

**CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN  
2011 - 2031**

**INDEPENDENT EXAMINATION  
December 2014**

**RESUMED EXAMINATION  
HEARINGS PROGRAMME &  
INSPECTOR'S ISSUES AND  
QUESTIONS**

Independent Examination of the Cherwell Local Plan

**CHERWELL LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

**Venue:** The hearing sessions will be held in the Council Chamber of Cherwell District Council Offices, Bodicote House, Bodicote, Banbury, Oxon OX15 4AA. Sessions will commence on Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014 at 0945 and normally finish no later than 1730.

The District Council will be participating in all hearing sessions.

**The Examination Programme may be subject to change. Please ensure you check the latest position if you are due to attend a particular hearing by contacting the Programme Officer or viewing it on the website at:**

[www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplanexamination](http://www.cherwell.gov.uk/localplanexamination)

**HEARINGS**

**Please remind yourself of the Inspector’s guidance concerning the format of hearings at this Examination, contained in the Briefing Notes.**

<b>WEEK 1</b>	
Tuesday 9 <sup>th</sup> December 2014  <b>0945 – 1000</b>  <b>1000 – 1300</b>  <b>1400 - 1730</b>	<b>Opening Statements</b>  Inspector – 0945, District Council - 0950  <b>Issue 1 – Strategy / Vision / Objectives &amp; Issue 2 – Employment (Policy SLE 1)</b>  <b>Issue 3 – Housing Scale / Distribution (Policies BSC 1-6)</b>
Wednesday 10 <sup>th</sup> December 2014 Day 2  <b>0930 – 1300</b>  <b>1400 - 1730</b>	<b>Issue 4 – Retail (Policy SLE 2) &amp; Tourism (Policy SLE 3)</b>  <b>Issue 5 – Transport (Policies SLE 4 &amp; 5)</b>
Thursday 11 <sup>th</sup> December 2014  <b>0930 – 1300</b>  <b>1400 - 1730</b>	<b>Issue 6 – Climate Change / Energy / Environment / Landscape (Policies ESD 1 – 18), except ESD 14 – Oxford Green Belt – see Issue 13</b>  <b>Issue 7 – Community Facilities &amp; Green Spaces (Policies BSC 7 – 12)</b>

Independent Examination of the Cherwell Local Plan

Friday 12 <sup>th</sup> December 2014  <b>0930 – 1730</b>	<b>Issue 13 – Kidlington (Policies KID 1 &amp; 2 and ESD 14 – Oxford GB)</b>
<b>WEEK 2</b>	
Tuesday 16 <sup>th</sup> December 2014  <b>0930 – 1730</b>	<b>Issue 8 – Bicester (Housing Sites)</b>
Wednesday 17 <sup>th</sup> December 2014  <b>0930 – 1730</b>	<b>Issue 9 – Bicester (Other Site Allocations)</b>
Thursday 18 <sup>th</sup> December 2014  <b>0930 – 1330</b>	<b>Issue 12 – Villages and Rural Areas (Villages 1 – 5)</b>
Friday 19 <sup>th</sup> December 2014  <b>0930 – 1730</b>	<b>Issue 10 – Banbury (Housing Sites)</b>
<b>WEEK 3</b>	
Monday 22 <sup>nd</sup> December 2014  <b>1430 – 1730</b>	<b>Issue 14 – Infrastructure / Delivery / Monitoring (Policy INF 1)</b>
Tuesday 23 <sup>rd</sup> December 2014  <b>0930 – 1730</b>	<b>Issue 11 – Banbury (Other Site Allocations)</b>

