	0
Fritwell	√	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	0
Godington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Great Bourton	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Hampton Gay	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hampton Poyle	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
Hanwell	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Hardwick	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Heathfield	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0	0
Hempton	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0
Hethe	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Hook Norton	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	GP Surgery, Library, Dentist
Horley	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Hornton	√	√	0	0	0	√	√	√	0

Horton-cum-Studley	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Islip	√	√	√	√	0	√	√	√	Medical Practice
Juniper Hill	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0
Kirtlington	√	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	0
Launton	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	Private GP
Little Bourton	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0	0
Lower Heyford	0	0	√	0	0	√	√	0	0
Merton	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0
Middle Aston	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Middleton Stoney	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Milcombe	0	0	0	√	0	√	√	√	0
Milton	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
Mixbury	√	0	√	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mollington	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Murcott	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Newton Purcell	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
Noke	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0
North Aston	0	0	√	0	0	0	√	0	0
North Newington	0	√	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Oddington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Piddington	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0
Prescote	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Shenington	√	√	0	0	0	√	0	√	GP Surgery
Shipton on Cherwell	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0
Shutford	0	0	√	0	0	√	√	√	0
Sibford Ferris	0	0	0	√	√	0	√	0	0
Sibford Gower	√	√	0	0	0	√	√	√	GP Surgery in Burdrop
Somerton	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	√	0
Souldern	0	0	√	0	0	√	√	√	0

South Newington	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Steeple Aston	√	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	0
Stoke Lyne	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0	0
Stratton Audley	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	0	0
Swalcliffe	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	√	0
Tadmarton	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Thrupp	0	0	0	0	0	√	0	0	0
Upper Heyford	0	0	√	0	0	√	√	√	0
Wardington	0	0	√	0	0	√	√	√	0
Wendlebury	0	0	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Weston on the Green	√	0	√	√	√	√	√	√	0
Wigginton	0	0	0	0	√	0	√	√	0
Williamscot	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wroxton	0	√	0	0	0	√	√	√	0
Yarnton	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	√	Medical Practice

14. There has been little change to the services and facilities in Cherwell since the last survey was undertaken. Nearly all category A villages still have a primary school and/or shop, which are considered to be particularly important in determining the level of sustainability. There have also been no new shops or new primary schools since 2007.

15. The villages identified as having the most services and facilities in the Submission Local Plan have generally retained these services and facilities. A re-examination of the capacity of village primary schools was also undertaken which showed that some schools remain near capacity in the rural areas. In general terms, the information collected for villages confirms the fact that the District has, in sustainability terms, a few large, well-served villages, some villages with some services and facilities and many less well-served, smaller villages. There are differences between villages, but with the exception of Kidlington, there are no small towns or large villages that are significantly more sustainable than other settlements.

Population

16. The village categorisation included in the Submission Local Plan has regard to parish population figures from the 2001 census. In reviewing Policy Villages 1,

consideration has been given to parish populations from the 2011 census as set out in Table 4 below:

Table 4: Parish Populations

Parish	Population
Adderbury	2819
Ambrosden	2248
Ardley with Fewcott	751
Arncott	1738
Barford St John and Barford St Michael	549
Begbroke	783
Blackthorn	317
Bletchingdon	910
Bloxham	3374
Bodicote	2126
Bourton	614
Broughton	286
Bucknell	260
Caversfield	1788
Charlton-on-Otmoor	449
Chesterton	850
Claydon with Clattercote	306
Cottisford	216
Cropredy	717
Deddington	2146
Drayton	242
Duns Tew	478
Epwell	285
Fencott and Murcott	285
Finmere	466
Fringford	602
Fritwell	736
Godington (included in Stratton Audley)	
Gosford and Water Eaton	1323
Hampton Gay and Poyle	141
Hanwell	263
Hardwick with Tusmore (included in Cottisford).	
Hethe	275
Hook Norton	2117
Horley	336
Hornton	328
Horton-cum-Studley	455
Islip	652
Kidlington	13723
Kirtlington	988
Launton	1204
Lower Heyford	492
Merton	424
Middle Aston (included in North Aston)	
Middleton Stoney	331
Milcombe	613
Milton	192
Mixbury	370

Parish	Population
Mollington	479
Newton Purcell with Shelswell Parish Meeting : included in Mixbury Parish Meeting figure.	
Noke	117
North Aston	316
North Newington	324
Oddington	129
Piddington	370
Prescote (included in Cropredy)	
Shenington with Alkerton	425
Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp	493
Shutford	476
Sibford Ferris	476
Sibford Gower	508
Somerton	305
Souldern	370
South Newington	285
Steeple Aston	947
Stoke Lyne	218
Stratton Audley	434
Swalcliffe	254
Tadmarton	541
Upper Heyford	1295
Wardington	602
Wendlebury	421
Weston-on-the-Green	523
Wigginton	194
Wroxton	546
Yarnton	2545

17. The population of villages has changed slightly since 2001 but in most cases this is minimal. For example at Cropredy the population has only increased by 5 people. At Adderbury the population has increased by about 300 people since the 2001 census. There have been some larger increases, for example at Ambrosden the population has increased by about 500 people. Changes to population alone do not necessitate a change in village categorisation.

