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1. Introduction

This Statement of Consultation describes the consultation undertaken in progressing with the Partial Review of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan 2011-2031 (Part 1). It will be updated as the Council proceeds through the statutory stages of plan-making.

This statement has been prepared to support a formal proposed submission plan under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. It reports on public consultation, engagement and co-operation undertaken in reaching this stage.

The Council has a statutory duty to consult and seek representations in preparing a Local Plan. It must also ensure that there is on-going co-operation with prescribed bodies under a ‘Duty to Co-operate’.

The Council’s policy on how it engages in plan-making is described in its Statement of Community Involvement 2016. The SCI is available on-line at www.cherwell.gov.uk/planningpolicy

2. The ‘Duty to Cooperate’

Section 33A (1) and (3) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) places a duty on a local planning authority to co-operate with other local planning authorities and other prescribed bodies when it undertakes certain activities, including the preparation of development plan documents, activities that can reasonably be considered to prepare the way for such preparation and activities that support such preparation so far as they relate to a strategic matter. This is to maximise the effectiveness with which those activities are undertaken.

Section 33A (4) states that a strategic matter is: ‘sustainable development or use of land that has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas, including (in particular) sustainable development or use of land for, or in connection with, infrastructure that is strategic and has or would have a significant impact on at least two planning areas.’

Section 33A (2) requires a local planning authority ‘to engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis’ in respect of the activities that are subject to the duty.

The local planning authorities that border Cherwell District are:

- Aylesbury Vale District Council
- Buckinghamshire County Council
- Northamptonshire County Council
- Oxford City Council
- Oxfordshire County Council
- South Northamptonshire Council
- South Oxfordshire District Council
- Stratford-on-Avon District Council
- Vale of White Horse District Council
- Warwickshire County Council
West Oxfordshire District Council

The Oxfordshire Councils are assisted in meeting the Duty to Co-operate by an ‘Oxfordshire Growth Board’ (a joint committee) which includes the local authorities within the Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) comprising; Cherwell District Council, Oxford City Council, South Oxfordshire District Council, Vale of White Horse District Council, West Oxfordshire District Council and Oxfordshire County Council. It also includes co-opted non-voting named members from the following organisations:

- LEP: Chairman
- Oxford Universities
- Skills Board
- Harwell/Diamond Light Source
- LEP Business Representative
- LEP Oxford City Business Representative
- Homes and Communities Agency

In addition, when considering matter that sit under the remit of the Local Transport Board then Network Rail and the Highways England have the right to attend the Growth Board as non-voting investment partners.

The Growth Board is supported by officer and working groups as required.

Regulation 4 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 sets out the other prescribed bodies for the purposes of implementing Section 33A of the 2004 Act. Of those bodies listed in the Regulation it is considered that the following bodies are relevant to Cherwell District:

- The Environment Agency
- Natural England
- The Civil Aviation Authority
- The Homes and Communities Agency
- The NHS Oxfordshire
- The Office of Rail Regulation
- The Highway Authority – Section 1 of the Highways Act 1980:
  - Oxfordshire County Council (Highways)
  - The Highways Agency (Highways England)
- Local Enterprise Partnerships:
  - The Oxfordshire Local Enterprise Partnership (OxLEP)
  - The South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership (SEMLEP)
- The Oxfordshire Local Nature Partnership

The application of the ‘Duty to Co-operate’ is also informed by the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and Planning Practice Guidance (PPG).
3. Previous consultation

In January 2016, the Council published a consultation paper which highlighted issues that needed to be considered in undertaking a Partial Review of the Local Plan. The Issues Paper invited comments and discussion of the issues was encouraged; a ‘call for sites’ was also made. A Statement of Consultation which summarised the issues raised during the consultation was published alongside the November 2016 Options Paper. These documents are available on-line at www.cherwell.gov.uk/planningpolicy

4. Consultation & Engagement

Consultation arrangements
On 14 November 2016 the Council published an Options Paper for consultation. The Paper was prepared to engage with local communities, partners and stakeholders in developing options on how to meet Oxford’s housing needs when preparing a partial review of the adopted Cherwell Local Plan Part 1. A copy of the Public Notice is attached at Appendix 1.

How did we consult?
The formal consultation ran for eight weeks from 14 November 2016 – 9 January 2017.

Distribution
The consultees listed in the Statement of Community Involvement and anyone who had registered on the Council’s database were notified by letter or email and were asked to comment on the Options Paper generally and answer specific questions (Appendix 2).

Hard copies were also placed at deposit locations across the district including libraries and Council offices. In addition hard copies were placed at some locations in Oxford (Oxford City Council offices, Old Marston Library and Summertown Library). A consultation summary leaflet and poster were also produced and were made available at these locations as well as on the Council’s website Appendices 3 & 4).

The consultation arrangements were discussed in advance with officers from Oxford City Council and publicity material provided to the City Council to enable it to advertise the consultation as it preferred.

Press Coverage
The statutory public notice was placed in the following newspapers:
- Oxford Mail (10 November 2016)
- Bicester Advertiser (10 November 2016)
- Banbury Guardian (10 November 2016)

Social Media
Press releases regarding the consultation were published on the Council’s Facebook and Twitter pages. The press releases explained the purpose of the consultation document and provided details
of the consultation including exhibition dates and locations where the documents were available to view.

Public Exhibitions

Staffed Public exhibitions were held during November and December 2016 at:

- **Castle Quay Shopping Centre**, Banbury OX16 5UN on Saturday 26th November 2016 from 10.00 am to 6.00pm.
- **Franklins House**, Wesley Lane, Bicester, OX26 6JU on Saturday 3rd December 2016 from 10.00 am to 6.00pm.
- **The Pavillion**, Cutteslowe Park, Oxford OX2 8ES on Saturday 10th December 2016 from 10.00 am to 6.00 pm
- **Exeter Hall**, Exeter Close, Kidlington OX5 1AB on Monday 19th December 2016 from 2.00 pm to 9.00 pm.

5. Consultation with Statutory and Non-Statutory Bodies

**Oxfordshire Growth Board**

In 2013, The Oxfordshire Local Planning Authorities (LPA) commissioned a new Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA), supported by joint working on economic forecasting to establish the appropriate level of planned growth across the Oxfordshire Housing Market Area and the level of housing need arising in each District.

Officers from all Oxfordshire Authorities met on 17 May 2013 to discuss how the results of the SHMA should be considered, incorporated in to emerging plans where possible, and used as the basis for further joint working between the Councils. The purpose was to reach agreement and formalise joint working, provide a common basis on which to progress the SHMA and avoid unnecessary delay to Local Plan preparation.

In April 2014 the Oxfordshire Local Authorities, published the SHMA for Oxfordshire. The document suggested that the demographic trends and growth of the County economy and the level of affordable housing need required would necessitate 100,060 additional new homes in Oxfordshire between 2011 and 2031.

In November 2014, the Oxfordshire Growth Board, a Joint Committee which, on behalf of OxLEP is charged with the delivery of projects agreed in the ‘Oxford and Oxfordshire City Deal’ and ‘Local Growth Deals’ agreed a programmes of work for addressing the unmet need arising from the SHMA. This programme of work would help the Local Planning Authorities meet the Duty to Co-operate whilst protecting the ‘sovereignty’ of individual councils over their Local Plans.

A Project Team was established for progressing the work, co-ordinated by the Growth Board’s Programme Manager and reporting to an Executive Officer Group which in turn reports to the Growth Board. This Project Team met regularly to consider the implications of the SHMA and how best to meet the identified unmet housing need of Oxford. This is in the context of recognising that the administrative boundaries of the City of Oxford are constrained and consequently it is seeking effective ways to address this issue in line with the Duty to Cooperate. The members of the formal
Growth Board comprise the leaders of each council who were presented with periodic updates and took key decisions at scheduled public meetings.

From January 2015 to September 2016, the Project Team generally met on a fortnightly basis to progress, on a co-operative basis, the following projects:

- An understanding of the urban capacity of Oxford and the level of unmet housing need
- Oxford Green Belt Study to assess the extent to which the land within the Oxford Green Belt performs against the purposes of Green Belts
- Oxford Spatial Options Assessment to help inform the apportionment or distribution of unmet housing need to the district and city councils.
- High Level Transport Assessment of Spatial Options
- Education Assessment of Spatial Options.

This programme of work culminated in a decision of the Growth Board on 26 September 2016 on the apportionment of Oxford’s unmet housing need to the individual district and city councils. A copy of the Oxfordshire Growth Board’s Signed Memorandum of Cooperation (South Oxfordshire DC did not sign the Memorandum) is reproduced at Appendix 6. This programme of work and the Growth Board’s decision has informed the preparation of the Partial Review of the Cherwell Local Plan.

All six Councils have continued to meet on matters associated with the Partial Review including a Countywide Infrastructure Assessment (OXIS) and preparations for a statutory Joint Spatial Plan for Oxfordshire.

Other Meetings/Discussions with Statutory and Non-statutory Bodies

In addition to meeting with bodies through the Oxfordshire Growth Board, Council officers have separately engaged with statutory and non-statutory bodies as follows:

- Regular monthly liaison meetings with officers at Oxfordshire County Council since early 2014.
- Meetings and other liaison with Oxford City Council and West Oxfordshire District Council. This has included discussion on the progress of each other’s plans and emerging proposals for the Partial Review. Collaboration is also taking place with Oxford City on the development of the ‘First and Last Mile’ package of transport requirements required as the Cambridge to Oxford Corridor is developed by the National Infrastructure Commission (NIC)
- On-going joint management arrangements with South Northamptonshire Council
- Duty to Cooperate meeting with Aylesbury Vale DC
- Meetings with Highways Authority to discuss infrastructure requirements in association with proposed allocations.
- Engagement with bodies on evidence and issues including Highways England, Environment Agency, Natural England and Historic England
- Formal consultation as part of the statutory Sustainability Appraisal process with Natural England, the Environment Agency and Historic England.
- Parish & Town Council & stakeholder workshops (described later in this statement)
- Parish Liaison meetings
- In addition to the parish workshops the Head of Strategic Planning and the Economy addressed a Kidlington Parish Council meeting on 4 January 2017 on the subject of the Options Consultation. The meeting was attended by circa 400 members of the public.
- The Deputy Manager - Planning Policy and Growth Strategy gave a presentation and update on the Partial Review to the Cherwell Local Strategic Partnership on 27 April 2017 (Appendix 9)

**Town & Parish Council/ Meeting Workshops**
Two Town and Parish Workshops took place for parishes in the south and north of the district on 7 and 12 December 2016 respectively. The workshops took the form of group discussions on the following agenda items.

- Partial Review – Context/Approach
- Draft Vision and Strategic Objectives
- Considering and Delivering Options
- CIL and Draft Developer Contributions SPD

On arrival, parishes were split into groups and each group discussed each agenda item. The group discussions were facilitated by a member of the Planning Policy Team with support from other officers.

The issues arising from the workshops in so far as they relate to the partial Review of the Local Plan are summarised below. A more detailed note can be found at Appendix 7.

**Parish Workshop (Bicester) Wednesday 7 December 2016 - 6pm – 8pm**

**Summary of Key Issues**

**Table 1**
- Can we seek contributions from the City for infrastructure in Cherwell?
- 4,400 house seems high
- Need infrastructure before houses
- Traffic congestion and transport are key concerns
- If it is Oxford’s need why does Cherwell need to fund it?
- Lack of progress on Oxford’s housing sites delivery

**Table 2**
- Green Belt is not sacrosanct
- South of District preferred
- Spatial relationship to Oxford
- Need for Oxford – close to Oxford
- Infrastructure needs to be considered first
- Loop (Route) to Park and Rides
- Who is going to fund the infrastructure?
- Integrated cycle paths through to Oxford
- Areas A & B preferred
• Support for CIL and Developer Contributions

Table 3
• Roads and Transport
• AONB should be established near Oxford
• Serious work to sort out transport around Oxford e.g. trams etc.
• Should Cherwell provide housing for Oxford?
• Don’t protect all of the Green Belt e.g. in A and B apart from near Woodstock
• No industrial/ commercial development
• No out of town shopping centre in Woodstock
• Smaller units and social housing
• Some CIL possibilities
• Constraints - Blenheim – World Heritage Site and Roman villa on proposed site near Woodstock
• Caversfield is within a conservation area.

Table 4
• Need investment in transport, traffic and roads
• Should Cherwell provide it all?
• Don’t protect all the Green Belt
• In A&B but not Woodstock
• Social housing
• No employment
• Some possibilities for CIL

Parish Workshop (Banbury) Monday 12 December 2016 - 6pm – 8pm

Summary of Key Issues

Table 1
• Can we see Oxford City’s SHLAA?
• Oxford should maximise existing sites eg brownfield
• Transport Constraints
• Infrastructure delivery
• Green Belt – some incursion may be ok but need to preserve identity/character of existing towns and villages
• Need to have evidence to justify sites
• Better chance to get infrastructure with larger sites
• Need to preserve green gaps between settlements with some development close to Oxford

Table 2
• Housing type – affordable, density and scale
• Need new roads, bus services, cycling. Long term investment
• Continue with Areas A and B (but high land values)
• No development in villages
• Some opportunities in low value green belt (evidence needed)
• Use PDL but expensive to deliver
• Should have lower CIL on PDL to free up MOD land

Table 3
• 4,400 too much
• What will happen with South Oxfordshire’s apportionment?
• Grenoble Road
• SHMA should be reassessed after BREXIT
• What is the housing need? Who? Where?
• Employers in Oxford find it difficult to recruit.
• Oxford has high rents and land prices
• Preferred areas of search A&B, Bicester and Banbury

Table 4
• Preference for development closer to Oxford because of transport, sustainability, affordable housing.
• Review Green Belt
• New settlement in preference to multiple small developments.

Officer Response
The issues raised have been considered in preparing the vision, objectives, and policies in the Partial Review, and in identifying the strategic development sites

Stakeholder Workshop
A focussed stakeholder workshop was held at Bodicote House on Tuesday 13 December 2016.

A summary of the issues raised can be found in Appendix 8.

Main comments on the Partial Review context and approach included:

• **Approach to growth**: support for county towns approach and Sustainable Urban Extensions, concerns with urban extensions to Oxford due to environmental, Green Belt and Infrastructure constraints, support for an approach based on Oxford’s needs with development located near Oxford, support for an approach which leans on public transport and transport hubs.