## **INSPECTOR'S ISSUES AND QUESTIONS FOR DISCUSSION**

**Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014 0945 – 1300**

### **Issue 1 – Strategy / Vision / Objectives**

- i) Does the Local Plan [LP] provide an appropriate spatial vision and objectives for the district over the plan period, consistent with national guidance in the NPPF and/or justified by clear and robust evidence and, if not, what is the best alternative and why?
- ii) Has the LP been the subject of suitably comprehensive and satisfactory sustainability appraisal [SA], strategic environmental assessment [SEA] and an appropriate assessment [AA] and if not, what else needs to be done and why?
- iii) Will the strategy satisfactorily and sustainably deliver the development needed to meet the objectives over the plan period and, if not, why not and what needs to be changed and why?
- iv) Are any objectives, policies or proposals inconsistent with national guidance and, if so, is there a local justification supported by robust and credible evidence?
- v) Is there clear evidence demonstrating how and why the preferred strategy was selected, including in terms of appropriate consultation with the public, representative bodies, neighbouring authorities, service and infrastructure providers and other interested parties, including in respect of the Duty to Co-Operate?

### **Issue 2 – Employment (Policy SLE 1)**

- i) Is the employment policy and are the proposals, including for Banbury, Bicester and Kidlington, consistent with the NPPF and/or justified by clear and robust evidence?
- ii) Will they deliver the levels of new employment sought or, if not, what else needs to be done and why and/or should more [or less] land be identified?
- iii) Is it appropriate in principle and reasonable in practice to seek to safeguard existing employment areas and/or should more flexible criteria [such as in relation to economic viability] be used to help make more effective use of brownfield sites [PDL]?

### **Participants [20 seats]**

**Alan Lodwick**  
**Barton Willmore**  
**Bloombridge LLP**  
**Boyer Planning**  
**CPRE Oxfordshire**  
**David Lock Associates**  
**Dominic Woodfield**  
**Framptons**  
**Hunter Page**  
**JPPC**  
**Kennett Properties**  
**Oxford City Council**  
**Oxford Green Belt Network**  
**Oxfordshire County Council**

Cherwell Local Plan Examination  
Programme for Hearing Sessions – Version 12 as at 8<sup>th</sup> December 2014

**Pegasus Group**  
**QUOD**  
**Savills**  
**Smiths Gore**  
**South Oxfordshire District Council**  
**Vale of White Horse District Council**

**Tuesday 9<sup>th</sup> December 2014 1400 – 1730**

**Issue 3 – Housing Scale / Distribution (Policies BSC 1-6)**

- i) Is the overall number of new dwellings sought in policy BSC 1 based on clear and robust evidence of the full, objectively assessed, local need for new (including affordable) housing over the plan period, in accord with the NPPF or, if not, what needs to be changed and why?
- ii) Is the overall scale and are the locations of new housing consistent with the LP's objectives and realistically deliverable within the plan period, taking into account the SHMA/SHLAA and the opportunities identified, including in Banbury, Bicester and other settlements? If not, what other locations should be considered and why?
- iii) Does the plan demonstrate that there will be a deliverable supply of housing land over the plan period, with suitable infrastructure provision, in accordance with the NPPF? If not, what alternatives should be considered and why?
- iv) Will the intended management of new housing delivery prove adequate to ensure that the strategic aims of the LP are met? If not, what else needs to be done and why?
- v) Should the LP address contingencies/alternatives, including in relation to the main allocated sites, in the event that completions do not come forward as expected?
- vi) Is policy BSC 4 on the mix of size and type of housing reasonable and realistic, including regarding the needs of older/disabled people, and does it provide sufficient flexibility, if viability is an issue for a particular scheme?
- vii) Is policy BSC 2 on density clear and consistent with national guidance, including in relation to Banbury and Bicester, and does it establish appropriate, realistic and reasonable criteria?
- viii) Are the thresholds and percentages for affordable housing in policy BSC 3 justified by up-to-date, clear and robust, local evidence of housing needs and economic viability, and does it provide sufficient flexibility, if viability is an issue for a particular scheme?
- ix) Is policy BSC 6 [Travelling Communities] clear and consistent with national guidance and does it establish appropriate, realistic and reasonable criteria?