Village Bus Services and Distance to Urban Centre (2014)

18. The following table shows the updated information used for bus services in each village and for the distance of each village to an urban centre.

Table 5: Bus Services & Accessibility to an Urban Centre

Village Name	Distance to nearest urban centre	Bus services
Adderbury	5.3km (Banbury)	**Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 2ThF 4Sa

Village Name	Distance to nearest urban centre	Bus services
		OCC Special Transport Services Banbury-Upper Heyford 2 Th Stagecoach S4 Banbury-Oxford 28 MTuWThF 25 Sa 8 Su
Alkerton	9.7km (Banbury)	**None**
Ambrosden	5.3km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 94** Bicester-Oxford 5 MTuWThF **Stagecoach S5** Arncott-Oxford 25 MTuWThF 26 Sa 4Su **Charlton Services 94** Bicester/Ambrosden-Oxford 8 MTuWThF 2 Sa
Ardley	15.4km (Bicester)	**Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 4TThF 5Sa
Arncott	7.9km (Bicester)	**Stagecoach S5** Arncott-Oxford 25 MTuWThF 26 Sa 4Su
Balscote	7.7km (Banbury)	**Johnsons Coaches 270** Banbury- Stratford-upon-Avon 8 MTuWThF
Barford St John	9.3km (Banbury)	**None**
Barford St Michael	9.3km (Banbury)	**OCC Special Transport Services** Banbury-Upper Heyford 2 Th
Begbroke	5km (Kidlington)	**goride K2** Kidlington circular 8 MTuWThFS **goride K3** Kidlington circular 3 MTuWThF **Stagecoach S3** Chipping Norton-Oxford 80 MTuWThF 66 Sa 44Su
Blackthorn	5.3km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 94** Bicester-Oxford 3 MTuWThF **Charlton Services 94** Bicester/Ambrosden-Oxford 2 MTuWThF 2 Sa
Bletchingdon	8.8 (Kidlington)	**Thames Travel 25/25A** Bicester-Oxford 37 MTuWThF
Bloxham	5.6km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 488/489** Banbury-Chipping Norton 29 MTuWThF 26 Sa
Bodicote	2.9km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach S5** Arncott-Oxford 25 MTuWThF 26 Sa 4Su **Stagecoach B2** Banbury-Bodicote circular 24 MTuWThF 25 Sa 5 Su
Broughton	4.2km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 50A** Stratford-upon-Avon-Oxford 14 MTuWThF
Bucknell	4.5km (Bicester)	**Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 4Tu 4ThF 5Sa
Caulcott	9.2km (Bicester)	**None**
Caversfield	2.7km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 22** Bicester circular 14 MTuWThF **Thames Travel 23** Bicester circular 10 MTuWThF
Charlton on Otmoor	9.7km (Kidlington)	**Thames Travel 94** Bicester-Oxford 5 MTuWThF **Charlton Services 94** Bicester/Ambrosden-Oxford 8 MTuWThF 2 Sa
Chesterton	4.2km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 25/25A** Bicester-Oxford 12 MTuWThF
Claydon	10.8km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 277** Banbury-Lighthorne Heath 4 MTuWThF
Clifton	12.2km (Banbury)	**Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 2ThF 4Sa
Cottisford	9.7km (Bicester)	**Stagecoach 8** Northampton-Bicester 9 MTuWThFSa
Cropredy	7.2km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 277** Banbury-Lighthorne Heath 4 MTuWThF
Deddington	9.7km (Banbury)	**Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 2ThF 4Sa **OCC Special Transport Services** Banbury-Upper Heyford 2 Th **Stagecoach S4** Banbury-Oxford 28 MTuWThF 25 Sa 8 Su