• **SHMA, housing need and apportionment**: concerns with the adequacy of the SHMA (exaggerated needs and focus on employment growth), support for SHMA as ratified by PINs, queries about population updates needed at later stages of plan preparation, queries on whether CDC will accommodate further growth and the consequences of SODC not endorsing the Growth Board apportionment.
• **Green Belt (GB) and Kidlington Gap**: Kidlington Gap is strategic, queries on whether best to undertake a GB Review or a GB Leap with views for and against both approaches, fears that a GB review will open ‘Pandora’s box’ and hence it should not be reviewed, support for a GB Review which is targeted and not excessive review and permanent for 20+ years. Need to justify GB review’s exceptional circumstances.

• **Deliverability**: Increased housing delivery possible, landowners looking at land disposal although builders are maxed out at the moment, landowners aspirations (land values) are an issue for affordable housing, need a mixed of large and small sites. Smaller sites are quicker and easier to deliver. Plan deliverable but GB review is needed.

• **Infrastructure**: High quality transport needed to areas for Oxford’s growth, queries on when the Plan will address infrastructure needs and whether consultations will take place as part of OCC Local Transport Plan.

• **Location of growth**: Support for areas A and B, support for and arguments against further growth in the north of the Cherwell, Upper Heyford and potential MoD land, motorway junctions seen as inappropriate, support for growth at Oxford Parkway, support for locating growth near existing development and near employment, question the approach to areas of search and whether areas A and B have been favoured, views on 4,400 being too much just for Kidlington.

**Officer Response**

The issues raised have been considered in preparing the vision, objectives, and policies in the Partial Review and in identifying the strategic development sites.

6. **Sustainability Appraisal**

The Sustainability Appraisal which accompanies the Proposed Submission Partial Review summarises the representations made to the Initial Sustainability Appraisal (November 2016) and provides responses to the representations.

7. **Representations – Summary of Issues Raised and how they have been considered.**

**Representations Received**

A total of 1225 representations were received which generated a total of nearly 6,000 comments. A table providing a full summary of each representation is attached at Appendix 10.

This section sets out a brief summary of the representations received. It does not offer a commentary on those representations. It has been prepared to provide an overview of the challenge of addressing a complex set of positions from a range of respondents. Full copies of each representation can be viewed online at www.cherwell.gov.uk/planningpolicy

**General Comments**

A large number of representations received made general comments without following the questionnaire.
Over 470 ‘Post card’ type representations were received. There were essentially two versions of the card as follows:

‘Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford. It is unsustainable. It would make traffic problems much worse. Schools and health services would be overstretched. Open countryside in the green belt will be sacrificed, countryside walks and views lost. Natural habitats of great local importance would be destroyed. Cherwell should challenge Oxford City’s unrealistically high extra housing figures. Objection to areas of search and development in the Oxford Green Belt. It is appreciated and enjoyed by local residents. It helps protect historic Oxford from over development. Green Belt is a permanent designation and should continue to be protected.’

‘Objection to the building of 4,400 new houses north of Oxford because it would inevitably lead to unacceptable destruction of the Green Belt, which most Oxfordshire residents have said they wish to retain and which CDC has undertaken to protect. Objection to more pressure being put on local infrastructure including roads, schools and health services which are already overstretched. Objection to the creation of one congested, urban sprawl, joining Oxford to Woodstock which would be unlikely to solve Oxford City’s housing problems and would be used as a dormitory for London commuters. Objection to the loss of our villages’ characters, identities and ancient historical settings and the loss for ever of our adjoining countryside, the local walks, scenery and rural pathways’

A petition responding to the questionnaire signed by 80 residents of Steeple Aston was also received.

Other general comments include:
- The consultation has been poorly publicised.
- Difficult to find consultation details and the paperwork is long and challenging.
- Holding the consultation over the Christmas period was not reasonable.
- Objection to having to meet another Council’s housing needs.
- Oxford needs to explore other options for housing.
- Housing is not needed.
- There is already a commitment in the adopted local plan to build 22,800 new homes by 2031.
- Objection to urban sprawl.
- Disagreement with revised Strategic Economic Plan for Oxfordshire.
- Widespread criticism of the SHMA.
- Growth targets are inflated and unrealistic.

**Officer Response**

The comments made on the consultation process have been noted.

The consultation exercise has met all the requirements stipulated by the relevant planning regulations.

Hard copies of all the consultation documents were available at the ‘deposit’ locations and some locations in Oxford City. Documents were also available on the Council’s website.

The advertised consultation period was eight weeks rather than the six weeks required by the Regulations to take into account the Christmas period.
The Council has a ‘Duty to Cooperate’ with neighbouring authorities.

The SHMA remains the most up-to-date objective assessment of housing need for the Oxfordshire housing market area.

**Question 1: Cherwell’s contributions to Oxford’s Housing Needs – Is 4,400 homes the appropriate housing requirement for Cherwell in seeking to meet Oxford’s unmet housing need?**

There were over 400 responses to this question. Overwhelmingly the representations objected to this figure.

The vast majority of parish councils, including Kidlington, Begbroke, Gosford and Water Eaton, Bodicote and Weston on the Green disagreed with this figure. Those parishes who agreed with the figure included Shipton on Cherwell and Thrupp, Kirtlington, and Banbury and Bicester Town Councils.

Oxfordshire CC, Oxford City Council and West Oxfordshire DC welcomed the apportionment.

Historic England expressed concern stating that it is likely that such a large apportionment would have a significant effect on the historic environment.

Comments in general support included:

- Figure is consistent with the evidence base
- Cherwell should provide more than 4,400 homes
- Council has to fulfil its obligation under ‘Duty to Cooperate’
- A higher level of provision would allow flexibility to accommodate any shortfalls
- Needs to be close to Oxford as it is for Oxford’s needs.
- Cherwell should start with an assessment of how to create new balanced communities that are well connected to Oxford, are of exemplar design and supported by necessary infrastructure and then determine how many houses to provide.
- SHMA mid-point should be 28,000 and not 25,000.
- 15,000 is a working assumption not a true indication of Oxford’s housing need, it should be 22,000
- Investigate all modes of transport to Oxford.
- Upgrading of key corridors to Oxford centre needed.
- Provision of good and improved public transport required
- Aim for a 'Rapid Transit Network' is laudable
- Update Countywide IDP
- Settlements outside the Green Belt such as Bicester, Banbury and Heyford Park are considered suitable with good transport connections to Oxford
- Ensure that the open spaces and countryside of Oxfordshire are not developed unnecessarily as these are vital to support the health and wellbeing of the residents of Cherwell District through outdoor recreation
- Building should be for rental specifically for low income professionals in the health system and education and to be kept occupied by such professionals only.
- AQMA
- Will the infrastructure be in place to match the scale of development?
- Starter homes and affordable homes for young and local people are needed.
- Appropriate housing mix needed
- Part of the South Oxfordshire DC apportionment should be redistributed to the remainder districts.

Comments that do not agree with the apportionment include:

- Oxford City’s strategy should include provision within its own boundaries
- There is no evidence
- Deeply flawed, inappropriate, unreliable, unrealistic, dubious, and not sustainable – not supported by spatial strategy
- Need for a further review of the SHMA to identify real housing need for Oxford
- Oxford should sort out its own problems
- Does not accord with Para 158 of the NPPF
- Further refinement needed following suitability and deliverability of the sites.
- Deliverability is dependent on transport infrastructure and services to build a new community.
- This number will significantly impact communities
- Fait-accompli
- Cherwell should wait
- 550 houses for Oxford is too low
- Avoid impact on the A34
- Oxford is dumping its share onto Kidlington
- Merging of Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington would result in an urban sprawl into Oxford and the and identity and character would be lost
- Consider Brexit
- The role of the OGB, LEP, SHMA and ONS is questioned.
- Increase in additional cars travelling to Oxford
- Existing transport infrastructure is not sustainable.
- Increased traffic congestion
- Limited capacity and increased demand
- Cycling is dangerous due to inadequate cycle lanes.
- Demand on the existing infrastructure and services are unsustainable.
- Increased air, noise and light pollution
- There are no exceptional circumstances to build on the Green Belt
- Inappropriate and unnecessary destruction of GB between Oxford and Kidlington
- Significant impact on wildlife, habitat, etc.
- Walks and views, open spaces, flora and fauna would be lost. Natural habitats lost.
- Use brownfield sites, unoccupied buildings and build close to the city’s ambitious industrial and business developments
- Oxford City is a historic city with a heritage status surrounded by rivers and the Green Belt
- Would radically alter the character of the area
- Would result in a population increase by 40%
- This is a very politically sensitive policy yet has not been subjected to public scrutiny or vote.
- Inadequate and poorly publicised consultation
- Prevent investors and buy to let landlords
- Oxford needs a robust housing policy
- No mention of eco-friendly housing
- New housing will not be affordable for the locals due to high prices
- Object to housing in Cherwell and employment in Oxford.
- Employment growth estimates are exaggerated by OxLEP
- Fundamentally unsustainable and damaging to Oxford

**Officer Response**

The Localism Act 2011 introduced a statutory Duty to Co-operate for local authorities in preparing their Local Plans. Authorities must engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis. The NPPF states that joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas.

All of Oxfordshire’s Councils have accepted that Oxford cannot fully meet its own housing needs. They collectively committed to consider the extent of Oxford’s unmet need and how that need might be sustainably distributed to the neighbouring districts so that this could be tested through their respective local plans.

Oxford has a high level of housing need and problems of affordable access to the housing market. New homes are required urgently to meet Oxford’s existing and future needs to meet demographic demand, to help access to the housing market and to support economic growth.

The Plan explains the conclusions of the Oxfordshire Strategic Housing Market Assessment (2014), how the SHMA was prepared and how the level of Oxford’s unmet need was identified. It also explains how the unmet housing need has been apportioned as a result of the Oxfordshire Growth Board’s decision on 26 September 2016.

The SHMA remains the most up-to-date objective assessment of housing need for the Oxfordshire housing market area.

The Sustainability Appraisal supporting the Plan tested the likely environmental, social and economic effects of providing 4,400 homes and the alternatives of providing significantly more or significantly less.

An extensive evidence base has been amassed to inform the preparation of the Plan. They cover issues such as landscape capacity, green belt, ecology, transport, viability, and flood risk. These pieces of evidence address many of the issues raised in the representations.

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

- The housing apportionment of 4,400 homes along with alternatives (significantly more or significantly less) were considered in the Sustainability Appraisal.
- The Proposed Submission Plan seeks to deliver 4,400 new homes as agreed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board on 26 September 2016 and tested through the Plan preparation process.
• Further information is included in Section 1 of the Proposed Submission Plan and in the Sustainability Appraisal.

**Question 2: Spatial relationship to Oxford: Do you agree that we need to specifically meet Oxford’s needs in planning for the additional housing?**

Those in general agreement included Oxford City Council, West Oxfordshire DC, Oxfordshire CC and English Heritage. Parishes and Town Councils that responded favourably included Bicester and Banbury Town Councils, Bloxham PC, Launton PC and Shipton on Cherwell and Thrupp PC.

The majority of the parish councils that responded did not agree. They included Gosford and Water Eaton PC, Begbroke PC, Hampton Gay and Poyle PC, Islip PC, Noke PM, Caversfield PC and Wendlebury PC.

The key points raised by the representations included:

• Spatial relationship to Oxford is logical located at the edge of Oxford and in close proximity to Oxford City centre with good public transport connections.
• New housing should be provided along the existing public transport connections and build on the existing travel patterns with supporting infrastructure in place before new housing development. Implement Rapid Transit.
• Sustainability Appraisal, Interim Transport Assessment and Growth Board’s assessment criteria was very limited to assess the impact on the Green Belt.
• Need to strengthen sustainable transport infrastructure though investment.
• The NPPF is clear that strategies for housing and employment in local plans should be integrated.
• Oxford should reduce the number of sites it has identified for employment purposes and should reallocate the land for housing.
• Oxford should only embark on a strategy to divert employment growth elsewhere to areas that need and welcome it both in Oxfordshire and the country as a whole.
• Sites selected for development should not compromise the purposes of the Green Belt.
• Oxford should do more for its housing need first and explore all possibilities. Allocate land for housing rather than employment. Oxford could meet their own needs by using neglected brownfield sites currently used or earmarked for commercial and industrial purposes.
• A district wide approach should be applied to considering additional opportunities for allocating residential land.
• Unclear why Cherwell should meet Oxford’s needs in this area and on such a large scale. Is a much larger city being planned? Is coalescence inevitable?
• Housing for employees can be dispersed all over Oxfordshire and surrounding districts
• Prevent coalescence of Kidlington with Oxford and retain the green gap, recreational value of the countryside etc. that are important to the residents of Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton.
• Reference the URBED report – expansion of Bicester and Didcot and their surrounding linked by train/tram services.
Officer Response

The Localism Act 2011 introduced a statutory Duty to Co-operate for local authorities in preparing their Local Plans. Authorities must engage constructively, actively and on an on-going basis. The NPPF states that joint working should enable local planning authorities to work together to meet development requirements which cannot wholly be met within their own areas.

All of Oxfordshire’s Councils have accepted that Oxford cannot fully meet its own housing needs. They collectively committed to consider the extent of Oxford’s unmet need and how that need might be sustainably distributed to the neighbouring districts so that this could be tested through their respective local plans.

Oxford has a high level of housing need and problems of affordable access to the housing market. New homes are required urgently to meet Oxford’s existing and future needs to meet demographic demand, to help access to the housing market and to support economic growth.

The district as a whole has a clear geographic, social, economic and historic relationship with Oxford. The Plan includes a clear vision for how Oxford’s unmet housing needs will be met within Cherwell.

The Plan’s vision, objectives and policies are specifically tailored to sustainably meet Oxford’s needs but at the same time also responding to the Cherwell context.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

- The spatial relationship to Oxford was considered when drafting the Vision and Objectives, identifying the Areas of Search Options and considering strategic development sites.
- Section 3 of the Proposed Submission Plan sets out the wider context.

Q3. Are there any issues that we need to consider as we continue to assess development options?

OCCG advises that any significant housing development will have implications for health provision, particularly GP practices.

Oxfordshire CC advises that funding for infrastructure continues to be an issue as does improving overall health and wellbeing.

West Oxfordshire DC considers that there is a need to consider the cumulative impact of options and growth in Cherwell together with growth planned in West Oxfordshire.