**Participants [20 seats]**

**Barton Willmore**  
**Bloombridge LLP**  
**Boyer Planning**  
**CPRE Oxfordshire**

**David Lock Associates**  
**English Heritage**  
**Hunter Page**  
**JPPC**  
**Oxford City Council**  
**Oxford Green Belt Network**  
**Oxfordshire County Council**  
**Pegasus Group**  
**Planning Potential**  
**Rapleys**  
**RPS**  
**Ruston Planning *\*For Q9 only***  
**Savills**  
**Smiths Gore**  
**South Oxfordshire District Council**  
**Vale of White Horse District Council**  
**West Waddy ADP**

**Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> December 2014 0930 - 1300**

**Issue 4 – Retail (Policy SLE 2) & Tourism (Policy SLE 3)**

- i) Does the LP appropriately define a hierarchy for the management and growth of retail centres over the plan period, and in relation to Banbury, Bicester and other centres, focusing on higher level centres to provide a strategic framework?
- ii) Is the presumption of “town centres first” consistent with national policy in the NPPF and/or justified by clear and robust evidence and appropriate in the local context or should the future role of other centres, such as the Bicester Village Outlet Centre, be reconsidered?
- iii) Does policy SLE 2 indicate suitable and appropriate opportunities over the plan period to help implement the strategy for retail and if not, why not and what should be changed and why?
- iv) Is policy SLE 3 suitable and appropriate to help implement the strategy for tourism over the plan period and if not, why not and what should be changed and why?

**Participants [6 seats]**

**Baecon**  
**Banbury Civic Society**  
**Barton Willmore**  
**DP9**  
**Indigo Planning**  
**Turley**

**Wednesday 10<sup>th</sup> December 2014 1400 - 1730**

**Issue 5 – Transport (Policies SLE 4 & 5)**

- i) Is the overall transport strategy consistent with the NPPF and the Local Transport Plan, including regarding the strategic road network and planned rail improvements, and, if not, what needs to be changed and why?
- ii) Are policies SLE 4 & 5 suitable and appropriate to deliver the necessary transport infrastructure improvements whilst minimising adverse environmental impacts and encourage increased use of public transport, including in terms of rail and bus services, cycling and walking and, if not, what else needs to be done and why?

**Participants [11 seats]**

**BaEcon  
Banbury Civic Society  
Boyer Planning  
Bloombridge LLP  
David Lock Associates  
Kerry Wilce  
Oxfordshire County Council  
Pegasus Group  
Sarah / Brett Chambers  
Stagecoach  
Wendlebury PC**

**Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> December 2014 0930 - 1300**

**Issue 6 – Climate Change / Energy / Environment / Landscape (Policies ESD 1 – 18 Except ESD 14 Oxford Green Belt to be discussed under Issue 13)**

- i) Are the policies consistent with the NPPF and/or justified by clear and robust local evidence and if not, what needs to be changed and why?
- ii) Are they consistent with national legislation and guidance, based on a robust and up to date assessment of needs, and likely to prove effective in protecting the Oxford Meadows SAC, other designated wildlife sites and the Cotswolds AONB?
- iii) Are policies ESD 1 - 6 relating to renewable energy appropriate, reasonable and realistic, in the light of national policy and the economic viability of development?
- iv) Are policies ESD 6 - 8 reasonable, realistic and appropriate, including in relation to flood risks, drainage systems and water resources?
- v) Do the policies strike the right balance between protecting the district's environment, townscape, landscape, built/historic heritage, biodiversity and nature conservation resources and facilitating other strategic development, including the provision of renewable energy?



