

**Submission Cherwell Local Plan (Part 1)
2011 – 2031**

Proposed Modifications

**Addendum to
Statement of Consultation**

October 2014

Addendum to Statement of Consultation

Introduction

1. Cherwell District Council has consulted on modifications to the Submission Cherwell Local Plan including modified Policies Maps and an update to a Sustainability Appraisal. The documents were published for consultation from Friday 22 August 2014 to Friday 3 October 2014 prior to submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.
2. The Draft Cherwell Local Plan was submitted to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government for public Examination on 31 January 2014 and was accompanied by a Statement of Consultation which detailed previous stages of consultation undertaken in preparing the Plan. The Statement remains part of the Local Plan evidence base and is available for viewing on-line at www.cherwell-dc.gov.uk/LocalPlanExamination . A separate Topic Paper (TOP1) on the legal Duty to Cooperate has also previously been made available.
3. The public Examination hearings were suspended on 4 June 2014 for six months. This was to enable the Council to put forward proposed modifications to the Plan involving increased new housing delivery over the plan period to meet the full, up to date, objectively assessed needs of the district, as required by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and based on the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment 2014 (SHMA)
4. Since the suspension of the examination hearings the Council has undertaken further consultation with a range of key stakeholders and interested parties in the preparation of the proposed modifications. Where necessary, discussions have also taken place with site promoters. Additionally, a new 'Call for Sites' has been undertaken in preparing an update to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA).
5. This addendum provides an account of the consultation undertaken since the suspension of the examination hearings on 3 June 2014. It also explains how the Proposed Modifications have been publicly consulted upon and provides a summary of the responses received.

Consultation since Suspension of Hearings

6. A series of consultation meetings have taken place in the interest of preparing 'sound' modifications and continuing to meet the Duty to Cooperate. Duty to Cooperate meetings continue to be scheduled and an update to Topic Paper 1 will be prepared for re-commencement of the Examination.
7. Meetings convened since the Examination hearings in June 2014 to discuss the development of the Cherwell Local Plan modifications are set out below.
 - 7.1 Aylesbury Vale District Council
 - 7.1.1 A formal Duty to Co-operate meeting was held between Cherwell and Aylesbury Vale District Council on 23rd July 2014.

- 7.1.2 The meeting reviewed the steps being taken at Cherwell to meet the new Oxfordshire SHMA in full, including call for sites to prepare a new SHLAA, new SA/HRA, SFRA and Landscape Assessments, with updates commissioned of the Economic Analysis and Movement Studies. Cherwell confirmed that the emerging approach to new development was focused on Bicester and Banbury in line with the existing strategy as set out in the Submission Local Plan and that the potential for some additional growth at Former RAF Upper Heyford was also being explored.
- 7.1.3 It was agreed that issues to address related to ensuring that the impact of growth at Bicester and Aylesbury on A41 is properly assessed and coordinated. Both parties agreed that the existing Statement of Common Ground remained the basis for working in Partnership.
- 7.2 Oxford City Council
- 7.2.1 A formal Duty to Co-operate meeting was held between Cherwell and Oxford City Council on 24th July 2014.
- 7.2.2 The meeting reviewed the steps being taken at Cherwell to meet the new Oxfordshire SHMA in full, including call for sites to prepare a new SHLAA, new SA/HRA, SFRA and Landscape Assessments, with updates commissioned of the Economic Analysis and Movement Studies. Cherwell confirmed that the emerging approach to new development was focused on Bicester and Banbury in line with the existing strategy as set out in the Submission Local Plan and that the potential for some additional growth at Former RAF Upper Heyford was also being explored.
- 7.2.3 Both parties discussed the final observation of the Inspector in his statement of 9 June 2014. Cherwell noted that it had received drafting proposals from Oxford City for inclusion in the Cherwell Local Plan, which it would carefully consider, but would of course come to its own view and would seek to continue to reflect the existing SPIP agreement, as well as the Inspector's observations from the Cherwell Examination.
- 7.2.4 Cherwell noted its intention was to update the text of para 89b of the Submitted Cherwell Local Plan with an additional explanatory paper being presented to the Inspector, including the SPIP timetable and the DCLG critical friend advice setting out how the Oxford issues are to be collectively addressed in a way that meets the provisions of the NPPF/NPPG and is 'sound'. Cherwell noted that a systematic Green Belt Review of the area around Oxford may be required as one option once the capacity of Oxford had been identified and tested, but that there are other options that would be considered by the Local Planning Authorities around Oxford too, including new settlement and the reuse of brownfield land.
- 7.2.5 Both parties agreed to continue engage through the Spatial Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SPIP) and to meet again in run up to the Cherwell Examination in December.
- 7.3 Oxfordshire County Council
- 7.3.1 A weekly conference call has taken place since 5th June 2014 between Cherwell and Oxfordshire County Council to review progress in the development of modifications to the Cherwell Local Plan. The telephone call and regular discussions on specific topics has addressed issues arising relating to site assessments and review, movement analysis, landscape analysis, SA/SEA and HRA processes. These discussions have also explored site policies and matters for inclusion in the refinement of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and associated policies within the