Issues raised more generally in the representations include:

- Impact on the Green Belt.
- Flooding and flood plains.
- Kidlington Masterplan, which considers that the Green Belt remains fundamentally unchanged.
• Need for appropriate infrastructure, access to Park and Ride, schools, public transport, medical facilities, shops, appropriate town centre developments, etc.
• Need to improve public transport connections and accessibility
• Need real commitment to transport improvements, such as A34, the railway and access to Oxford.
• What government support is available from a political and financial stance?
• Implications and impact on environmental character and quality.
• Future sustainability of Oxford as a University City given severe constraints on growth.
• Consider the employment needs in Cherwell.
• Significant housing development will have implications for health provision in Oxfordshire.
• Consider the potential for Category A villages for Oxford’s needs in relation to connectivity and sustainability.
• New development should not prevent expansion of the Oxford Airport in the future.
• Ability for development to provide a rail link.
• Plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt.
• Rethink the broad idea of a new village/small town instead of ruining the integrity of 3 existing well defined villages.
• Sustainability, distance from Oxford and resultant traffic pollution.
• Health and wellbeing of the residents
• Phasing to reassess the actual need in 10 years.
• Taylor Review – rural areas are equally sustainable with technological change leading to change in working patterns allowing more home working and reducing the need to travel.
• Key worker homes as a potential form of affordable housing alongside employment sites.
• Contributions from developers should be much higher.
• Prevent coalescence of settlements
• A new station should not be used as a prop to allow other unwanted development.
• Support housing in Woodstock and Islip.

Officer Response

An extensive evidence base has been prepared to inform the Partial Review. These include Transport Assessment and Modelling, Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment, a Housing and Economic Land availability Assessment, a Green Belt Study, and a Habitats Regulations Assessment.

The Partial Review has been prepared having regard to consultation feedback from key local stakeholders including the NHS, the Highway Authority and education providers.

The Plan’s vision, objectives and policies are specifically tailored to sustainably meet Oxford’s needs but at the same time also responding to the Cherwell context.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

• The issues were considered when drafting the Vision and Objectives in Section 4 of the Proposed Submission Plan.
Q4. Do you support the draft vision? Are changes required?

The principle of the draft vision is supported by the majority of parish councils and other respondents.

Both Kidlington PC and Gosford and Water Eaton PC state that the Vision should make reference to existing communities and the environment. Historic England considers that the Vision should include ‘that conserve or enhance the historic environment and heritage assets therein’.

Other comments on the vision include:

- Need to preserve the traditional and peaceful rural character of the village life
- Development needs to be of exemplary design, supported by the necessary infrastructure
- Provide a range of household types that reflect Oxford’s and Oxfordshire’s diverse needs but not at the expense of the wildlife habitats and existing communities.
- Support our world class economy and ensure people have convenient, affordable and sustainable travel opportunities for work, recreation and services.
- Vision statement needs to recognise that Oxford is not the only focus within Oxfordshire.
- New balanced communities should be well connected to Oxford and other economic centres within Oxfordshire
- To add “Ensuring new housing is delivered to provide balanced communities…” to the Vision statement
- Include reference to deliverability, the integrity of the Green Belt and the regeneration of Kidlington in the Vision Statement
- Consider impact on the local communities including safeguarding the countryside for the urban population, not removing opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation near urban areas, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.
- Not considered appropriate for housing development to happen without proportionate employment and economic development.
- OGB should be distributing employment sites as well as considering locations other than Oxford to reduce the need for commuting to the City.
- To succeed, such new communities must have access to, or facilities provided that will allow cultural, community, health and education activities to flourish. These aspects should be specified in the ‘Vision’.
- The Vision needs amending to mention the protection and enhancement of the natural environment for future generations, including the Oxford Green Belt.
- Vision should make reference to realising potentially significant local (social, economic, and environmental) benefits associated with accommodating a proportion of Oxford’s unmet housing needs housing in the district
- Suggested rewording, “To require that developments are well-designed and responsive to their surroundings”.
- Provide adequate infrastructure to support growth
- Locate adjacent to Oxford City
- As these will be in GB the design should achieve high densities that minimise the impact on GB objectives with exemplary environmental standards.
• Sustainable forms of development.
• Preference to homes as opposed to flats, in particular in the Green Belt
• Consider sites for less than 100 dwellings
• Housing need is exaggerated; there is no evidence for it;
• Unused industrial sites should be used first.
• Vision is faulty premise, there are no exceptional circumstances to justify building on the Green Belt
• Consider the possibility of garden village outside the Green Belt.
• Oxford-Cambridge technology corridor

Officer Response

The purpose of the Plan is to help meet Oxford's unmet housing needs.

The Partial Review is to meet Oxford's needs not Cherwell's (although once it is provided it is not within the Council's gift to interfere with the housing market).

There is no need identified in the SHMA for an Oxford and environs sub-area.

The vision is not locationally specific.

It is agreed that some rewording is required. The Vision would benefit from a reference to responding distinctively and sensitively to the local Cherwell context

The Vision would benefit from a reference to the achievement of high environmental standards.

It is agreed that the Vision should make reference to improving health and well-being.

Meeting diverse housing needs is already included as is exemplar development.

A change highlighting a need to respond distinctively and sensitively to the local built, historic and environmental context would be beneficial

The Vision is more than just about housing numbers and emphasises the importance of supporting infrastructure.

The delivery of housing is clear in the supporting objectives

The potential impact on the Green Belt is a matter for the subsequent consideration of options to meet the Vision. Issues of deliverability are for the objectives and policies.

The principle of strengthening Kidlington is agreed but the content of the Partial Review is dependent on the consideration of options.

The Vision cannot preclude the option of development in the countryside. Sustainable sites need to be identified and the impact on the environment tested.

It is agreed that the reference to communities could be read as precluding the expansion of existing communities. More emphasis has been added on the provision of new development.
The Growth Board has reached agreement on the level of need and its apportionment.

Many of the other issues raised are policy and implementation matters.

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

- The issues were considered when drafting the Vision in Section 4 of the Proposed Submission Plan and tested with the benefit of evidence including the sustainability appraisal

**Question 5: Do you support draft Strategic Objective SO16? Are changes required?**

**In Support**
A number of representations, including those from Oxfordshire CC, Oxford City Council and Historic England, were supportive of this objective. Points made included:

- Councils should work together for a coordinated approach
- It is a statutory requirement under the Duty to Cooperate
- Collaborating with other stakeholders will ensure that not only are the housing numbers met but that the dwellings are located in accessible and appropriate areas.
- Bicester Town Council agrees to SO16
- Subject to Cherwell’s contribution being proportionate to that of Oxford and other districts. GB being preserved and protected and in keeping with unique character of village life.

**Do Not Support**
A number of representations, including that from Begbroke Parish Council, did not support this objective.

- Cherwell should not accept the housing figures from Oxford they are too high.
- The 2015 adopted local plan should prevail.
- There are insufficient doctors and emergency services.
- Do not believe Oxford has an unmet need. It should use employment land for housing, empty homes and brownfield land.
- Cherwell officers should look after Cherwell not Oxford.
- Appears other councils being dictated to by Oxford.
- Figure is too high based on flawed assumptions.
- Process inadequately thought through and consultation exceptionally poor.
- No. It is not an objective but rather a method. The objective for Kidlington should be about protection of its strengths and attributes as a pleasant place to live and work
- It needs to change to include action by Oxford to deal with the completely inadequate transport links to and around the city (NOT more buses).
- There is nothing to suggest that realistic and deliverable plans are in place to provide the necessary infrastructure improvements.

**Proposed Amendments**
Several representations, including from Kidlington PC, were received suggesting amendments to the wording of the objective

- Needs to state how three authorities will work together in delivering sustainable solutions of housing in the city. The policy is fragmented across three authorities. With no single authority responsible for meeting this housing need there is little political imperative to deliver the numbers identified in the way set out in the policy wording.
- Amendments required that support and compliment the city's world class economy, universities and outstanding environment.
- The overall approach could be enhanced by also continuing the Kidlington Master Plan process.
- Suggest amending the policy wording to outline how the infrastructure and housing can be jointly delivered with key stakeholders during the plan period. The wording as it stands is limited in its ability to deliver.
- Changes are required to reflect para B95 of the Local Plan Part 1 (which commits the Council to seeking to address the unmet housing needs arising from elsewhere in the OHMA particularly Oxford City) and para 17 of the Inspector's 9 June 2015 report on the examination into the Local Plan
- Does not make reference to the need to avoid sacrificing the quality of life enjoyed by Cherwell residents and businesses.
- The statement needs to acknowledge those living and working in Cherwell and not just the needs of Oxford. There is little detail on how transport issues could be resolved and accommodate developments such as the Northern Gateway.

**Officer Response**

Comments in support of this objective are noted.

The objective is not locationally specific

The apportionment was established by the Oxfordshire Growth Board and the capacity of Oxford to meet its own needs has been tested.

The Partial Review responds to national planning policy and an adopted Local Plan commitment.

The Plan will identify sustainable policies to deliver the Vision and objectives

A reference to the provision of infrastructure would be beneficial

The Partial Review will require a transport specific policy

The objective refers to the critical partners in terms of meeting needs and delivering key infrastructure within Cherwell. The Oxfordshire Councils collectively continue to work together through the Oxfordshire Growth Board. However, it is possible that other neighbouring Authorities may become key partners

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

- The issues were considered when drafting the Strategic Objectives in Section 4 of the Proposed Submission Plan and tested with the benefit of evidence including the sustainability appraisal
Question 6: Do you support SO17?

There is widespread criticism of this objective including from Kidlington PC and Gosford and Water Eaton PC. The main points raised include:

- The current projections for housing in the SHMA 2014 and OXLEP’s economic forecasts are fundamentally flawed and out of date. The evidence base needs updating.
- The objective is unbalanced as it takes no account of environmental or social factors
- Further economic growth of Oxford is unsustainable
- Changes are required to protect the green belt
- Concentration should be on developing other industries across Oxfordshire so removing the need to travel to Oxford.
- Cherwell cannot meet Oxford’s growth needs without a huge infrastructure investment which cannot be funded.
- More employment is needed in Cherwell not Oxford.

There were a number of supportive comments including from West Oxfordshire DC, Oxford City Council and Bicester Town Council. Other comments included:

- It should be acknowledged that the existing adopted local plan already achieves a level of support to Oxford by the Bicester allocations.
- Housing growth should support the rural economy
- Supported only if the current transport problems are addressed.
- Objective should more explicitly reflect the need to locate housing in a way that best serves the Oxford economy.
- It is important to provide an appropriate evidence base to justify the level of Oxford’s unmet housing need.

Officer Response

The comments in support of this objective are noted.

This objective is not locationally specific

There is no evidence not to rely on the SHMA

The objectives embedded in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan Part 1 are applicable

The housing is being provided to meet the economic needs of Oxford. Cherwell has planned to meet its own needs in the adopted Local Plan.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

- The issues were considered when drafting the Strategic Objectives in Section 4 of the Proposed Submission Plan and tested with the benefit of evidence including the sustainability appraisal

Question 7: Do you support draft Strategic Objective SO18?
The majority of representations were generally in support of the overall aims of this objective. The OCCG considered that the issue of key worker housing for health is important. Both Gosford & Water Eaton PC and Kidlington PC support this objective. Other comments included:

- The housing needs to be for people who work locally not London commuters.
- Housing needs to be kept permanently affordable.
- As long as it does not gridlock Kidlington a certain level of commuting in to Oxford will be acceptable.
- Plan should consider specific affordable housing quotas of at least 50% as within Oxford City.
- Design and layout is important. Any development should be of mixed housing to be affordable to a range of people.
- These homes should also be available for Kidlington residents.
- The public sector needs to take a lead in delivering these affordable homes.
- Support for the provision of access from new housing to Oxford’s employment areas to encourage delivery of sustainable transport links.
- Not acceptable for developers not to provide affordable housing on viability grounds.
- Only if Oxford City can demonstrate its housing needs are genuine and if Cherwell’s economic growth is promoted as well.

A minority of the representations raised concerns/objections to this objective. Comments made include:

- CDC should develop less economically successful locations.
- It will create urban sprawl and unhappy neighbourhoods.
- Key workers need to live in areas away from the centre with good transport links. North Oxford and Kidlington are too expensive.
- Little confidence that development will meet needs of the target groups for affordable housing.
- Not at the expense of the green belt.
- Should not assume that Oxford has significantly different housing market characteristics and issues than the rest of the HMA.
- How can housing be distinguished between those who require access to Oxford and those who do not?

Officer Response

Some re-wording of the policy would be helpful in the interest of clarity. The Vision refers to the diverse needs of the City. However, this specific objective is tailored to meeting Oxford’s specific needs & issues of affordability.

The objective references key worker housing which is raised in the Oxford Housing Strategy.

The objective is not locationally specific.

The plan will need to be shown to be deliverable.

Sustainable travel is highlighted in the Vision and the Local Transport Plan in SO19.

The objective seeks to respond to Oxford’s need and affordability issues but cannot control the market.
The viability of affordable housing requirements will be policy tested. While it is accepted that travel to work patterns do not reflect administrative boundaries, the housing is planned to meet Oxford's needs arising from its economic growth (and other needs). Access to Oxford's own key employment area needs to be central to the strategy but that does not mean that other economic factors will not influence final locational decisions.

While some clarification of the objective would be helpful, in terms of those more generally, requiring a home, the objective covers this by the reference to those requiring access to Oxford's key employment areas. The market will also release housing within Oxford. The plan cannot control the market but as the housing need arising from the economic growth of Oxford & its affordability needs, it is important that the strategy for Cherwell focuses on this. The Plan will need to consider the definition of Key workers.

South Oxfordshire DC's apportionment is a matter for them, and coordinated consideration through the Oxfordshire Growth Board.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

- The issues were considered when drafting the Strategic Objectives in Section 4 of the Proposed Submission Plan and tested with the benefit of evidence including the sustainability appraisal

Question 8: Do you support Draft Strategic Objective SO19?

Begbroke PC objected to SO19 as current transport issues are unmanageable, with little scope for future improvement. Oxford Bus Company questions the ability of the Plans to deliver the infrastructure required against the clear gap between aspiration and funding. Bicester Town Council is concerned that the STP is not robust enough and traffic issues will continue to escalate. Gosford and Water Eaton PC supports the objective but are very concerned about the potential impact of large scale development on existing transport infrastructure given major problems. West Oxfordshire DC supports the objective. The impact on the A44 corridor needs to be carefully considered. It is vital both districts work together with the County to bring forward the proposed A40/A44 link.