Village Name	Distance to nearest urban centre	Bus services
Drayton	2.9km (Banbury)	**Johnsons Coaches 270** Banbury- Stratford-upon-Avon 11 MTuWThF
Duns Tew	13.8km (Banbury)	**OCC Special Transport Services** Banbury-Upper Heyford 2 Th **Stagecoach S4** Banbury-Oxford 9 MTuWThF 9 Sa
Enslow	3 km (Kidlington)	**Thames Travel 25/25A** Bicester-Oxford 6 MTuWThF
Epwell	11.6km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 50A** Stratford-upon-Avon-Oxford 2 MTuWThF
Fencott	10.5 km (Kidlington)	**None**
Fewcott	(15.8km) (Bicester)	**Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 4TThF 5Sa
Finmere	12.2km (Bicester)	**Heyfordian Travel 37** Finmere-Bicester 4 Tu **Redline 132/133** Brackley-Buckingham 6 MTWThF **Redline 132/133** Brackley-Buckingham-Banbury 7 Sa
Fringford	7.1km (Bicester)	**Stagecoach 8** Northampton-Bicester 9 M-S
Fritwell	10.6km (Bicester)	**Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 4TThF 5Sa
Godington	9.7km (Bicester)	**None**
Great Bourton	5.5km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 277** Banbury-Lighthorne Heath 4 MTuWThF
Hampton Gay	3.5 km (Kidlington)	**None**
Hampton Poyle	3.7km (Kidlington)	**Thames Travel 25/25A** Bicester-Oxford 33 MTuWThF
Hanwell	4.8km (Banbury)	**Catterrall's Coaches 503** Long Itchington-Banbury 2 Th
Hardwick	8km (Bicester)	**Heyfordian Travel 37** Finmere-Bicester 4 Tu
Heathfield	4km (Kidlington)	**None**
Hempton	11.9km (Banbury)	**OCC Special Transport Services** Banbury-Upper Heyford 2 Th
Hethe	9.0km (Bicester)	**Stagecoach 8** Northampton-Bicester 9 MTuWThFS
Hook Norton	15.1km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 488/489** Banbury-Chipping Norton 22 MTuWThF 23 Sa
Horley	6.4km (Banbury)	**Heyfordian Travel 504** Banbury-Hornton 2 Th
Hornton	10.3km (Banbury)	**Heyfordian Travel 504** Banbury-Hornton 2 Th
Horton-cum-Studley	17.9km (Kidlington)	**Heyfordian Travel 118** Oxford-Brill 2 MTTh 6 WFSa
Islip	4.5km (Kidlington)	**Thames Travel 94** Bicester-Oxford 5 MTuWThF **Charlton Services 94** Bicester/Ambrosden-Oxford 8 MTuWThF 2 Sa
Juniper Hill	11.0km (Bicester)	**None**
Kirtlington	8.5km (Kidlington)	**Thames Travel 25/25A** Bicester-Oxford 33 MTuWThF
Launton	3.5km (Bicester)	**Langston & Tasker 18** Bicester-Aylesbury 10 MTuWThF **Stagecoach S5** Arncott-Oxford 24 MTuWThF 22 Sa
Little Bourton	3.9km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 66** Banbury-Leamington Spa 10 MTuWThF **Stagecoach 277** Banbury-Lighthorne Heath 4 MTuWThF
Lower Heyford	11.1km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 25/25A** Bicester-Oxford 29 MTuWThF **OCC Special Transport Services** Banbury-Upper Heyford 2 Th
Merton	7.7km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 94** Bicester-Oxford 5 MTuWThF **Charlton Services 94** Bicester/Ambrosden-Oxford 8 MTuWThF