Cherwell Local Plan. Both parties have agreed that the existing Statement of Common Ground remains the basis for working in Partnership.

7.3.2 A formal bilateral meeting took place between Cherwell and Oxfordshire County Council on 19 June 2014 and again on 11th September 2014 at which the preparation of the modifications to the Cherwell Local Plan was discussed.

7.4 Stratford-on-Avon Council

7.4.1 A formal Duty to Co-operate meeting was held between Cherwell and Stratford on Avon Council on 22 July 2014.

7.4.2 The meeting reviewed the steps being taken at Cherwell to meet the new Oxfordshire SHMA in full, including call for sites to prepare a new SHLAA, new SA/HRA, SFRA and Landscape Assessments, with updates commissioned of the Economic Analysis and Movement Studies. Cherwell confirmed that the emerging approach to new development was focused on Bicester and Banbury in line with the existing strategy as set out in the Submission Local Plan and that the potential for some additional growth at Former RAF Upper Heyford was also being explored. The Warwickshire SHMA and its potential implications was also discussed.

7.4.3 Both Councils agreed that there are no major issues between the plans for each District and noted that the major growth planned at Gaydon (in Stratford) to meet housing needs and the growth needs of Jaguar Land Rover will generate transport growth (previously discussed with Oxfordshire County Council as Highways Authority), but also provides an opportunity for improving the coordination of support each Council is providing to the High Performance Engineering sector in each District, a matter with Stratford-on-Avon, Cherwell, South Northamptonshire and Aylesbury Vale Councils have been working jointly on through an LGA funded study.

7.4.4 Both parties have agreed that the existing Statement of Common Ground remained the basis for working in Partnership.

7.5 South Northamptonshire Council

7.5.1 A meeting was held between Cherwell and South Northamptonshire Council on 28 July 2014 as a formal Duty to Co-operate meeting. The two Councils continue to work closely together under joint management.

7.5.2 The meeting reviewed the steps being taken at Cherwell to meet the new Oxfordshire SHMA in full, including call for sites to prepare a new SHLAA, new SA/HRA, SFRA and Landscape Assessments, with updates commissioned of the Economic Analysis and Movement Studies. Cherwell confirmed that the emerging approach to new development was focused on Bicester and Banbury in line with the existing strategy as set out in the Submission Local Plan and that the potential for some additional growth at Former RAF Upper Heyford was also being explored.

7.5.3 Both parties agreed that joint working would continue on the mitigation of anticipated transport impacts arising from the planned growth in each Plan area, for example on the A422/Junction 11 and the A43/Junction 10 and continuing the joint Council approach to working with the Highways Agency and AECOM on the national Route Based Strategies for managing transport growth.