Other comments included:

- No. Congestion in Kidlington will increase.
- There has been insufficient thought. Do not wish to live like Bicester.
- Nothing to suggest that realistic and deliverable plans are in place to provide the necessary infrastructure improvements.
- Plans not taking sufficient account of rapid changes in transport arising from social and technological changes.
- The Transport Plan is not achievable. Councils do not have the ability to influence commercial operators.
- Traffic around Oxford is extremely congested. Recent improvements in North Oxford have not significantly improved traffic flow.
- CDC is being held to ransom. I.e. no infrastructure improvements without more housing.
- Even with no development the LTP would still not meet the transport needs.
- Not sure how currently insoluble traffic problems can be solved by adding more cars.
- Emphasis would be better focussed on diverting traffic that is passing through Oxfordshire away from the congested areas around the City.
A majority of the representations supported this objective. Comments included:

- Would like more emphasis on efficient public transport not park and rides
- OCC needs to invest in public transport for commuters’ to ease congestion.
- The proposed transport schemes would be welcomed.
- The level of building requires national support to improve transport arteries.
- Objective should recognise the on-going work of the OGB to evaluate existing transport infrastructure capacity.
- Sustainable transport, public transport, cycling and walking lies at the heart of any successful housing development.
- Objective in general accordance with para 30 of NPPF.
- Sustainable transport links are key.
- This is a key element in the whole Partial Review
- It is critical that links between development sites in Cherwell and employment areas of Headington and Cowley are in place early in the Plan.

Officer Response

The comments in support of this objective are noted.

An infrastructure strategy is currently being prepared on a countywide basis

The objective is not locationally specific

How the identified issues have been taken into account

- The issues were considered when drafting the Strategic Objectives in Section 4 of the Proposed Submission Plan and tested with the benefit of evidence including the sustainability appraisal

Question 9: Do you have any comments on the Areas of Search we have defined?

OCC states that the preferred ‘areas of search’ should relate well to Oxford by way of proximity and/or accessibility. New developments should be on key transport corridors which have existing, planned or potential for fast and frequent public transport services to Oxford centre and key employment locations within the City. OCCG comment that more remote or rural locations pose additional challenges due to distance from existing GP surgeries, and lack of sustainable options for new local surgeries.

A large number of the representations made essentially the same point as follows:

- Object strongly to development on GB around Kidlington, which is well used and enjoyed by many. It protects the historic City of Oxford from over-development, and the government’s promise to protect it should be upheld.
Other comments specifically relating to Areas of Search A and B include:

- Bicester Town Council agrees that they are the only sensible areas for Oxford workers.
- Area of search should be focussed on the A44 Corridor.
- Kidlington PC agree with the Areas of search A and B but are concerned about the scale of development ‘allocated’ to Cherwell by the Oxfordshire Growth Board.
- Begbroke PC objects to development in the Green Belt.
- The fact that the Council appears to have already concluded before the consultation process that Areas A and B are the most sustainable broad locations suggests that the Council does not plan to seriously assess other areas or respect the national Green Belt policy.
- Green Belt is a permanent designation and unmet housing needs do not justify building on it.
- Brownfield sites, previously developed land and areas next to busy roads and junctions should always be considered before green belt.
- There are not ‘exceptional circumstances’ to justify development in the green belt. Adopted policy ESD14 should prevail and maintain existing green belt boundaries.
- A survey by CPRE shows 76% of Oxfordshire residents were in favour of protecting the green belt with the majority seeing housing as the greatest threat.
- The Initial Transport and Sustainability Assessments’ preference for Areas of Search A and B pre-empt the consultation process and undermines the NPPF’s aim to include, rather than exclude, people and communities in the planning process.
- Make sure all the options are looked at properly and at same level of detail and rigour as A and B.
- The majority of the Areas of Search are too far from Oxford but 4,400 homes are too overwhelming if narrowed down to one or two areas for their proximity to Oxford.
- The Kidlington Masterplan should be the basis for future development.
- Only areas close to Oxford should be considered for this development.

Whilst the vast majority of comments were in relation to Areas of Search A and B a number commented on other Areas of Search were received as follows:

- D, G, H, and I are very poorly related to Oxford.
- Area C should be avoided due to potential traffic challenges
- E should be avoided due to coalescence between Bicester and surrounding villages.
- C and G are potential locations for a regional distribution centre.
- Development should be in smaller villages to keep schools, shops and bus services.
- Area I is notable for its rural beauty and views, distinctive and unique village life, limited infrastructure and public transport links.
- Bletchingdon and Kirtlington should be included in Area B.
- Area H is too tightly drawn. It should be expanded to include settlements such as Bloxham which are located in close proximity, and with good transport links, to Banbury.
- Southern area of the District, including Bicester, maybe a better area of search. Identified areas of search are appropriate for larger strategic sites but Category A villages can also be sustainable locations for development.
- Clear reference should be made to the overarching spatial strategy and the Areas of Search should accord with the approved Strategy in the adopted local plan. Ie the majority of the development should be focussed on Banbury and Bicester.
- Council should have considered an option assessing sites within an appropriate distance from existing train stations.
- Other options need to be fully explored before considering developing in the green belt.
- Inclusion of Area H is welcomed.
- Option I represents a ‘scatter gun’ approach. Development on the scale proposed would not be sustainable.
- Options E and F as well as rural dispersal are probably best choices.
- Banbury and Bicester could meet Oxford’s needs with strengthened rail links.
- Area H is already absorbing huge numbers of new houses and does not address Oxford’s opportunities for economic growth.
- There is more potential at Bicester.
- Ambrosden should be in Option E not I.
- Option I should be broken down so that sub-areas are assessed accordingly and more fairly.
- E and H already have traffic problems at peak times.
- F could provide a very good site if links created to M40 and rail services improved.

**Officer Response**

Nine areas of search were considered as potential broad locations for accommodating housing growth.

The Plan preparation process has concluded that options C to I or a combination of any options including C to I would not sufficiently deliver the Vision and objectives of the Partial Review.

Options C to I would have a greater detrimental impact on the development strategy for Cherwell set out in the existing adopted 2015 Local Plan.

It has been concluded, based on the extensive evidence base, that Options A and B could deliver the Vision and objectives of the Partial Review.

Options A and B will have a far less significant impact on the delivery of the development strategy for meeting Cherwell’s needs.

The Partial Review responds to national planning policy, including that relating to the Green Belt.

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

- Section 2 of the Proposed Submission Plan explains the Areas of Search Options and provides reasons why Options A and B were preferred. The selection of Areas of Search has been informed by evidence including the sustainability appraisal.
Q10. Site Size Threshold. Do you agree with our minimum site size threshold of two hectares for the purpose of site identification? Do you agree that we should not be seeking to allocate sites for less than 100 homes?

There were over 150 responses to this question with a relatively even split on those who agreed and those that disagreed.

The vast majority of Parish Councils who responded supported the statement. However, Begbroke PC, Gosford and Water Eaton PC and Hornton PC disagreed.

Oxfordshire County Council and Oxford City Council agreed with the thresholds.

Historic England stated that the potential contribution of sites below the threshold should not be ignored.

Those that agreed with the statement made comments including:
- Sensible to have a threshold.
- Sites need to be large to deliver affordable housing and infrastructure.
- Would be consistent with Local Plan Part 1.
- Development on larger sites should be phased.
- The site threshold of 2ha should be retained but no reference should be made to the number of dwellings.
- Higher density developments will help reduce land take.

Comments from those that disagreed included:
- A gross density of 50dph is inappropriate for suburban and rural areas.
- A range of sites will ensure that environmental impacts are minimised and that development integrates easily with existing communities.
- Large sites favour volume builders who may land bank.
- A portfolio of larger and smaller, immediately available, sites will support delivery targets.
- Figures appear arbitrary.
- No thresholds are proposed by NPPF.
- Cumulatively smaller sites can make a contribution to meeting Oxford’s unmet need.
- The minimum site size should be much higher in order to facilitate the comprehensive planning and delivery of development.
- Smaller sites favour development of brownfield sites.

**Officer Response**

A threshold of 100 dwelling would be consistent with Local Plan Part 1.

The Partial Review is a strategic process to meet the needs of Oxford.

Sites of a strategic scale enable the Plan to put a greater emphasis on place shaping principles.

Sites need to be of a sufficient size to help secure necessary infrastructure.
How the identified issues have been taken into account

- The Proposed Submission Plan consider sites of two or more hectares (to achieve at least 100 homes) within Areas of Search Options A and B as these areas are considered to be most suitable for Oxford’s needs.

Q11. Identified Potential Strategic Development Sites: Do you have any comments on the sites we have identified?

Oxfordshire County Council conducted a RAG assessment of each of these sites covering transport and highways, public transport, archaeology, education, and minerals and waste. Their comments have not been repeated here but are set out in their detailed representation. (PR-B-0877).

Area of Search Option A

PR14: Land North of the Moors, Kidlington

- BBOWT advise that this site is located close to the Lower Cherwell CTA and Langford Meadows LWS (Local Wildlife Site). Concerned about direct and indirect impacts on the LWS (including recreational impacts). Expect the LWS to be protected by an appropriate buffer and any development to provide enhancements in line with CTA aims and objectives.
- Historic England advises that this site abuts the Church Street Conservation Area to the east. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.
- Environment Agency advises that flood zone 2 and 3 at or close to NE corner of the site.
- Kidlington PC state that land north of the village forms a continuous open farmed landscape between the village and the River Cherwell. It preserves part of the visible rural setting of Kidlington, a green approach to the City and a substantial recreation asset for Kidlington and the local area. Any new development on this site would channel additional traffic through the village centre. Development should not extend into this very important open land, which is of exceptional beauty and frequently used as recreation land by local residents.
- Cllrs Neil Prestige & Cllr Maurice Billington object to any development on this site and considers that this site is inappropriate for development; therefore should be removed from the consultation process. This site lies to the north of Kidlington with no development on it. It is also an area that is hugely important to local wildlife and residents. The loss of this area would be detrimental to the area.
- The promoters of the site state that they are grateful it is included in Table 6.
- There have been a very small number of representations in support of this site.

There have been a very substantial number of objections to the allocation of this site. The main points raised include:

- Loss of green belt
- The Moors is already congested. On road parking restricts access by emergency vehicles.
- Area of beauty enjoyed by walkers with views of open countryside and the village conservation area.
- Important area of biodiversity.
- Would destroy ancient ridge and furrow, wildlife and flora.
- Important site for birds.
- Site is a haven for wildlife, many of which are protected.
- Recreational land beneficial for health.
- Area crossed by footpaths.
- Adverse effects on Lower Cherwell Valley CTA.
- Would destroy historic landscape.
- Abuts Church Street Conservation Area.
- Spire of St Mary’s Church is a local landmark visible from the surrounding landscape.
- Impact on setting of listed buildings.
- Area prone to flooding. Increased flood risk.
- History of flooding problems in The Moors.
- Foul water drainage already a problem in the area.
- Needs to be preserved.
- Building here would be act of vandalism.
- Kidlington is a village and thriving community with its own identity.
- Increase in noise and air pollution.
- Should be preserved as countryside.
- No scope for extra schools and health services which are already stretched.
- According to Conservative manifesto green belt should not be used.

PR20: Begbroke Science Park, Begbroke

- Yarnton PC object for policy reasons as the site is in the Green Belt. Policy ESD14 seeks to prevent coalescence of settlements and safeguards the countryside from encroachment. It plays a strong role in preventing the coalescence of Yarnton, Begbroke and Kidlington. Policy ESD13 seeks to secure the enhancement of the character and appearance of the landscape, particularly in urban fringe locations. Policy Villages 1 categorises Yarnton and Begbroke as category A villages. Thus only minor development, infilling or conversion is allowable in, or alongside these communities. Exceptional circumstances to allow development in the Green Belt cannot be demonstrated.

- Begbroke PC consider the development of this site would be contrary to green belt policy, which proposes "Protecting Green Belt Land" - extract from the NPPF (paragraphs 79 to 90)

- Kidlington PC considers that there is a clear defensible boundary along the canal and a clear gap between the canal and Yarnton. The narrow bridge over the canal is a constraint for inter-connectivity and integration. Consider that the degree of development to the west of the A44 warrants further consideration, as this would offer potential for planned growth close to employment centres with direct access to Oxford along a major transport corridor. This would however need careful design and the creation of new defensible boundaries to address landscape impacts, and preserve gaps between settlements.

- Historic England advises this site includes the grade II listed Begbroke Hill Farmhouse and abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the east. The grade II listed Tudor Cottage is located just outside the site. Any development of this site should retain the Farmhouse and have regard to the setting of these assets, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.
- Environment Agency advise that there are flood zones 2 and 3 in north and eastern parts of the site. Extensive in east. Rushy Meadows SSSI adjoins NE corner of site.
- Oxford Civic Society states that this site appears appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as other land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction of Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line. Believe there is great potential for a development-related SwiftRail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. In addition, they suggest making an initial release of parts of the site which are accessible to existing bus services on the A44.
- BBOWT states that this site is a large development area especially together with sites PR23 and PR24. It adjoins the Lower Cherwell CTA and the Rushy Meadows SSSI raising concerns about direct and indirect impacts on the SSSI. Expect that any development in this area to retain a minimum buffer of 50m. Considering the overall quantum of development in the area particularly concerned about cumulative impacts on the SSSI, which might compromise the condition and ecological interest of the site in the long term. Would expect development to provide enhancements in line with the CTA aims and objectives.
- The promoters/landowners state that this site presents a sustainable location for housing and employment development.

There have been a very small number of representations in support of some development on part of this site.

There have been a large number of representations objecting to the development of this site. The comments include:

- Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated.
- Loss of green belt unacceptable.
- Priority should be given to brownfield sites.
- Begbroke, Yarnton and Kidlington would be merged and lose their separate identities.
- Small, quiet, safe community of Begbroke would be lost.
- Roads already congested.
- New transport links proposed too little, too late.
- Part of site is liable to flood.
- Rowel Brook subject to flooding.
- Severe and regular flooding in Fernhill Road.
- Local schools and doctors at capacity.
- What provision is made for cyclists?
- Begbroke Lane is part of National Cycle Network.
- Infrastructure already at capacity.
- Excessively large site.
- Area provides a wildlife corridor.
- Contains allotments.
- Would surround and isolate Rushy Meadows SSSI.
- Would damage amenity value of Oxford Canal.
- Loss of open countryside and agricultural land.
- Air, noise, light pollution.
- Increase in crime.
- Excessively large site.
- Well used footpaths.
- Home to flora and fauna.