Village Name	Distance to nearest urban centre	Bus services
		2 Sa
Middle Aston	14.5km (Bicester)	**None**
Middleton Stoney	5.6km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 25/25A** Bicester-Oxford 29 MTuWThF
Milcombe	8.2km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 488/489** Banbury-Chipping Norton 28 MTuWThF 24 Sa
Milton	7.2km (Banbury)	**OCC Special Transport Services** Banbury-Upper Heyford 2 Th
Mixbury	16.1km (Bicester)	**None**
Mollington	7.7km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 66** Banbury-Leamington Spa 10 MTuWThF **Stagecoach 277** Banbury-Lighthorne Heath 4 MTuWThF
Murcott	12.9km (Bicester)	**None**
Newton Purcell	9.5km (Bicester)	**Heyfordian Travel 37** Finmere-Bicester 4 Tu
Noke	7.1km (Kidlington)	**None**
North Aston	13.7km (Banbury)	**None**
North Newington	4.2km (Banbury)	**Johnsons Coaches 269** Banbury- Stratford-upon-Avon 2 MTuWThF
Oddington	7.9km (Kidlington)	**Thames Travel 94** Bicester-Oxford 5 MTuWThF **Charlton Services 94** Bicester/Ambrosden-Oxford 8 MTuWThF 2 Sa
Piddington	9.0km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 94** Bicester-Oxford 3 MTuWThF **Charlton Services 94** Bicester/Ambrosden-Oxford 2 MTuWThF 2 Sa
Prescote	8km (Banbury)	**None**
Shenington	9.7km (Banbury)	**Johnsons Coaches 269** Banbury- Stratford-upon-Avon 11 MTuWThF
Shipton on Cherwell	3.9km (Kidlington)	**goride W10** Woodstock-Water Eaton Park and Ride 9 MTuWThFSa **Stagecoach S4** Banbury-Oxford 26 MTuWThF 24 Sa 8 Su
Shutford	7.9km (Banbury)	**Johnsons Coaches 269** Banbury- Stratford-upon-Avon 2 MTuWThF
Sibford Ferris	12.0km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 50A** Stratford-upon-Avon-Oxford 14 MTuWThF
Sibford Gower	12.2km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 50A** Stratford-upon-Avon-Oxford 14 MTuWThF
Somerton	15.3km (Banbury)	**Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 4TThF 5Sa
Souldern	14.2km (Banbury)	**Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 4TThF 5Sa
South Newington	9.2km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 488/489** Banbury-Chipping Norton 8 MTuWThF 4 Sa
Steeple Aston	13.2km (Bicester)	**Stagecoach S4** Banbury-Oxford 28 MTuWThF 25 Sa 8 Su
Stoke Lyne	7.6km (Bicester)	**Heyfordian Travel 37** Finmere-Bicester 4 Tu **Heyfordian Travel 81/81A** Banbury-Ardley-Souldern-Bicester 3ThFSa
Stratton Audley	5.6km (Bicester)	**Stagecoach 8** Northampton-Bicester 9 MTuWThFSa
Swalcliffe	9.3km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 50A** Stratford-upon-Avon-Oxford 14 MTuWThF

Village Name	Distance to nearest urban centre	Bus services
Tadmarton	7.9km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 50A** Stratford-upon-Avon-Oxford 14 MTuWThF
Thrupp	1.2km (Kidlington)	**goride W10** Woodstock-Water Eaton Park and Ride 9 MTuWThFSa
Upper Heyford	9.2km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 25/25A** Bicester-Oxford 29 MTuWThF **OCC Special Transport Services** Banbury-Upper Heyford 2 Th
Wardington	8.9km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 200** Daventry-Woodford Halse-Banbury 16 MTuWThF 14 Sa
Wendlebury	4.8km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 25** Bicester-Oxford 9 MTuWThF
Weston on the Green	8.4km (Bicester)	**Thames Travel 25** Bicester-Oxford 9 MTuWThF
Wigginton	10.6km (Banbury)	**Stagecoach 488/489** Banbury-Chipping Norton 4 MTuWThF 3 Sa
Williamscot	8 km (Banbury)	**None**
Wroxton	8.9km (Banbury)	**Johnsons Coaches 270** Banbury- Stratford-upon-Avon 11 MTuWThF
Yarnton	6.0km (Bicester)	**goride K2** Kidlington circular 8 MTuWThFSa **goride K3** Kidlington circular 3 MTuWThF **Stagecoach S3** Chipping Norton-Oxford 80 MTuWThF 66 Sa 44Su

19. There has been some significant reduction in bus services since the last review. For example at Shutford there were four services previously but now there is only one, and there is now no service at Barford St John. However, there remains a bus service at all the category A villages.

Updating Sustainability Conclusions

20. As explained in Appendix 3 of Topic Paper 2, a range of criteria was used to establish the level of 'sustainability' for villages in land use terms. The criteria needed to capture an understanding of access to services and facilities, the availability of employment opportunities, the village's population, and the village's location. Table 6 below explains why these criteria were considered relevant in determining the sustainability of a village (reproduced from Appendix 3 of Topic Paper 2).