7.5.4 Both parties have agreed that the existing Statement of Common Ground remained the basis for working in Partnership.

7.6 South Oxfordshire Council

- 7.6.1 A meeting was held on 31 July 2014 (jointly with Vale of White Horse Council) between Cherwell and South Oxfordshire Council as a formal Duty to Co-operate meeting.
- 7.6.2 The meeting reviewed the steps being taken at Cherwell to meet the new Oxfordshire SHMA in full, including call for sites to prepare a new SHLAA, new SA/HRA, SFRA and Landscape Assessments, with updates commissioned of the Economic Analysis and Movement Studies. Cherwell confirmed that the emerging approach to new development was focused on Bicester and Banbury in line with the existing strategy as set out in the Submission Local Plan and that the potential for some additional growth at Former RAF Upper Heyford was also being explored.
- 7.6.3 All parties agreed they would continue to work jointly together and with the County Council to address matters of growth affecting the A34 and through SPIP to seek to ensure that the approach to meeting the unmet need of Oxford City was 'sound', met all regulatory needs including the SA/HRA requirements, undertook full public consultation and considered all realistic spatial options.

7.7 Vale of White Horse Council

- 7.7.1 A meeting was held between Cherwell and Vale of White Horse Council on 31 July 2014 (jointly with South Oxfordshire) as a formal Duty to Co-operate meeting.
- 7.7.2 The meeting reviewed the steps being taken at Cherwell to meet SHMA in full, including call for sites to prepare a new SHLAA, new SA/HRA, SFRA and Landscape Assessments, with updates commissioned of the Economic Analysis and Movement Studies. Cherwell confirmed that the emerging approach to new development was focused on Bicester and Banbury in line with the existing strategy as set out in the Submission Local Plan and that the potential for some additional growth at Former RAF Upper Heyford was also being explored.
- 7.7.3 All parties agreed they would continue to work jointly together and with the County Council to address matters of growth affecting the A34 and through SPIP to seek to ensure that the approach to meeting the unmet need of Oxford City was 'sound', met all regulatory needs including the SA/HRA requirements, undertook full public consultation and considered all realistic spatial options.

7.8 West Oxfordshire Council

- 7.8.1 A meeting between Cherwell and West Oxfordshire Council was held on 30 July 2014 as a formal Duty to Co-operate meeting.
- 7.8.2 The meeting reviewed the steps being taken at Cherwell to meet the new Oxfordshire SHMA in full, including call for sites to prepare a new SHLAA, new SA/HRA, SFRA and Landscape Assessments, with updates commissioned of the Economic Analysis and Movement Studies. Cherwell confirmed that the emerging approach to new development was focused on Bicester and Banbury in line with the existing strategy as set out in the Submission Local Plan and that the potential for some additional growth at Former RAF Upper Heyford was also being explored.
- 7.8.3 Both parties agreed they would continue to work jointly and through SPIP to ensure a joint Oxfordshire Council approach to meeting the unmet need of Oxford, using a sound process that was compliant with the regulations and considered all realistic spatial options.

7.9 The Highways Agency

- 7.9.1 Cherwell met with Oxfordshire County Council and the Highways Agency on 23 July under the auspices of the Duty to Co-operate.
- 7.9.2 The meeting reviewed the steps being taken at Cherwell to meet the new Oxfordshire SHMA in full, including call for sites to prepare a new SHLAA, new SA/HRA, SFRA and Landscape Assessments, with updates commissioned of the Economic Analysis and Movement Studies. Cherwell confirmed that the emerging approach to new development was focused on Bicester and Banbury in line with the existing strategy as set out in the Submission Local Plan and that the potential for some additional growth at Former RAF Upper Heyford was also being explored.
- 7.9.3 The meeting discussed County Council transport modelling and agreed that more analysis was needed, recognising that solutions exist to address the identified growth at Junctions 9, 10 and 11 on the M40. It was agreed that a further meeting would be arranged with AECOM and the Highways Agency for Cherwell and Oxfordshire County Council to explore the transport modelling in the context of the development of the Route Based Strategies which the HA is developing. Technical notes have since been prepared by the County Council and detailed modelling continues which will support the County Council's formal response to the proposed modifications.
- 7.9.4 A further meeting with the Highways Agency to discuss the level of Cherwell growth and its relationship to the emerging Route Strategies was held on 1 October 2014.