PR23: Land at junction of Langford Lane/A44, Begbroke

- Begbroke PC consider the development of this site would be contrary to green belt policy, which proposes "Protecting Green Belt Land" - extract from the NPPF (paragraphs 79 to 90)
- Natural England advise that the potential impact on Rushy Meadows SSSI will need to be assessed, including any impacts arising from changes in hydrology, increased air pollution or recreational pressure.
- Oxford Civic Society states that this site appears appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as other land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction of Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line. Believe there is great potential for a development -related SwiftRail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. In addition, they suggest making an initial release of parts of the site which are accessible to existing bus services on the A44.
- GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd advise that this site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of London Oxford Airport has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds).

A number of representations were received objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Can aircraft in trouble land here?
- Loss of green belt. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated.
- Impact on already congested local road network.
- Small, quiet, safe community of Begbroke will be lost.
- School and doctors at capacity.
  Noise and air pollution from airport.
- Airport operations could be affected.
- Traffic and pedestrian highway safety concerns.
- Impact on wildlife.
- Would result in urban sprawl.
- Need to preserve the countryside, landscape and environment.
- Will destroy rural separation of Begbroke from Woodstock.
- Will damage historic character and setting of Begbroke village.
- Green belt walks and views will be lost.

PR24: Begbroke Lane, North East Field, Begbroke
- Environment Agency advises that Rushy Meadows SSSI lies to the east of the site.
- Natural England advise that the potential impact on Rushy Meadows SSSI will need to be assessed, including any impacts arising from changes in hydrology, increased air pollution or recreational pressure.
- Begbroke PC considers the development of this site is in complete contravention to council policies. Category 2 villages have fewer services and/or are remote with limited public transport and limited potential for development.
- Oxford Civic Society states that this site appears appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as other land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction of Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line. Believe there is great potential for a development-related SwiftRail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. In addition, suggest making an initial release of parts of the site which are accessible to existing bus services on the A44.
- The landowners/promoters of the site support this allocation.
- A very small number of representations supported this allocation.

A number of representations were received objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Can aircraft in trouble land here?
- Loss of green belt. Exceptional circumstances have not been demonstrated.
- Impact on already congested local road network.
- Small, quiet, safe community of Begbroke will be lost.
- School and doctors at capacity.
- Noise and air pollution from airport.
- Airport operations could be affected.
- Traffic and pedestrian highway safety concerns.
- Impact on wildlife.
- Would result in urban sprawl.
- Need to preserve the countryside, landscape and environment.
- Will destroy rural separation of Begbroke from Woodstock.
- Will damage historic character and setting of Begbroke village.
- Green belt walks and views will be lost.
- Begbroke Lane is part of the National Cycle Network.
- Field acts as a security barrier around the immigration detention centre.
- There should be a green corridor along the Oxford Canal.
- Flooding problems
- Need to maintain separation between village and Langford Lane industrial area.

PR27: Land north of the Moors and East of Banbury Road, Kidlington

- Historic England advises that this site abuts the Church Street Conservation Area to the east and the Oxford Canal and the Hampton Gay, Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Conservation Areas to the west. The site also abuts the grade II listed Sparrowgap Bridge over the Oxford
Canal. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation areas, with reference to the conservation area character appraisals and the setting of the bridge.

- Environment Agency advises that flood zones two and three may adjoin most of the northern boundary of the site.

- Natural England advise that the potential impact on Rushy Meadows SSSI will need to be assessed, including any impacts arising from changes in hydrology, increased air pollution or recreational pressure. Priority habitats are located in close proximity to the north in the floodplain of the Cherwell, including floodplain grazing marsh. Indirect impacts will need to be considered as well as the potential to deliver the aims of the Lower Cherwell Conservation Target Area (CTA) through provision of a net gain in biodiversity.

- Kidlington PC states that this site is a continuous open farmed landscape between the village and the River Cherwell. It preserves part of the visible rural setting of Kidlington, a green approach to the City and a substantial recreation asset for Kidlington and the local area. They consider that any new development on this site would channel additional traffic through the village centre. Development should not extend into this very important open land, which is of exceptional beauty and frequently used as recreation land by local residents.

- The Canal & River Trust offer no comments on the acceptability or otherwise of these possible sites but would like to raise concerns that if too many of these sites are chosen then the rural character of this section of the Oxford Canal will change as the area becomes more urban. Careful consideration must therefore be given to the waterside treatment at any of the sites and request that further consideration and consultation takes place with the Trust as a key stakeholder.

- Cllrs Neil Prestige & Cllr Maurice Billington objects to any development on this site and considers that this site is inappropriate for development; therefore should be removed from the consultation process. This site to the north of Kidlington with no development on it. It is also an area that is hugely important to local wildlife and residents. The loss of this area would be detrimental to the area.

- Oxford City Lib Dem Group considers that this site has good potential for making better use of the historic setting of the Parish Church which is currently detached from rest of village.

- BBOWT advise that this site adjoins Langford Meadows LWS and the Lower Cherwell CTA. Are concerned about direct impacts and indirect impacts (eg recreational impacts) that might compromise the ecological interest of this site. This is particularly the case in light of potential cumulative effects in the area and more specifically PR14. It should also be noted that some areas to the west of the development site are considered to meet LWS criteria and are proposed to be designated as LWS in the future.

- The promoters of Site PR14 state that they are not promoting this site, but believe they control the access to it.

- The site promoters propose that this could form a sustainable development in association with Site PR14.

- There have been a very small number of representations in support of this site.

There have been a very substantial number of objections to the allocation of this site. The main points raised include:
- Many allotment holders were moved to this site when the site on the other side of the railway tracks was allocated for the building of the new care facility in 2015.
- Loss of green belt
- The Moors is already congested. On road parking restricts access by emergency vehicles.
- Area of beauty enjoyed by walkers with views of open countryside and the village conservation area.
- Important area of biodiversity.
- Would destroy ancient ridge and furrow, wildlife and flora.
- Important site for birds.
- Site is a haven for wildlife, many of which are protected.
- Recreational land beneficial for health.
- Area crossed by footpaths.
- Adverse effects on Lower Cherwell Valley CTA.
- Would destroy historic landscape.
- Abuts Church Street Conservation Area.
- Spire of St Mary’s Church is a local landmark visible from the surrounding landscape.
- Impact on setting of listed buildings.
- Area prone to flooding. Increased flood risk.
- History of flooding problems in The Moors.
- Foul water drainage already a problem in the area.
- Needs to be preserved.
- Building here would be act of vandalism.
- Kidlington is a village and thriving community with its own identity.
- Increase in noise and air pollution.
- Should be preserved as countryside.
- No scope for extra schools and health services which are already stretched.
- According to Conservative manifesto green belt should not be used.

**PR32: Land adjoining 26 and 33 Webb’s Way, Kidlington**

- Historic England advises that this site is within the Church Street Conservation Area. The Conservation Area Character Appraisal is not entirely clear about the contribution of these fields to the special interest, character or appearance of the Conservation Area, but it is presumed that they are considered to provide an attractive setting to the village, and the Appraisal does identify a positive vista across the land towards the village. It would seem likely therefore that the loss of its openness would be detrimental to that interest, character and appearance, and therefore consider that this site should not be taken forward.
- Environment Agency state that flood zones 2 and 3 are on north and east of site.
- Kidlington PC states that this site forms a continuous open farmed landscape between the village and the River Cherwell. It preserves part of the visible rural setting of Kidlington, a green approach to the City and a substantial recreation asset for Kidlington and the local area. Any new development on this site would channel additional traffic through the village centre. Development should not extend into this very important open land, which is of exceptional beauty and frequently used as recreation land by local residents.
- Cllrs Neil Prestige & Cllr Maurice Billington objects to any development on this site. It is inappropriate for development; therefore should be removed from the consultation process.
This site lies to the north of Kidlington with no development on it. It is also an area that is hugely important to local wildlife and residents. The loss of this area would be detrimental to the area.

- Oxford City Lib Dem Group considers that this site has good potential for making better use of the historic setting of the Parish Church which is currently detached from rest of village.
- Site promoters state that this site is located in a sustainable location with good access to services and facilities with excellent foot and cycle connections.

There were a large number of objections to this site. Comments include:

- Important area of biodiversity.
- One of the nicest, unspoilt parts of Kidlington with wonderful views.
- Safe, popular walking area with views of historic buildings.
- Forms part of the Church Fields Character Area as defined in the Conservation Area Appraisal.
- Would destroy ancient ridge and furrow, wildlife and flora.
- Important site for birds.
- Site is a haven for wildlife, many of which are protected.
- Recreational land beneficial for health.
- Area crossed by footpaths.
- Adverse effects on Lower Cherwell Valley CTA.
- Would destroy historic landscape.
- Within Church Street Conservation Area.
- Spire of St Mary’s Church is a local landmark visible from the surrounding landscape.
- Impact on setting of listed buildings.
- Area prone to flooding. Increased flood risk.
- Site becomes waterlogged in winter.
- Foul water drainage already a problem in the area.
- Needs to be preserved.
- Building here would be act of vandalism.
- Kidlington is a village and thriving community with its own identity.
- Increase in noise and air pollution.
- Should be preserved as countryside.
- Access through Mill Street is a problem.
- No scope for extra schools and health services which are already stretched.
- According to Conservative manifesto green belt should not be used.

PR34: South of Sandy Lane, Begbroke

- Yarnton PC state that the site is wholly in the Green Belt. ESD14 safeguards the countryside from encroachment. The site is isolated, poorly served by a narrow Class C road. Adjacent to a well-used railway line, and potentially development will affect the setting of the Oxford Canal Conservation Area.
- Begbroke PC considers the development of this site is in complete contravention to council policies. Category 2 villages have fewer services and/or are remote with limited public transport and limited potential for development.
- Environment Agency advise that flood zone 2 and 3 is on north and east of site. A culverted main river at eastern boundary.
- Oxford Civic Society states that this site appears appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as other land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction of Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line. Believe there is great potential for a development -related SwiftRail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network.

Objections to this site include:

- If site developed then Kidlington, Begbroke and Yarnton would become one settlement.
- This site is isolated and there are issues with the Oxford-Birmingham railway.
- Exceptional circumstances not demonstrated.
- Loss of green belt unacceptable.
- Priority should be given to brownfield sites.
- Difficult to access
- Loss of agricultural land.
- Need to protect the countryside. Countryside views will be lost.
- Would damage amenity value of Oxford Canal.
- Local road network already congested.
- Loss of valuable wildlife habitats.
- Lack of bus services and good cycle routes to Oxford.
- Site on the edge of sewage works which may need to expand.

**PR38: North Oxford Triangle, Kidlington**

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC state that this site scores 'HIGH' in the GB study. Note the substantial representation from Oxford City Council which promotes major development around Oxford Parkway station. Whilst can see benefits from locating close to the station there is clearly a risk that this area would encourage London commuters, driving up house prices and would not help in solving Oxford's housing needs. Also: the eastern fringes of this area is within flood zones 2 and 3; there are listed buildings at Frideswide Farm and Water Eaton; The golf club is an important leisure facility which is protected as Green Space within the adopted Local Plan; Considerable archaeological importance including the site of Cutteslowe Deserted Medieval village.
- Historic England advise that there is a grade II* listed St Frideswide Farmhouse located just outside the site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the Farmhouse.
- Environment Agency advises that there is a small area of flood zone 3 near Cutteslowe Park. Possible watercourse at north of golf course.
- Natural England advises that an area of traditional orchard priority habitat lies immediately to the east.
- Kidlington PC state that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)
- Site promoters state that much of the site is owned by Christ Church College which will help to ensure a comprehensive approach to development.
- Oxford Preservation Trust considers that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford’s setting and flooding issues
- Friends of Cutteslowe & Sunnymead Park consider that they would require the provision of additional park leisure facilities and should not rely on Cutteslowe Park.
- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum strongly objects to this site.
- The Harbord Road Area Resident Association considers that this site is not suitable for reasons of traffic congestion on the roads and around the area particularly at peak hours. There are other large developments which will have additional impact on congestion. GB land, which should be protected. Development would lead to Kidlington merging with Oxford. There are areas of rich wildlife and biodiversity, which is widely enjoyed by local communities. Lack of education and health infrastructure. These sites border Cutteslowe Park, which is Oxford’s largest park heavily used by local and more remote communities. Building up to the Park would be extremely detrimental to its setting which is currently in wide open countryside. Cutteslowe Park is at capacity at peak times and is inadequate for even the current numbers of visitors which will increase when the new splash pool opens.
- Oxford Lib Dem Group considers that Oxford and Kidlington must maintain a substantial green barrier between the two settlements, and must not allow housing adjacent to bust roads, for reasons of noise, air pollution etc.

There were a very small number of representations in support of this site. One comment was that it was the least damaging on Kidlington.

There were a large number of representations objecting to this allocation. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Would effectively remove green belt between Oxford and Kidlington creating an urban extension of Oxford.
- Priority should be given to brownfield sites before green belt.
- Where will the golf course go?
- Impact on local road network. Existing network already congested.
- Challenging transportation and infrastructure constraints in this area of Oxford.
- Would destroy walks and views enjoyed by locals and visitors to Cutteslowe Park.
- The land to the north of Cutteslowe Park should be retained either as farmland or an extension to the park.
- Home to a wide range of wildlife.
- Natural habitats will be destroyed.
- Loss of protected species and habitats.
- Damage to landscape setting of Water Eaton Manor.
- Need to consider Southfield golf course for development.
- Proximity to Oxford Parkway will attract London commuters.
- Pressure on schools and healthcare.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Air quality
- Loss of sports and leisure facilities.

PR39: Frieze Farm, Woodstock Road, Kidlington

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC states that this site performs 'HIGH' against two of the four GB purposes in the GB study and again is important in preventing urban sprawl and merging of Kidlington and Oxford. The site is adjacent to the Oxford Canal which is a very important recreational corridor and designated Conservation Area within the District. The corridor is protected through Policy ESD16 of the adopted Local Plan. Development in this area has the potential for adverse effects on the canal.
- Kidlington PC considers that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)
- Historic England advises that this site includes the grade II listed Frieze Farmhouse. Any development of this site should retain the Farmhouse and have regard to its setting.
- Environment Agency advises there is a small area of flood zone 3 at the western boundary near the canal.
- Natural England advises that an area of floodplain grazing marsh priority habitat is adjacent to the site to the west, and Stratfield Brake deciduous woodland to the north. Indirect impacts will need to be considered as well as the potential to deliver the aims of the Lower Cherwell CTA through provision of a net gain in biodiversity.
- BBOWT states that this site adjoins a LWS (Meadows West of Oxford Canal) as well as the Lower Cherwell CTA. Concerned about direct and indirect impacts as well as cumulative effects of nearby proposed developments on this site.
- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum considers that if this site is developed, it would cause loss of farmland. It is surrounded by major roads on all sides and safe access for pedestrians and cyclists to schools, shops etc. is only available to the north. It favours car use.
- Oxford Preservation Trust considers that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford’s setting and flooding issues.
- Oxford Lib Dem Group state that Oxford and Kidlington must maintain a substantial green barrier between the two settlements, and must not allow housing adjacent to busy roads, for reasons of noise, air pollution etc. Plans showing Northern Gateway as undeveloped are misleading.
- The promoters of this site have provided detailed comments in support of its allocation.