**Participants [8 seats]**

**Banbury Ornithological Society**  
**Barton Willmore**  
**Boyer Planning**  
**David Lock Associates**  
**Dominic Woodfield**  
**Pegasus Group**  
**Rapleys**  
**Terrence O'Rourke Ltd**

**Thursday 11<sup>th</sup> December 2014 1400 - 1730**

**Issue 7 – Community Facilities, Open Spaces, Sport, Recreation (Policies BSC 7 – 12)**

- i) Are the policies consistent with the NPPF and/or justified by clear and robust local evidence and if not, what needs to be changed and why?
- ii) Are policies BSC 7 -9 consistent with national legislation and guidance and likely to provide effective in providing suitable appropriate and necessary community facilities in connection with new developments?
- iii) Are policies BSC 10 -12 relating to open space, sport and recreation based on a robust and up to date assessment of needs and likely to prove effective in enhancing existing and delivering new green infrastructure, in practice?

**Participants [7 seats]**

**Bloombridge LLP**  
**Boyer Planning**  
**David Lock Associates**  
**Dominic Woodfield**  
**Heather Johnston**  
**Pamela Roberts**  
**Oxfordshire County Council**

**Friday 12<sup>th</sup> December 2014 0930 - 1730**

**Issue 13 – Kidlington - Policies KID 1 & 2 and policy ESD 14 – Oxford Green Belt in that order**

- i) Are the policies and proposals for growth and change in this area appropriate and reasonable, including in relation to the NPPF, and in terms of environmental, economic and social impact?
- ii) Are they clear and deliverable, including in respect of the associated infrastructure requirements?

**Participants [16 seats]**

**Alan Lodwick**  
**Andrew Hornsby-Smith**  
**Bloombridge LLP**

**CPRE Oxfordshire**  
**GVA**  
**John Batchelor**  
**JPPC**  
**Judy Hall**  
**Kidlington Parish Council**  
**Oxford City Council**  
**Oxford Preservation Trust**  
**Oxfordshire County Council**  
**Oxford Green Belt Network**  
**Savills**  
**Terrence O'Rourke Ltd**  
**West Waddy ADP**

**Tuesday 16<sup>th</sup> December 2014 0930 - 1730**

**Issue 8 – Bicester - Housing Sites, Bic 1 NW Bicester, Bic 2 Graven Hill, Bic 3 SW Bicester (Phase 2), Bic 12 SE Bicester, Bic 13 Gavray Drive and Omission Sites in that order.**

- i) Are the policies and proposals for growth and change in this area appropriate and reasonable, including in relation to the NPPF, and in terms of environmental, economic and social impact?
- ii) Are they clear and deliverable, including in respect of the associated infrastructure requirements?

**Participants [18 seats]**

**BaECON**  
**Barton Willmore**  
**Bicester Local History Society**  
**Bloombridge LLP**  
**Boyer Planning**  
**CPRE Oxfordshire**  
**David Lock Assocs**  
**Dominic Woodfield**  
**Environment Agency**  
**Framptons**  
**Kemp and Kemp**  
**Middleton Stoney Parish Council**  
**Oxford City Council**  
**Pamela Roberts**  
**Pat Clissold**  
**Strutt and Parker**  
**Terrence O'Rourke Ltd**  
**Turley**

**Wednesday 17<sup>th</sup> December 2014 0930 - 1730**

**Issue 9 – Bicester -Other Site Allocations, Policies Bic 4 to Bic 11 inclusive and Omission Sites in that order**

- i) Are the policies and proposals for growth and change in this area appropriate and reasonable, including in relation to the NPPF, and in terms of environmental, economic and social impact?

- ii) Are they clear and deliverable, including in respect of the associated infrastructure requirements?

**Participants [12 seats]**

**BaECON  
Barton Willmore  
Bloombridge LLP  
David Lock Associates  
DP9  
Environment Agency  
Framptons  
Indigo Planning  
Oxfordshire County Council  
QUOD  
Royal Pioneer Corp Angling Assoc  
Turley**

**Thursday 18<sup>th</sup> December 2014 0930 - 1330**

**Issue 12 – Villages and Rural Areas (Villages 1 – 4 and Villages 5 Former RAF Upper Heyford)**

- i) Are the policies and proposals for growth and change in these areas appropriate and reasonable, including in relation to the NPPF, and in terms of environmental, economic and social impact?
- ii) Are they clear and deliverable, including in respect of the associated infrastructure requirements?