7.10 English Heritage

- 7.10.1 A meeting between CDC and English Heritage took place on 25 July 2014 and between Cherwell, Oxfordshire County Council, WYG (on behalf of the Council) and English Heritage on 1 August 2014 to consider the potential for additional growth at Upper Heyford.
- 7.10.2 The meeting reviewed the steps being taken at Cherwell to meet the new Oxfordshire SHMA in full, including call for sites to prepare a new SHLAA, new SA/HRA, SFRA and Landscape Assessments, with updates commissioned of the Economic Analysis and Movement Studies. Cherwell confirmed that the emerging approach to new development was focused on Bicester and Banbury in line with the existing strategy as set out in the Submission Local Plan.
- 7.10.3 The principle of additional growth taking place at Upper Heyford was agreed, subject to this taking place at considered, identified locations and with appropriate safeguards being put in place to address heritage, ecology, and transport constraints.

7.11 Parish Liaison

- 7.11.1 The meeting of the six-monthly Parish Liaison Forum on 18 June 2014 received a full update on the Examination, the preparation of modifications, and the steps being taken to ensure that the Cherwell Plan meets objectively assessed needs in the SHMA ahead of the Examination re-commencing on 9 December 2014.
- 7.11.2 Points covered included:
- The planning inspector Mr Payne formally suspended the examination on 4 June until 9 December to allow council officers time to consider proposed modifications to the plan in order to accommodate additional homes across

the district. Appropriate, sustainable and deliverable sites needed to be identified to meet housing and related needs.

- At the time the document was submitted to the Government for examination in January, Cherwell was planning to accommodate 16,750 homes between 2006 and 2031. However in light of the recent publication of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) in April, the council has indicated its willingness to seek to accommodate an increase in housing.
- In revising the plan, council officers will consider options to accommodate the increased housing numbers and associated infrastructure. This will involve reviewing sites to see if they can deliver additional homes and revisiting sites which had previously been rejected to reconsider any development potential.
- The timetable for preparation of the modifications to the Local Plan through to the re-Examination was presented.
- That the modifications would build out of the proposed strategy from the Submitted Local Plan and not involve writing a new Local Plan. This means a town focused approach, but as a consequence of much higher numbers, the rural figure was also likely to increase. No additional housing growth at the villages is not a realistic option.
- That work to consider how to meet Oxford's needs would require countywide collaboration over a sustained period of time, potentially up to 2 years. The Cherwell Local Plan as submitted included the text of the agreement reached by all Councils including Oxford City, though they had argued against the SPIP agreement at the Cherwell Local Plan Examination.
- The new housing figures represent a big increase and mean that by continuing to consider focusing growth at the two towns, seeking to avoid green belt and to try to ensure that major housing growth limited on the villages, means that certain areas that we have not previously supported for growth now have to be seriously considered and assessed if we are to secure a sound and 'deliverable' plan.
- We have begun a series of meetings with the promoters of the key sites in the plan to see if the delivery can be increased (such as NW Bicester), or site area increased (such as South East Bicester), or excluded sites (such as Upper Heyford) might be brought forwards. We do not anticipate Green Belt release being needed to meet the Cherwell housing figure.
- Cherwell continues to liaise with Oxfordshire County Council on further transport modelling and any additional infrastructure (education) that may be needed as sites grow or new sites are added to the plan.