A very small number of representations have been received in support of the allocation of this site.
There have been a large number of objections. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Impact on already overloaded road network.
- Proximity to Oxford Parkway means site will attract London commuters.
- Separated from any existing community and services.
- Poor environment for residential development due to unsatisfactory noise and air pollution from A34 and A44.
- Will damage amenity value of Oxford Canal.
- Adjacent to Stratfield Brake Nature Area.
- Encroaches on a large area of the ‘Kidlington Gap’.
- Need to protect countryside.
- Loss of wildlife habitat.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Would be urban sprawl.
- Would lead to coalescence of settlements.

**PR41: Land at Drinkwater, Kidlington**

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC states that this site performs ‘HIGH’ against two of the four GB purposes in the GB study and again is important in preventing urban sprawl and merging of Kidlington and Oxford. The site is adjacent to the Oxford Canal which is a very important recreational corridor and designated Conservation Area within the District. The corridor is protected through Policy ESD16 of the adopted Local Plan. Development in this area has the potential for adverse effects on the canal.
- Kidlington PC states that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)
- Historic England advises that this site includes the grade II listed Oxford Canal Tilting Bridge and is partly within the Oxford Canal Conservation Area. The majority of the western boundary of the site abuts the Conservation Area. Any development of this site should retain the Tilting Bridge and Canal and have regard to the setting of both, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.
- Environment Agency advises that there is a small area of Flood zone 3 at the western boundary near the canal. A watercourse crosses southern part of site.
- Natural England has concerns that development here could have potential indirect impacts on the Oxford Meadows SAC (and its component SSSIs), through alterations in the hydrological regime of the site, air pollution impacts, or increases in recreational pressure. This will need to be assessed through screening for likely significant effects in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Potential indirect impacts on Hook Meadows and the Trap Grounds SSSI would also need to be assessed. An area of priority habitats including floodplain grazing marsh is adjacent to the site to the west; indirect impacts would need to be
considered as well as the potential to deliver the aims of the Lower Cherwell and Oxford Meadows to Farmoor CTAs through provision of a net gain in biodiversity.

- BBOWT advises that this site adjoins two LWSs (Dukes Lock Pond, Loop Farm Flood Meadows) and two CTAs (Lower Cherwell, Oxford Meadows and Farmoor). It also comes close to Oxford Meadows SAC. Concerned about direct, indirect and cumulative impacts on the SAC and LWSs. Impacts of development on this site will need to be appropriately assessed in line with environmental legislation and LP policy ESD9.

- Oxford Preservation Trust considers that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues.

- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum states that this site is surrounded by major roads to the south and west and the planned link road will cross it. There are limited public transport possibilities for access to Oxford so it favours car use and pedestrians and cyclists would have to cross major roads.

There were a very small number of representations in support of this allocation.

A large number of representations objected to this site. Comments include:

- Harm to rural character of Kidlington
- Pressure on services and facilities.
- Impact on Oxey Mead hay meadow, part of the SAC, and New Marston Meadows SSSI.
- Loss of green belt.
- Impact on already overloaded road network.
- Proximity to Oxford Parkway means site will attract London commuters.
- Separated from any existing community and services.
- Poor environment for residential development due to unsatisfactory noise and air pollution from A34 and A44.
- Will damage amenity value of Oxford Canal.
- Adjacent to Stratfield Brake Nature Area.
- Encroaches on a large area of the ‘Kidlington Gap’.
- Need to protect countryside.
- Loss of wildlife habitat.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Would be urban sprawl.
- Would lead to coalescence of settlements.
- Existing infrastructure inadequate.

PR48: Land south of Solid State Logic Headquarters, Begbroke

- Begbroke PC considers the development of this site is in complete contravention to council policies. Category 2 villages have fewer services and/or are remote with limited public transport and limited potential for development.
- The Environment Agency advises that there is no flooding on site, but access appears to be via Flood zone 3 on A44 at roundabout.
- Natural England advises that the potential impact on Rushy Meadows SSSI will need to be assessed, including any impacts arising from changes in hydrology, increased air pollution or recreational pressure.
- GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd advise that this site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of London Oxford Airport has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds).
- Site promoter states that there are no environmental constraints to the development of this site.
- One representation was received in support of this site.

A number of representations were received objecting to the allocation of this site. Comments included:

- Loss of Green belt.
- Impact on local road network.
- Loss of wildlife habitat.
- Adverse impacts on Begbroke Conservation Area.
- Traffic and pedestrian highway safety concerns.
- Will lead to coalescence of settlements and loss of identity.
- Need to preserve the countryside.
- Would be urban sprawl.
- Existing infrastructure and services inadequate.
- Loss of landscape and rural views.
- Would harm historic setting and character of Begbroke village.
- Would merge Begbroke and Yarnton.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Air, noise and light pollution.

PR49: Land at Stratfield Farm, Oxford Road, Kidlington

- Historic England advises that this site includes the grade II listed Stratfield Farmhouse and abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the west. This is one of a number of proposed sites containing or near to isolated listed farmsteads, which would be surrounded by development if these sites were allocated, which in turn is likely to have a major impact on their significance. Their historical interest is often bound up in the relationship with the land from them and their aesthetic value is often enhanced by an isolated rural setting. Suggest that an analysis of the impact of development on the significance of the farmstead is undertaken. Any development of this site should retain the Farmhouse and have regard to its setting and that of the Conservation Area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.
- Environment Agency advises that the Canal adjoins the west of the site. A watercourse crosses the western part of the site.
- Natural England states that their data indicates that the site includes areas of traditional orchard priority habitat.
- Kidlington PC objects to the development of this site. Consider this area will be unacceptably narrow. It is the important gap between Kidlington and the City. This site is adjacent to Stratfield Brake facility, and has been considered as a potential site for much needed additional recreational land and open space to serve the village.
- Cllrs Neil Prestige & Cllr Maurice Billington state that this site is adjacent to Stratfield Brake sports ground. Would like to see any development on this site to be a mixture of recreation and housing so that the range of sports at Stratfield Brake can be expanded. The council also need to take into consideration the nature reserve at Stratfield Brake.

Several representations were received in support of this site. Comments include:

- Forms a natural extension to Kidlington.
- Stratfield Farm would be good for a maximum of 300 houses provided there is access from the south end of Garden City and not Kidlington roundabout.
- Add land west of drain to Stratfield Brake wildlife conservation area. At least a 5m buffer should be allowed on both sides of the canal.

A significant number of representations were received objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Would result in coalescence of settlements.
- Would lead to urban sprawl.
- Drainage and flooding problems.
- The roundabout at Sainsbury's and the roads south will be totally gridlocked.
- Existing road network already congested.
- Infrastructure, including schools and doctors already overstretched.
- Loss of landscape and rural views.
- Impact on nature conservation and biodiversity.
- Adjacent to Stratfield Brake Nature Area.
- Loss of Stratfield Farm historic setting.
- Crime concerns.
- Stratfield brake playing field is often wet and boggy. Development would make this worse.
- Located in Kidlington Gap.
- Houses would be for London commuters due to proximity of Oxford Parkway Station.

**PR50: Land North of Oxford, Kidlington**

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC state that this site scores 'HIGH' in the GB study. Note the substantial representation from Oxford City Council which promotes major development around Oxford Parkway station. Whilst can see benefits from locating close to the station there is clearly a risk that this area would encourage London commuters, driving up house prices and would not help in solving Oxford’s housing needs. Also: the eastern fringes of this area is within flood zones 2 and 3; there are listed buildings at Frideswide Farm and Water Eaton; The golf club is an important leisure facility which is protected as Green Space within the adopted Local Plan; Considerable archaeological importance including the site of Cutteslowe Deserted Medieval village.
- Environment Agency advises that there are approximately 31ha of flood zone 2 and 3 along eastern side of site. A watercourse forms the eastern boundary.
- Historic England advises that this site includes the grade II* listed St Frideswide Farmhouse and the grade II listed wall to the north-east of the Farmhouse. A site visit is needed to fully understand the context and setting of the building but consider that major development on
the eastern part of this site is likely to entail a high level of harm to the significance of the building. Therefore consider that this site should not be taken forward.

- Natural England states that their data indicates that the site includes areas of traditional orchard priority habitat.

- Kidlington PC state that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)

- Site promoters state that much of the site is owned by Christ Church College which will help to ensure a comprehensive approach to development.

- Oxford Preservation Trust considers that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues

- Friends of Cutteslowe & Sunnymead Park consider that they would require the provision of additional park leisure facilities and should not rely on Cutteslowe Park.

- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum strongly objects to this site.

- The Harbord Road Area Resident Association considers that this site is not suitable for reasons of traffic congestion on the roads and around the area particularly at peak hours. There are other large developments which will have additional impact on congestion. GB land, which should be protected. Development would lead to Kidlington merging with Oxford. There are areas of rich wildlife and biodiversity, which is widely enjoyed by local communities. Lack of education and health infrastructure. These sites border Cutteslowe Park, which is Oxford's largest park heavily used by local and more remote communities. Building up to the Park would be extremely detrimental to its setting which is currently in wide open countryside. Cutteslowe Park is at capacity at peak times and is inadequate for even the current numbers of visitors which will increase when the new splash pool opens.

- Oxford Lib Dem Group considers that any development at this site should be at the northern part of the identified site. However, this housing will be attractive to London commuters (already evidenced by anecdotal information from estate agents), which, while not a bad thing in itself, will of course do nothing to meet the housing need of either Oxford or CDC.

There were a very small number of representations in support of this site. One comment was that it was the least damaging on Kidlington.

There were a large number of representations objecting to this allocation. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.

- Would effectively remove green belt between Oxford and Kidlington creating an urban extension of Oxford.

- Priority should be given to brownfield sites before green belt.

- Where will the golf course go?

- Impact on local road network. Existing network already congested.

- Challenging transportation and infrastructure constraints in this area of Oxford.

- Would destroy walks and views enjoyed by locals and visitors to Cutteslowe Park.
- The land to the north of Cutteslowe Park should be retained either as farmland or an extension to the park.
- Home to a wide range of wildlife.
- Natural habitats will be destroyed.
- Loss of protected species and habitats.
- Damage to landscape setting of Water Eaton Manor.
- Need to consider Southfield golf course for development.
- Proximity to Oxford Parkway will attract London commuters.
- Pressure on schools and healthcare.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Air quality
- Loss of sports and leisure facilities.

PR51: Land West of A44/Rutten Lane, North of Cassington Road, surrounding Begbroke Wood, Yarnton

- Yarnton PC objects on policy grounds. LP Policy ESD14 prevents coalescence of settlements of Yarnton, Begbroke. Green Belt Policy ESD14: safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. Policy Villages 1 - Yarnton and Begbroke are Category A villages where only minor development, infilling or conversion is permitted. In addition, surface water run-off from this elevated site frequently causes significant flooding in Yarnton along Cassington Road and Rutten Lane, a problem which can only be made worse by additional hardstanding areas within any development.
- Begbroke PC considers the development of this site is in complete contravention to council policies. Category 2 villages have fewer services and/or are remote with limited public transport and limited potential for development.
- WODC consider that this site is in the open countryside to the west of Yarnton and would have significant landscape implication.
- GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd consider that this site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of LOA has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds).
- Historic England advises that this site includes the grade II listed Spring Hill and is within the setting of a number of listed buildings to the south-east. Any development of this site should retain Spring Hill and have regard to the setting of these listed buildings.
- Environment Agency states that there are no on site flood zones, but access appears to be via flood zone 3 on A44 at roundabout. Small watercourse on site.
- Natural England advises that the site allocation is sensitive from an ecological point of view, since it surrounds Begbroke Wood, an ancient woodland and a LWS and Worton Heath (also supporting ancient woodland and associated priority habitats), lies adjacent to the north west. Has produced standing advice in relation to ancient woodland. Impacts on these sites, including severance of ecological connectivity should be avoided.
- BBOWT advises that this site adjoins two LWSs, which are also designated Ancient Woodlands (Bladen Heath and Begbroke Wood). Development is proposed on all sides of Begbroke Wood resulting in this becoming isolated. This will compromise the ecological interest and survival of this woodland in the long term and as such development resulting in
impacts and isolation of these sites should be resisted. Should development take place expect that a minimum buffer of 50m is provided between the development and the LWS/AW and that no development to take place West of Begbroke Wood to ensure retained connectivity with Bladen Heath in the long-term.

- The site promoters consider the site is in a sustainable location. Initial phases of the development will be provided on a smaller area concentrated to the east of the site.

There were very few representations in support of this application.

There were a large number of objections to this site. Comments include:

- Would aggravate flooding and drainage issues. With heavy rain surface water runs off the fields across Rutten Lane and down Cassington Road.
- Area of huge historical significance and footpaths offer stunning views over the surrounding countryside.
- Loss of green belt unacceptable.
- Schools and doctors are at capacity.
- Roads already congested.
- Highway and pedestrian safety concerns.
- Lack of good bus services to Oxford.
- What provision is there for cyclists?
- Spring Hill is an area of exceptional natural beauty, with ancient paths (Frogwelldown Lane, Dalton Lane and The Shakespeare Way) and is enjoyed by many.
- Site sits on hill and would be visually imposing.
- Serious impact on biodiversity and wildlife.
- Impact on Yarnton would be huge.
- Would merge Yarnton with Begbroke.
- Urban sprawl.
- Large site on the wrong side of A44 some distance from Kidlington, with no obvious defendable green belt boundaries.
- Very detrimental to the historic character and setting of Begbroke.
- Will create a ribbon like development along the A44.
- Loss of countryside and views.

PR74: Land at no. 40 and to the rear of 30-40 Woodstock Road East

- Begbroke PC understands this to be partly a brownfield site and consider that it has potential for development.
- Natural England advises that the potential impact on Rushy Meadows SSSI will need to assessed, including any impacts arising from changes in hydrology, increased air pollution or recreational pressure.
- Oxford Civic Society states that this site appears appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as other land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction of Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line. Believe there is
great potential for a development-related SwiftRail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. In addition, they suggest making an initial release of parts of the site which are accessible to existing bus services on the A44.