**Participants [20 seats]**

**Adderbury Parish Council  
Ardley with Fewcott Parish Council  
Barton Willmore  
Berry Morris  
Bloxham Parish Council  
CBRE  
CPRE Oxfordshire  
David Lock Associates  
Deddington Development Watch  
Deddington Parish Council  
English Heritage  
Heyford Park Residents and Community Development Association  
Middleton Stoney Parish Council  
Oxfordshire County Council  
Pegasus Group  
RPS  
Terrence O'Rourke Ltd  
Upper Heyford Parish Council  
Upper Heyford Village Residents Group  
West Waddy ADP**

**Friday 19<sup>th</sup> December 2014 0930 - 1730**

**Issue 10 – Banbury - Housing Sites, Ban 1 Canalside, Ban 2 Hardwick Farm/Southam Road (E+W), Ban 3 W of Bretch Hill, Ban 4 Bankside Phase 2, Ban 5 N of Hanwell Fields, Ban 16 South of Salt Way – West, Ban 17 South of Salt Way East, Ban 18 Land at Drayton Lodge Farm, Ban 19 Land at Higham Way and Omission Sites in that order**

- i) Are the policies and proposals for growth and change in this area appropriate and reasonable, including in relation to the NPPF, and in terms of environmental, economic and social impact?
- ii) Are they clear and deliverable, including in respect of the associated infrastructure requirements?

**Participants [12 seats]**

**Barton Willmore  
Bodicote Parish Council  
David Lock Assocs  
Framptons  
Grundon  
Kemp & Kemp  
Oxfordshire County Council  
Planning Potential  
Rapleys  
Savills  
Smiths Gore  
Turley**

**Monday 22<sup>nd</sup> December 2014 1430 – 1730**

**Issue 14 – Infrastructure / Delivery & Monitoring (Policy INF 1)**

- i) **[Infrastructure]** - Bearing in mind the funding required, is the plan economically viable and practically achievable in the timescales envisaged and in the forms proposed and, if not, what should be changed and why to enhance delivery prospects?
- ii) **[Delivery]** - Is the necessary public and private sector funding likely to be available to deliver development on the key sites and elsewhere in the district, including in relation to the strategic road network?
- iii) **[Flexibility]** - Is the plan reasonably flexible to enable it to deal with changing circumstances and, if not, what changes/contingencies would improve the ability to respond to new issues arising during the plan period, such as a lack of investment in major projects?
- iv) **[Monitoring]** - Will the monitoring proposed in Appendix E be sufficiently comprehensive and informative to achieve its objectives and if not, why not, and what needs to be changed?
- v) **[Implementation]** - Are the implementation mechanisms identified sufficient and suitable to achieve their objectives, for example in relation to delivering the strategic housing allocations and, if not, why not, and what needs to be changed?

**Participants [7 seats]**

**Barton Willmore  
Boyer Planning  
David Lock Associates  
Oxford City Council  
Oxfordshire County Council  
Pegasus Group  
Sarah / Brett Chambers**

**Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> December 2014 0930 – 1730**

**Issue 11 – Banbury - Other Site Allocations, Policies Ban 6 to Ban 15 inclusive and Omission Sites in that order**

- i) Are the policies and proposals for growth and change in this area appropriate and reasonable, including in relation to the NPPF, and in terms of environmental, economic and social impact?
- ii) Are they clear and deliverable, including in respect of the associated infrastructure requirements?

**Participants [11 seats]**

**Bodicote Parish Council  
Brown & Co  
David Lock Associates  
Framptons  
Kennet Properties  
Oxfordshire County Council  
Pegasus Group  
Savills  
South Northants Council  
Smiths Gore  
Turley**