7.11.3 The 18 June 2014 meeting of the Parish Liaison Forum also considered other matters which relate to the strategies of the Cherwell Local Plan including Rural Community Energy, Local Heritage Assets, Housing Need and Allocations Policy.

7.11.4 Previously the Parish Liaison Forum has met and considered a number of matters relating to the strategies of the Cherwell Local Plan including:-

- 13 Nov 2013 - Local Plan Update; Rural Broadband and Assets of Community Value.
- 12 June 2013 - Neighbourhood Planning; New Homes Bonus; Cherwell Community Land Trust & Community Right to Bid.
- 28 November 2012 – Community Right to Bid.
- 13 June 2012 – Cherwell's Draft Local Plan & Cherwell's Draft Conservation and Urban Design Strategy.
- 9 November 2011 – Planning: National Reform, Local Effects & Community Led Plans.

7.12 The Oxfordshire Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership

7.12.1 The Oxfordshire Strategic Planning and Infrastructure Partnership (SPIP) has continued to meet and consider collectively development and planning issues relevant to all of the Local Authorities in Oxfordshire.

7.12.2 While the discussions on the preparation of the Oxfordshire SHMA have been extensive, SPIP has considered a wide range of issues including HCA funding, the East – West rail project and LEP matters.

7.12.3 Discussions of how best to take forward the Oxfordshire SHMA have continued with an outline timetable of key steps and the engagement through DCLG of Mr Keith Holland as a critical friend to advise the authorities.

7.12.4 Table of SPIP Meetings Nov 2011 to March 2014

Date	Meeting type	SHMA related Discussion	Other items of collaboration
25/11/11	Executive	-	
01/12/11	Full partnership	-	
13/01/12	Executive	-	
01/03/12	Executive	-	
15/03/11	Board	-	
05/04/12	Executive	-	LIP, E-W rail
24/05/12	Board	-	
26/07/12	Executive	-	
06/09/12	Executive	-	
20/09/12	Partnership	-	
18/10/12	Executive	-	
26/11/12	Board	-	
29/11/12	Executive	SHMA – first discussion	
20/12/12	Partnership	SHMA	
21/02/13	Executive	SHMA – draft brief for tender	LIP, City Deal, RGF,
21/03/13	Board	SHMA - update	City Deal, LTB
09/05/13	Executive	SHMA – including update on shortlisting/interviews	City Deal, LTB
11/06/13	Executive conference call	SHMA - update	
20/06/13	Executive	SHMA – including agreement to Statement of Cooperation	Extra Care Housing
04/07/13	Executive	SHMA - update	
23/07/13	Board	SHMA – including agreement to Statement	

		of Cooperation	
08/08/13	Executive	SHMA - update	LTB, ESIF
05/09/13	Board	SHMA - update	OLEP SEP
19/09/13	Executive	SHMA – including joint work programme	Extra Care housing,
17/10/13	Executive conference call	SHMA - update	
14/11/13	Executive	SHMA - update	Local Transport Plan, Flood Risk
12/12/13	Executive conference call	SHMA - update	
16/12/13	Executive	SHMA - update	OLEP SEP
07/01/14	Board	SHMA - update	OLEP SEP
16/01/14	Executive	SHMA - update	
30/01/14	Board	SHMA - update	HCA housing programme
04/03/14	Board	SHMA – post SHMA programme	
13/03/14	Executive	SHMA - update	
27/03/14	Board	SHMA – including critical friends, post SHMA programme, draft tender for post SHMA SA	Green Infrastructure
29/05/14	Board	SHMA – including Oxford capacity tender, critical friend advice	HCA housing programme
12/06/14	Executive		
10/07/14	Executive	DCLG Critical Friend Proposal,	City Deal, Housing Link with Adult & Social Care