There were a very small number of representations in support of this site.

There were a large number of objections to the site. Comments include:

- Loss of Green Belt.
- Roads already congested.
- Small, quiet, safe community of Begbroke will be lost.
- What provision made for cyclists?
- Highway and pedestrian safety concerns.
- Access to site difficult.
- Begbroke school oversubscribed. Doctors at capacity.
- Haven for wildlife with many species of birds and animals.
- Loss of landscape and rural views.
- Would lead to coalescence of settlements.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Important to maintain separation between Begbroke and Langford Lane Industrial area.
- Cause devastation to the character and historic setting of Begbroke.
- Problems with air quality, noise and light pollution.
- Loss of agricultural land.

**PR75: Land adjacent to The Old School House, Church Lane, Yarnton**

- Yarnton PC objects to development of this site for policy reasons. Site lies wholly within Oxford Green Belt. Policy ESD14 seeks to prevent urban sprawl and safeguard countryside from encroachment. Policy Villages 1 categorises Yarnton as a Category A Village, where minor development, infilling and conversion is permitted. In addition, access to this site would be poorly served by the single track Church Lane, leading on to the traffic-calmed Cassington Road.
- Historic England advises that this site abuts the grade II registered Yarnton Manor historic park and garden to the south. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the park.

A very small number of representations supported this site.

A number of representations raised objections to this site. Comments include:

- Impact on local road network.
- Loss of green belt.
- Local road network not capable of accommodating significant additional traffic.
- Site not well related to established settlement pattern.
- Need to protect setting of listed Yarnton Manor and its historic gardens and other listed buildings.
- Need to protect historic part of village.
- Access problems.
- Urban sprawl
- Loss of landscape and rural views.
- Yarnton is not a suitable location for large development sites.
- Damage to wildlife and biodiversity.
- Loss of countryside.
- Detrimental effect on local infrastructure, schools and doctors.
- Loss of countryside views and green space.
- Development would severely prejudice the operation of the adjacent educational campus.
- Flooding and drainage problems.

PR91: Land South of Station Farm Industrial Park, Kidlington.

- BBOWT advises that this site is located completely within the CTA Lower Cherwell and adjoins Rushy Meadows SSSI raising concerns about direct and indirect impacts on the SSSI. Expect that any development in this area to retain a minimum buffer of 50m to the SSSI boundary. Considering the overall quantum of development in the area particularly concerned about cumulative impacts on the SSSI, which might compromise the condition and ecological interest of the site in the long term. In addition, would expect development to provide enhancements eg in form of providing appropriate management and measures that are in line with the CTA aims and objectives.
- Historic England advise that this site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area and the grade II listed Roundham Lock to the west. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of these assets, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.
- Environment Agency advises that the canal adjoins western boundary of the site.
- Natural England has concerns about the potential impact of development at this location on Rushy Meadows SSSI which lies immediately adjacent, to the west of the canal. Assessment of potential impacts on hydrology of the meadows, as well as potential increased recreational pressure or air pollution would need to be assessed.

There were a very small number of representations in support of this application. Comments included:

- Forms natural extension to Kidlington.
- Has no historic or environmental value.

There were a number of objections to this site. Comments include:

- Difficult to access.
- Loss of green belt.
- Site is very wet. Would be better used for recreation with improved access to the canal.
- Close to SSSI.
- Boggy swamp area haven for wildlife.
- Would increase traffic congestion.
- Urban sprawl.
- Inadequate infrastructure.
- Loss of landscape and rural views.
- Loss of countryside.
- Best used as a green buffer for supporting Rushy Meadows SSSI.
- Adverse impact on the canal.
- Coalescence of Kidlington and Begbroke.
- Better used for commercial development.

**PR92: Knightsbridge Farm, Yarnton**

- Yarnton PC state that the site lies wholly within the Oxford Green Belt, although part of it is considered to be brownfield. ESD14 seeks to encourage the recycling of derelict and other urban land. However, access to the A44 from this site is totally inadequate, highly dangerous, and the danger can only be exacerbated if further development were to be allowed.
- Environment Agency advises that a main river forms south eastern boundary of site.
- The promoters of the site state that it is well related to Yarnton. There is an existing access to the site from A44. Site is not within a conservation area nor does it contain any listed buildings. There are no environmental or landscape policy designations constraining the site. The site can be developed in isolation or could be considered as a wider strategic allocation at Yarnton. The site is of sufficient size to make a meaningful contribution to Oxford’s unmet housing need as well as providing the necessary local facilities and infrastructure.

There were a number of objections to this site. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Impact on wildlife habitats.
- Flooding concerns.
- Site used for recycling/production of building materials.
- Increase in traffic congestion.
- Urban sprawl.
- Inadequate infrastructure.
- Loss of landscape and rural views.
- Loss of countryside.
- Coalescence of settlements.

**PR118: London-Oxford Airport**

- WODC states that this site adjoins its boundary. It would appear to compromise London Oxford Airport. This is an important piece of strategic transport and economic development infrastructure for Oxfordshire.
- Natural England advises that the potential impact on Rushy Meadows SSSI will need to be assessed, including any impacts arising from changes in hydrology, increased air pollution or recreational pressure.
- GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd have provided a statement that sets out the planning proposition for the London Oxford Airport site and the economic case for the proposal.

A very small number of representations were received in support of this site.

A number of objections were received to this site. Comments include:
- Loss of green belt.
- Impact on local traffic.
- Airport is a vital strategic asset.
- Noise pollution due to proximity to airport.
- Loss of wildlife habitats.
- Highway and pedestrian safety concerns.
- Coalescence of settlements.
- Better to allow runway extension across the Straight Mile than close and redevelop airport site.
- Better used as industrial and science parks.
- Good location for park and ride.
- Existing infrastructure inadequate.
- Urban sprawl.
- Would cut off wildlife corridor.
- Flooding and drainage problems.

**PR122: Land to South of A34, adjacent to Woodstock Road, Wolvercote, Kidlington.**

- Environment Agency advises that there is a small watercourse at south of site.
- Oxford Preservation Trust states that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford’s setting and flooding issues.
- Kidlington PC states that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)
- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum states that this site considered separately and as part of site PR38 is unsuitable for housing. It is badly located bounded by the railway and the A34. Noise and air quality would be seriously damaging for residents. The problems of isolation and access are similar to those of PR123.
- Oxford Lib Dem Group states that Oxford and Kidlington must maintain a substantial green barrier between the two settlements, and must now allow housing adjacent to busy roads, for reasons of noise, air pollution etc. Plans showing Northern Gateway as undeveloped are misleading.

A number of representations object to this site. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Site will attract London commuters due to proximity of Oxford Parkway station.
- Flooding and drainage issues.
- Impact on local infrastructure.
- Increased traffic congestion.
- Loss of countryside.
- Noise and pollution from adjacent railway line.
- Urban sprawl.
- Loss of open space between Oxford and Kidlington.
- Loss of wildlife habitats.

**PR123: Land to South of A34, North of Linkside Avenue, Wolvercote, Kidlington**

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC state that this site scores 'HIGH' in the GB study. Note the substantial representation from Oxford City Council which promotes major development around Oxford Parkway station. Whilst can see benefits from locating close to the station there is clearly a risk that this area would encourage London commuters, driving up house prices and would not help in solving Oxford’s housing needs. The golf club is an important leisure facility which is protected as Green Space within the adopted Local Plan.
- Oxford Preservation Trust states that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford’s setting and flooding issues.
- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum disagree with the ++rating for SA6 and SA16. Consider that the site is not suitable for employment because access is only possible through narrow residential streets. Disagree with the rating under SA10 because there is no easy access except by car. The golf course is already small and developing this site would reduce it and make it unviable. It would also remove a valuable recreational facility and, just as important, an area that makes a contribution to biodiversity and provides a wild life corridor.

A very small number of representations were in support of this site.

A number of representations object to this site. Comments include:

- Site will attract London commuters due to proximity of Oxford Parkway station.
- Flooding and drainage issues.
- Loss of green belt.
- Crucial part of ‘green lung’ providing recreation facilities.
- Loss of natural habitats.
- Remote site.
- Viability of golf course compromised.
- Pressures on services and facilities.
- Increased traffic congestion.
- Loss of countryside.
- Noise pollution.
- Urban sprawl.
- Priority should be given to sites outside green belt and brownfield sites.
- Will lead to coalescence of settlements.

**PR124: Land to West of A44, North of A40, Wolvercote, Kidlington.**

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC states that this site performs 'HIGH' against two of the four GB purposes in the GB study and again is important in preventing urban sprawl and merging of Kidlington and Oxford. The site is adjacent to the Oxford Canal which is a very important recreational corridor and designated Conservation Area within the District. The corridor
protected through Policy ESD16 of the adopted Local Plan. Development in this area has the potential for adverse effects on the canal.

- Kidlington PC considers that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)

- Environment Agency advises that there is a watercourse on the southern and western (canal) boundaries.

- Historic England advises that this site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the west. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

- Natural England has concerns that development here could have potential indirect impacts on the Oxford Meadows SAC (and its component SSSIs), through alterations in the hydrological regime of the site, air pollution impacts, or increases in recreational pressure. This will need to be assessed through screening for likely significant effects in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Potential indirect impacts on Hook Meadows and the Trap Grounds SSSI would also need to be assessed. An area of priority habitats including floodplain grazing marsh is adjacent to the site to the west; indirect impacts would need to be considered as well as the potential to deliver the aims of the Lower Cherwell and Oxford Meadows to Farmoor CTAs through provision of a net gain in biodiversity.

- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum considers that this site is surrounded by major roads to the south and west and the planned link road will cross it. There are limited public transport possibilities for access to Oxford so it favours car use and pedestrians and cyclists would have to cross major roads.

- Oxford Preservation Trust states that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford’s setting and flooding issues.

- The site promoters would welcome the identification of this site as an option for growth. It is located close to existing sustainable transport links. The link between the A44 and A40 in the Oxford Transport Strategy passes through this site. This site contributes little to the function of the GB and development would be naturally contained by the existing road and canal network that surrounds the site.

A very small number of representations were received in support of this site.

A number of representations were received objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Impact on local traffic. Increased congestion.
- Risk of flooding.
- Urban sprawl.
- Loss of open countryside.
- Loss of landscape and views.
- Inadequate infrastructure.
- Site separated from existing community and services. Constrained by highways.
- A poor environment for residential development due to noise and air pollution.
- Pressure on services and facilities.
- Impact on the canal.
- Coalescence of settlements.
- Loss of natural habitats.

**PR125: Land at Gosford Farm, Gosford, Kidlington**

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC state that as well as being in the GB, most of this site is shown as being in Flood Zone 3 and should not be considered further on this basis. Development within this and surrounding areas has the potential to increase flooding risks for existing properties in Cherwell and downstream in Oxford.
- Kidlington PC objects to development in this area, due to loss of a part of the setting of the village and erosion of the Green Belt.
- Cllrs Neil Prestige & Cllr Maurice Billington objects to development on this site and considers that this site should be removed from the consultation process entirely because this site is in the Green Belt with no development on it at all. It offers a natural gap between Oxford and Gosford and Water Eaton, this is vital so that the village does not get swallowed up by Oxford.
- The Environment Agency advises that most of the site is within Flood zone 3(and 2).
- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum consider that this site has similar problems to sites 38 and 50 in that both are too close to major roads and would suffer from noise and air pollution, especially in spaces necessary for outdoor recreation.
- Oxford Lib Dem Group considers that this site would not create coalescence of Oxford and Kidlington.

Several representations have been received in support of this site. Comments include:

- Natural extension to Kidlington and Gosford.
- Least damaging impact on Kidlington.

A large number of representations have been received objecting to this site. Comments include:

- The site floods. It is in flood zone 3.
- Loss of green belt.
- Wildlife habitats and views lost.
- Noise and air pollution from A34.
- Will attract London commuters due to proximity to Oxford Parkway.
- New cemetery is based here.
- Drainage problems.
- Property will be devalued.
- Water Eaton and Gosford’s character will be destroyed.
- Urban sprawl.
- Loss of walks.
- Coalescence of villages with Oxford.
- Lack of infrastructure.
- Traffic congestion.
- Loss of open countryside and agricultural land.
- Site has ancient hedgerows.
- Extensive changes will be required to Bicester Road.
- Existing public transport inadequate.
- Located in Kidlington Gap.

**PR126: Seedlake Piggeries, Yarnton**

- Kidlington PC objects to development in this area, due to loss of any part of the setting of the village and erosion of the Green Belt.
- Environment Agency advises that there is a watercourse on southern and western (canal) boundaries.
- Yarnton PC objects to development of this site on policy grounds. Site is wholly in the Green Belt, Policy ESD14 seeks to safeguard the countryside from development and prevent urban sprawl. Policy Villages 1 identifies Yarnton as a Category A Village, where only minor development, infilling and conversions are permitted. In addition, access to and from the dual carriageway A44 is restrictive and near impossible at this location. The site includes an important water course that flows into Yarnton village, and overpaving natural soak-away will exacerbate flooding already occurring in southern sections of the village.
- Oxford Civic Society states that this site appears appropriate based on the SA and ITP assessments. Although in the GB, it is assessed as much less critical in terms of contribution to its objectives as other land in the GB. Oxford Canal provides opportunities for attractive landscape incorporation and recreation. In transport terms there is an opportunity for the re-construction of Kidlington Railway station (closed in 1960's) serving not only the new development, but the whole of Kidlington, on the Oxford - Banbury line. Believe there is great potential for a development-related SwiftRail or tram-train dimension to be added to the local network. In addition, they suggest making an initial release of parts of the site which are accessible to existing bus services on the A44.

There were a very small number of representations in support of this site.

There were a number of representations objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Impact on local road traffic.
- Loss of green belt.
- Loss of wildlife habitats.
- Urban sprawl.
- Loss of countryside.
- Loss of landscape and rural views.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Would destroy identities of Yarnton and Begbroke.
- Increased traffic congestion.
- Site includes an important water course that feeds in to Yarnton.
- Close to sewage works.
- Contradicts adopted local plan policies.
- Noise issues due to proximity to railway line.
- Isolated site.