Table 6: Village Categorisation – Sustainability Criteria

Criteria	Commentary
Children's Nursery	• It provides local education potentially accessible to the residents of a village or nearby village • It provides a social focus for the community • It can be multi-functional in terms of hosting other events such as fitness classes and meetings • It may provide employment for local people
Primary School	• It provides local education potentially accessible to the residents of a village or nearby village • It provides a social focus for the community • It can be multi-functional in terms of hosting other events such

	as fitness classes and meetings • It may provide employment for local people
Retail/services/businesses	• It will provide a service • It could provide employment for local people
Food Shops	• It provides essential items (food and drink) for residents, in particular for those not able to travel longer distances • It provides a social focus for the community • Provides potential employment
Post Offices	• It provides a postal service particularly for older people who may require assistance and support with matters such as pension collections • It provides a social focus for the community • Provides potential employment
Pubs	• It provides food and drink for local people and visitors
Recreation Areas	• Recreation areas provide facilities for local people, particularly for young people to play and socialise
Community Halls	• It provides a social focus for the community
Bus Services	• A bus service means that people are provided with the opportunity to travel by means other than the private car to the urban centres and possibly elsewhere.
Distance to Urban Centres	• If a village is close to a town this increases the opportunities for the use of public transport and walking and cycling to the town. It also means that car journeys made to the town will be shorter contributing to reducing carbon emissions.
Population	• A village is more sustainable if it has a higher population as this population is more likely to provide custom, helping to maintain a service or facility.
Employment Areas	• Could provide employment for local people

21. Having regard to the above criteria and the updated information on services, population and bus services, the conclusions of the village review were that there was little overall material change to the relative differences between villages despite there being some changes in service provision and population size. However, within those villages considered to be more sustainable, it was determined that the relative 'ranking' of Middleton Stoney needed to change having regard to less availability of sources of employment (only a single company) and food shops.

Policy Implications

22. The preparation of Proposed Modifications entailed a review of Policy Villages 1 in the context of national policy requirements and guidance, the updated review of villages and the need to meet objectively assessed housing needs as identified in the 2014 SHMA.

23. It was considered that in the interests of meeting housing needs positively and sustainably, there was justification to 'merge' the previously identified category B

villages with the previously identified Category A villages. This would provide more opportunities for 'minor development' within villages and would also inform the review of Policy Villages 2, i.e. the villages to which larger scale development outside existing built-up limits would be directed. In merging the category A and category B villages, it was considered that while the village of Islip would 'score' sufficiently highly to be included as a category A village, it could not be categorised as such due to it being completely within (i.e. 'washed-over' by) the Green Belt.

24. It was also considered, again in the interest of meeting higher levels of housing need, that the identified satellite villages, with their relationship with larger service villages, would be appropriate locations for minor development within built-up limits (in addition to infilling and conversions) but should remain in a second 'B' category. The satellite villages do not 'score' highly enough in their own right to be included as category A villages but are considered to be appropriate for minor development because of the benefits of access to a service centre within a village cluster. For example, Claydon, Great Bourton, Mollington and Wardington benefit from their relationship with Cropredy. As smaller settlements, they would not be suitable for larger scale development provided for by Policy Villages 2.

25. All other villages should be category C villages (including Middleton Stoney because of its lowered, relative sustainability 'score'), but again, in the interest of meeting higher levels of housing need, it was considered that the scope of residential development permitted within category C villages should be broadened beyond conversions (as in the Submission Local Plan) to including infilling.

Conclusion

26. In preparing Proposed Modifications to the Local Plan, to meet the objectively assessed housing needs identified in the 2014 SHMA, the relative sustainability of Cherwell's villages has been updated with new surveys of village services and facilities, current census information on population size and the availability of bus services. The relative sustainability of villages has not materially changed for the purpose of village categorisation other than in the case of Middleton Stoney. The reviewed categorisation informs Proposed Modifications to Policies Villages 1 and Villages 2, the latter providing for larger scale rural housing distribution (see Main Modifications 139 and 147).

27. In policy terms, having regard to the NPPF and NPPG and the higher level of housing need identified in the 2014 SHMA, it was concluded that the Proposed Modifications needed to provide a broader scope of opportunity for residential development within the built up limits of villages. It is therefore proposed that all villages should now be permitted to consider infilling development and conversions, and that a wider range of villages should be allowed to consider minor development. The policy approach is set out in the table below:

Category	***Villages by Category***	***Type of Development***
A	*Service Villages* *Adderbury, Ambrosden, Arncott, Begbroke, Bletchingdon (*), Bloxham, Bodicote, Chesterton, Cropredy, Deddington, Finmere, Fringford, Fritwell, Hook Norton, Kidlington, Kirtlington, Launton, Milcombe, Sibford Ferris/Sibford Gower, Steeple Aston, Weston -on –the-Green (*), Wroxton, Yarnton*	*Minor Development* *Infilling* *Conversions*
B	*Satellite Villages*	*Minor*

	Blackthorn, Claydon, Clifton, Great Bourton, Hempton, Lower Heyford, Middle Aston, Milton, Mollington, South Newington, and Wardington.	*Development* *Infilling* *Conversions*
C	*All other villages*	*Infilling* *Conversions*