Consultation on Main Modifications

8. The Main Modifications were made available for public comment for a period of six weeks. A number of minor modifications were also made available for viewing at the same time. Comments made were to relate to proposed modifications only. The Council did not consult on other aspects of the Plan previously consulted upon.
9. Consultation documents and all supporting documents could be viewed and downloaded through the Council's website at: www.cherwell.gov.uk/LocalPlanExamination

10. The modifications and key supporting documents were available to inspect at the Deposit Locations listed below:

Cherwell District Council Offices, Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, OX15 4AA
8.45am - 5.15pm Monday -Friday

Banbury Library, Marlborough Road, Banbury, OX16 5DB
Monday 9am – 1pm, Tuesday 9am-7pm, Wednesday 9am – 8pm, Thurs and Friday
9am – 7pm, Saturday 9am – 4.30pm, closed Sunday

Neithrop Library, Community Centre, Woodgreen Avenue, Banbury OX16 0AT
Monday 10am – 7pm, Tuesday Closed, Wednesday 2pm – 5pm, Thursday 10am –
1pm, Friday 10am- 5pm, Saturday 9.30am – 1pm, closed Sunday

Bicester Town Council, The Garth, Launton Road, Bicester, OX26 6PS
Monday – Thursday 9am – 5pm, Friday 9am – 4pm

Bicester Library, Old Place Yard, Bicester OX26 6AU
Monday 9.30am – 7pm, Tuesday 9.30-5pm, Wednesday and Thursday 9.30am –
7pm, Friday 9.30am – 5pm, Saturday 9am-4.30pm, closed Sunday

Kidlington Library, Ron Groves House, 23 Oxford Road, Kidlington, OX5 2BP
Monday 9.30am – 5pm, Tuesday 9.30am – 7pm, Wednesday 9.30am – 1pm,
Thursday 9.30am – 5pm, Friday 9.30am – 7pm, Saturday 9.00am – 4.30pm, closed
Sunday

Adderbury Library, Church House, High Street, Adderbury, OX17 3LS
Tuesday: 10 am –12 noon & 3 – 7pm, Thursday: 2pm – 5pm & 6 – 7pm, Friday:
10am – 12 noon & 2 pm – 5pm, Saturday: 9.30 am –1pm, closed Monday,
Wednesday & Sunday

Deddington Library, The Old Court House, Horse Fair, Deddington, Oxon. OX15 0SH
Monday 2pm - 5pm, 5.30pm - 7pm, Tuesday Closed Wednesday 9.30am - 1pm,
Thursday 2pm - 5pm, 5.30pm - 7pm Friday Closed Saturday 9.30am - 1pm, closed
Sunday

Hook Norton Library, High Street, Hook Norton, Banbury, Oxon, OX15 5NH
Monday 2pm - 5pm, 6pm - 7pm, Tuesday Closed, Wednesday 2pm - 5pm,
Thursday Closed, Friday 2pm - 5pm, 6pm - 7pm, Saturday 9.30am - 12.30pm, closed
Sunday

Copies will be available on the North, Central and West Mobile Library Services.
For details of locations and times of the mobile library visit www.oxfordshire.gov.uk or
phone 01865 810240

Banbury LinkPoint, 43 Castle Quay, Banbury, Oxfordshire, OX15 5UW
8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday
Bicester LinkPoint, 38 Market Square, Bicester, Oxfordshire, OX26 6AL
8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday
Kidlington LinkPoint, Exeter Hall, Oxford Road, Kidlington, Oxon, OX5 1AB
8.45am (10am Wednesday) to 5.15pm Monday to Friday

Consultation and Representations

11. The Main Modifications were required to be consulted on for six weeks and be subject to a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) / Sustainability Appraisal (SA). The documents were published for consultation from Friday 22 August 2014 to Friday 3 October 2014. The consultation related to the proposed modifications only (minor modifications were included, though not required to be consulted upon). The

Council did not consult on other aspects of the Plan that had previously been consulted upon.

12. Evidence supporting the proposed modifications was made publicly available at the commencement of the consultation. The modifications and all supporting documents remain available online at www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplanexamination.

13. Following the consultation, representations have been reviewed.

14. In total, there were over 300 individual responses containing over 1,500 individual comments. The main issues raised were as follows:

15. Overview

- There was a considerable amount of support to the Local Plan as well as objections.
- Generally there was community concern relating to:
 - Increased housing requirements based on the SHMA
 - The proposed local review of the Green Belt for Kidlington, if needed to meet Kidlington's needs
 - Development at Gavray Drive
 - Scope for some villages to receive slightly more minor development
- There was limited community concern generally and relating to the majority of proposed strategic sites
- There was general support from a number of agents/developers relating to:
 - The overall pro-growth strategy in sustainable locations
 - Strategic housing sites at Banbury and Bicester
 - Strategic employment sites at Banbury and Bicester
 - Increased housing requirements based on the SHMA
 - Increased housing provision in the most sustainable villages
 - The allocation of more employment land
- There was some objection from a number of agents/developers relating to:
 - The focus of housing and employment growth at Banbury and Bicester and a lack of growth identified at Kidlington
 - Detail relating to site policies
 - Omission sites
 - The consideration of some sites in Part 2 of the Local Plan rather than Part 1.

16. Duty to Cooperate

- The Plan is supported by Aylesbury, Vale of White Horse, South Oxfordshire, South Northants and Oxfordshire County Council.
- No response was received from West Oxfordshire or Stratford District Council's, but meetings were held under Duty to Cooperate requirements in July with no significant concerns expressed.
- There was support from Oxfordshire County Council regarding the use of the SHMA figures and the strategy of focussing growth at Banbury and Bicester with a commitment to continuing to work with the District to find the optimum transport solutions for the towns and at Upper Heyford.
- Substantial objection was raised relating to the Local Plan strategy from Oxford City and to some detailed elements, associated documents, and the process of producing the Local Plan. Opposition from the City Council related to the Plan not proposing to meet Oxford's needs, the focus of growth at

Banbury and Bicester at the expense of Kidlington and the lack of a strategic review of the Green Belt (Despite modification 29 setting out a timetable for addressing the Oxford issues separately from the Cherwell growth).

17. Strategy

- There was a broad measure of support for modifications to the Local Plan including support for the growth strategy at Banbury and Bicester.
- There was also some objection to focussing housing and employment growth at Banbury and Bicester.
- Some objection was raised relating to the lack of major growth identified in the rural areas, including at Kidlington.
- There was limited objection to proposed strategic housing sites except for at Gavray Drive.
- The overall SHMA figures are questioned by a number of Parish Councils and individuals, following a letter campaign by the CPRE.
- The delivery of the SHMA figures are questioned by a number of developers who suggest more housing sites need to be allocated to provide a contingency.
- Garden City principles were promoted.
- Oxford Preservation Trust support retention of Green Belt (contrary to information provided by Oxford City in June that civic Oxford supported the lifting of the Green Belt).
- Green Belt retention supported by many community respondents.

18. Economy

- Continued support was received for the increased amount of employment land identified at Banbury and Bicester
- There was support for encouragement of the logistics sector, with some concerns over B8 development.
- Continued support was received for the allocation of employment sites for mixed B use classes to encourage a range of employment.
- There was support for a more permissive policy for rural employment.
- Some limited concern about the potential expansion of Bicester town centre was raised.
- Omissions sites are proposed at Junction 9 and Junction 10 of the M40 for employment

19. Transport

- General support for Local Plan strategy was received from the County Council with outstanding assessments required.
- Representations were received from the County Council highlighting traffic capacity issues at Banbury and Bicester and the potential need for relief roads at Banbury and Bicester and the need to promote the use of sustainable modes
- There were some representations raising the lack of infrastructure and concerns over an increase in traffic.
- Cross boundary transport issues to be resolved through corridor agreements with Aylesbury and South Northants.

20. Community

- There were some representations from the community requesting that there is more investment in community facilities.

- Representations were received from the County Council relating to the need to provide for more school places, particularly at Banbury, and the limited capacity of some primary schools in the District.
- The need to ensure that there is sufficient public open space was expressed.

21. Environment

- There were representations from developers against policies ESD1 to 5 contending that building regulations only should be used.
- There are no objections by Natural England regarding levels of growth and the Council's Habitat Regulation Assessment. Some comments relating to matters of detail in the Local Plan relating to Bicester 12 – South East Bicester and Bicester 13 – Gavray Drive were made.
- There are no objections to Local Plan strategy by the Environment Agency. Some comments relating to matters of detail in the sequential test and site policies were received.
- Some concern over the ecological impacts of increased housing requirements and the development of strategic sites were expressed.
- No objection to the Local Plan strategy, but concerns expressed about development at Upper Heyford and South East Bicester in relation to potential impact on the historic environment were received from English Heritage.
- Mixed views were expressed about the use of Green Buffers and their proposed modification to address issues that were raised in the June Examination.

22. Bicester

- There was some objection to development at South East Bicester in relation to the extended site area and potential impact on areas of ecological value.
- A petition was received to development at Gavray Drive from 'Save Gavray Meadows Campaign' (about 1500 signatures).
- A reduction in developable area at Gavray Drive was suggested by Bicester Local Historical Society.
- Bicester Vision support the Local Plan in terms of the employment land allocated stating that Bicester has land to support growth of Oxford companies.
- Bicester Chamber of commerce proposed more employment land is provided and the transport infrastructure of the town is addressed.
- Bicester Town Council supported the allocation of more employment land and supported the provision of a south east link road.
- Comments were received on the detailed policy requirements at north west Bicester.
- Value Retail and Sainsbury's express concern over the extent of the town centre boundary.
- Bicester Heritage Limited is promoting the allocation of employment land at Bicester Airfield.

23. Banbury

- South Northants District Council expressed some concern over transport at Junction 11 but suggest continuing dialogue.
- Some concern was expressed over levels of development at Banbury including from Banbury Town Council.
- Banbury 17 South Salt Way - Developer concern expressed over site policy detailed requirements. Some community concern expressed including from Bodicote Council.

- Banbury 19 Drayton Lodge - Developer concern expressed over site details. There was support for protection of woodland and dwellings at the centre of the site.
- Support for, including from Banbury Town Council, the development of Bolton Road, Spiceball, Canalside and Higham Way.
- Banbury Town Council express a view that a primary school should be provided at Canalside.
- Some support for a south east link road was received.
- Some promotion of extensions to strategic sites including at land west of Bretch Hill and at Southam Road was received.

24. Kidlington

- There was community concern over the small scale green belt review and that this will lead to a more significant strategic review.
- Support for growth within the built up area of villages rather than the use of Green Belt land.
- Concern from Kidlington Parish Council about traffic but qualified support for the opportunity for a limited small scale review of the Green Belt to meet local needs and the removal of a separate housing figure for Kidlington.

25. Rural

- Justification for the rural numbers was disputed and some developers are arguing for an increase to give the Plan greater flexibility
- There was concern from some Parish Council's relating to housing growth in villages, including from Bloxham, Adderbury and Milton.

26. Upper Heyford

- Representations for and against the principle of development were received.
- English Heritage and Oxfordshire County Council have clear unambiguous opposition to development beyond 1600 dwellings which the plan proposes.
- Concern in terms of scale and particularly transport impacts, including at Kidlington and Middleton Stoney.

27. Monitoring & Infrastructure

- Oxfordshire County Council have advised of the need to consider a Plan Review in the future to ensure infrastructure needs are catered for.
- Some general concern over the lack of infrastructure planning in the Local Plan.
- Views that developer contributions need to be sought to fund infrastructure

Summary of Representations Received

28. Attached is a schedule summarising the representations received.