**PR167: Land adjacent to Oxford Parkway, Banbury Road, Kidlington**

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC states that this site scores ‘HIGH’ in the GB study. Note the substantial representation from Oxford City Council which promotes major development around Oxford Parkway station. Whilst can see benefits from locating close to the station there is clearly a risk that this area would encourage London commuters, driving up house prices and would not help in solving Oxford’s housing needs. Also: the eastern fringes of this area are within flood zones 2 and 3; there are listed buildings at Frideswide Farm and Water Eaton. Considerable archaeological importance including the site of Cutteslowe Deserted Medieval village.
- Kidlington PC Parish states that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)
- Environment Agency advises that there is a watercourse at southern boundary.
- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum considers that free-market housing here would very likely be occupied predominantly by London commuters rather than those working in Oxford. Part of the site is close to the railway and the A34. If developed together with site PR50 it would just be part of urban sprawl.
- Oxford Preservation Trust considers that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford’s setting and flooding issues

There were a very few representations in support of this site.

There were a large number of representations objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Impact on local road network.
- Loss of green belt.
- Will attract London commuters due to proximity to Oxford Parkway.
- Coalescence of settlements.
- Loss of rural character of Kidlington and Gosford.
- Includes the car park for Oxford Parkway.
- Priority should be given to non-green belt and brownfield land.
- Flooding and drainage problems
- Traffic congestion.
- Loss of countryside and landscape.
- Located in the Kidlington Gap.
- Urban sprawl.
- Loss of wildlife habitats.

**PR168: Loop Farm, Wolvercote, Kidlington**
- Gosford and Water Eaton PC states that this site performs 'HIGH' against two of the four GB purposes in the GB study and again is important in preventing urban sprawl and merging of Kidlington and Oxford. The site is adjacent to the Oxford Canal which is a very important recreational corridor and designated Conservation Area within the District. The corridor is protected through Policy ESD16 of the adopted Local Plan. Development in this area has the potential for adverse effects on the canal.

- Historic England advises that this site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the east. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

- Environment Agency advises flood zone 3 at north of site. Canal forms eastern boundary, main river forms western boundary.

- Natural England has concerns that development here could have potential indirect impacts on the Oxford Meadows SAC (and its component SSSIs), through alterations in the hydrological regime of the site, air pollution impacts, or increases in recreational pressure. This would need to be assessed through screening for likely significant effects in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010. Data shows that a significant proportion of the site supports floodplain grazing marsh priority habitat within the Lower Cherwell CTA.

- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum consider that this is an isolated site with restricted access from A44 and not good for housing.

- Oxford Preservation Trust considers that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues.

There were a number of representations objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Coalescence of settlements.
- Separated from existing communities and services.
- Site constrained by highways.
- Traffic congestion.
- Urban sprawl.
- Run off or contamination could go into Kingsbridge Brook which runs to Oxford Meadows SAC. The possible hydrological link between site PR168 and the SAC need to be assessed and evaluated for potential harm. Sites near to housing with ageing sewers always have nitrate contaminated groundwater.
- Loss of open countryside, landscape and views.
- Pressure on existing services and facilities.
- Poor residential environment due to noise and air pollution.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Loss of wildlife habitats.
- Harm to character of canal.

**PR177: Loop Farm(2), Wolvercote, Kidlington**

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC states that this site performs 'HIGH' against two of the four GB purposes in the GB study and again is important in preventing urban sprawl and merging of
Kidlington and Oxford. The site is adjacent to the Oxford Canal which is a very important recreational corridor and designated Conservation Area within the District. The corridor is protected through Policy ESD16 of the adopted Local Plan. Development in this area has the potential for adverse effects on the canal.

- Kidlington PC considers that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. They are concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD)

- Historic England advises that this site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the east. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

- Environment Agency advises flood zone 3 at north of site, near where site adjoins A44. Canal forms western boundary.

- Natural England has concerns that development here could have potential indirect impacts on the Oxford Meadows SAC (and it component SSSIs), through alterations in the hydrological regime of the site, air pollution impacts, or increases in recreational pressure. This would need to be assessed through screening for likely significant effects in accordance with the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2010

- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum considers that a major road (A44) on the east side of the site would cause problems with sound and air pollution.

- Oxford Preservation Trust considers that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues.

- The promoters of the site would welcome the identification of this site as an option for growth. It is located close to existing sustainable transport links. The link between the A44 and A40 in the Oxford Transport Strategy passes through this site. This site contributes little to the function of the GB and development would be naturally contained by the existing road and canal network that surrounds the site.

There were a very small number of representations in support of this site.

There were a number of representations objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Coalescence of settlements.
- Separated from existing communities and services.
- Site constrained by highways.
- Traffic congestion.
- Urban sprawl.
- Run off or contamination could go into Kingsbridge Brook which runs to Oxford Meadows SAC. The possible hydrological link between site PR168 and the SAC need to be assessed and valued for potential harm. Sites near to housing with ageing sewers always have nitrate contaminated groundwater.
- Loss of open countryside, landscape and views.
- Pressure on existing services and facilities.
- Poor residential environment due to noise and air pollution.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Loss of wildlife habitats.
- Harm to character of canal.
- Harm to rural character of Kidlington.
- Lack of infrastructure.
- Will damage the wildlife corridor of the canal.
- Potential impact on Oxey Mead hay meadow, part of the SAC and New Marston Meadows SSSI.
- Loss of countryside walks.
- Priority should be given to non-green belt sites and brownfield sites.

**PR178: Land east of Kidlington and west of A34, Kidlington**

- Gosford and Water Eaton PC note that this site has been promoted for circa 700 homes. This site is in the GB and forms an important role in preventing the merging of Kidlington/Gosford and Oxford. The site scores ‘HIGH’ in the GB study. Development in this area would significantly erode the Kidlington/Gosford gap.
- Kidlington PC considers that this area is separated from Kidlington by major transport corridors forming significant landscape barriers, the Oxford Parkway development and the open fields. As it lies south of the village major new development is less likely to increase adverse traffic impacts in the village and will not directly impact on the valued intimate green environs of the village. Concerned that new community and retail could compete with the viability of facilities in the village to the detriment of the improvements and investment identified as necessary in the recently approved Kidlington Masterplan (SPD).
- Environment Agency advises that there is a small area of flood zone 3 at the north of the site.
- Cllrs Neil Prestige & Cllr Maurice Billington objects to development on this site and considers that this site should be removed from the consultation process entirely because this site is in the Green Belt with no development on it at all. It offers a natural gap between Oxford and Gosford and Water Eaton, this is vital so that the village does not get swallowed up by Oxford.
- Oxford Lib Dem Group considers that this site would not create coalescence of Oxford and Kidlington.
- Wolvercote Neighbourhood Forum consider that this site has similar problems to sites PR38 and PR50 in that both are too close to major roads and would suffer from noise and air pollution, especially in spaces necessary for outdoor recreation.
- Oxford Preservation Trust considers that this site must be assessed against the criteria on the main purposes of the Green Belt, Oxford's setting and flooding issues.

A very small number of representations have been received in support of this site. Comments include:

- Site a natural extension to Kidlington.
- Least damaging impact on Kidlington.
A large number of representations were received objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Coalescence of settlements.
- Loss of walks.
- Loss of wildlife habitats.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Loss of Kidlington Gap.
- Will attract London commuters due to proximity of Oxford Parkway.
- Noise from A34.
- Will exacerbate existing traffic congestion.
- Inadequate public services.
- Lack of infrastructure.
- Loss of countryside and landscape.
- Urban sprawl.
- Would be sandwiched between two very busy roads, one being the A34. Concerns already over dangers of diesel fumes, increasing pollution.
- Would damage character of Kidlington, Gosford and Water Eaton.

**PR194: Land off Langford Lane, Kidlington**

- Environment Agency advises that a river adjoins southern part of eastern boundary.
- Natural England advises that the potential impact on Rushy Meadows SSSI will need to be assessed, including any impacts arising from changes in hydrology, increased air pollution or recreational pressure.
- GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd consider that this site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of LOA has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds).
- BBOWT advises that this site adjoins Langford Meadows LWS raising concerns about direct and indirect impacts on this site, which might compromise the ecological interest of this site. An appropriate buffer will need to be provided should the site be considered further.

Several representations have been received in support of this site.

A number of representations have been received objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Harm to landscape and countryside.
- Site is just west of a local wildlife site. Development would be detrimental.
- Impact on wildlife habitats.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Increased traffic congestion.
- Inadequate infrastructure.
- Existing services stretched.
- Loss of country walks.
- Urban sprawl.
- Damage to rural character of settlements.

**PR195: Kidlington Depot, Langford Lane, Kidlington**

- The Environment Agency advises that there are no obvious constraints. Site currently shown as business park/telecommunications depot and adjoins airport. Any potential for contamination.
- Natural England advises that the potential impact on Rushy Meadows SSSI will need to be assessed, including any impacts arising from changes in hydrology, increased air pollution or recreational pressure.
- GVA on behalf of Oxford Aviation Services Ltd consider that this site falls within the Safeguarding Area. The operator of LOA has confirmed that the erection of any buildings on this site would be unacceptable as this would conflict with aircraft approach to the runway (safety grounds).

There were a small number of representations in support of this site.

There were a number of representations objecting to this site. Comments include:

- Loss of green belt.
- Would be better used for commercial development.
- Increased traffic congestion.
- Loss of wildlife habitats.
- Inadequate infrastructure.
- Existing services and facilities stretched.
- Flooding and drainage problems.
- Harm to countryside and wider landscape.
- Urban sprawl.

**Area of Search Option B**

**PR19: Shipton on Cherwell Quarry, Shipton on Cherwell**

- BBOWT state that this site encompasses Shipton Quarry SSSI and Bunkers Hill Quarry LWS in their entirety as well as additional areas of farmland. Very concerned about the potential allocation of this site for development and the effects development will have on the interest of the SSSI and the LWS. The site is also located within the Lower Cherwell CTA. Allocation of this site should be resisted.
- Historic England advises that this site abuts the Oxford Canal Conservation Area to the south-east and the Hampton Gay, Shipton-on-Cherwell and Thrupp Conservation Area beyond. It is also within the setting of the grade II listed Shipton Lift Bridge and the grade II Bridge at Shipton Weir and close to Hampton Gay (listed and scheduled) and its church. A site visit needs to be made to investigate further the impact of development on the setting of all these historic assets as part of any further consideration of this site, with reference to the conservation area character appraisals.
- Natural England states that the site includes Shipton on Cherwell and Whitehill Quarries SSSI, which is designated for its geological interest. Negative impacts on the SSSI would need to be avoided. Shipton on Cherwell Quarry is also a LWS, designated primarily for its
assemblage of wetland birds as well as the priority habitat ‘open mosaic habitats on previously developed land’. The site is in the Lower Cherwell Valley CTA.

Other comments received include:

- Road improvements needed.
- Would be an interesting development opportunity
- The site promoters state that this brownfield site provides an excellent opportunity for a mixed use ‘garden village’ development set within a unique landscape structure.
- There are biodiversity constraints to developing this site due to the rare wetland habitat and its margins. There are clean water pools, which are an incredibly rare resource in the nitrate polluted countryside of today.
- Unsustainable location and the scale of infrastructure required make this site unviable.

PR21: Land off Mill Lane/ Kidlington Road, Islip

- Noke PM state that this proposal would be inappropriate for a small village like Noke. It would put unnecessary burden on the infrastructure services and facilities in the village.
- Islip PC states that this site comprises existing agricultural land within the Green Belt. Developing this site would lead to a scale of development that would be excessive.

Other comments include:

- Road and rail needs widening.
- Site a natural extension to Islip.
- Statutory criteria for green belt protection must be adhered to.
- Object as a green field site. Brownfield sites are available.
- Loss of open countryside, impact on views, walks and wildlife habitats.
- Islip has a very poor transport infrastructure with no effective bus or rail service, narrow roads and ancient river bridge.
- Would put a huge strain on existing services and facilities in the village.
- Mill Lane is too narrow.
- Land prone to flooding.
- Impact on traffic flows and road safety.

PR22: Land North West of London-Oxford Airport nr Woodstock, Woodstock

- West Oxfordshire DC advises that this site adjoins its boundary. It is on the site of a recently refused planning application. It would have significant landscape and heritage implications.
- Historic England advise that this site contains the Blenheim Villa, a Roman villa and associated field system 200m north east of Little Cote scheduled monument. The development of this site would have an unacceptable impact on the monument and its setting and should not be taken forward. The Blenheim Palace World Heritage Site and Registered Historic Park and Garden is located to the south-west of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the Park.
- Woodstock Town Council states that no assessment has been made of the cumulative impacts of development proposed in neighbouring authorities. Development would impact on the openness of the adjacent green belt. A previous application to develop the site was
refused and the Town Council are strongly of the view that nothing has changed. Support views of ICOMOS relating to impact on Blenheim Palace WHS. Site also has a Roman villa. Would destroy Town’s unique character and tourism.

- Shipton on Cherwell and Thrupp PC state that the site is entirely inappropriate to meet Oxford’s needs due to remote location in relation to City. Exiting local road network inadequate in its current form.

- BBOWT consider it important that the effects of the development are not assessed in isolation but are considered comprehensively in consultation with WODC.

- ICOMOS-UK is of the view that any development on this site would have a harmful impact on the setting of Blenheim WHS.

- Woodstock Action Group objects to the development of this site. The cumulative impacts of recently planned developments will double the population of the town. The existing infrastructure will be unable to cope. Development would be harmful to this ancient town and Blenheim Palace.

Other comments include:

- Remote location in relation to Oxford City.
- Local road network overloaded.
- Loss of landscape and countryside.
- Site lies outside the green belt.
- Excellent transport links to Oxford
- Loss of settlement character.
- The site promoters and landowners have provided detailed comments and justification to support this site.
- Fully support the need for more housing in Woodstock, 600-800 houses over the course of the plan period seems appropriate, and would prevent the decline of the town and ensure infrastructure needs are met. Essential that CDC and WODC co-ordinate their planning response whilst consulting with the residents of Woodstock.

PR25: Land east of Marlborough School, Woodstock

- Woodstock Town Council state that the site is poorly related to Woodstock both in terms of access and landscape. Fears that development of this site would inhibit any expansion plans of the school.

- West Oxfordshire DC considers that this site is on the edge of Woodstock and would form an extension to this town in West Oxfordshire. The cumulative implications in terms of landscape impact and infrastructure need to be fully considered, as West Oxfordshire is already proposing three urban extensions for this town.

- Shipton on Cherwell and Thrupp PC state that the site is entirely inappropriate to meet Oxford’s needs due to remote location in relation to City. Exiting local road network inadequate in its current form.

- Woodstock Action Group objects due to its location on a sharp bend. There are highway safety issues in this locality.

Other comments include:
- North corner of Shipton Road needs widening
- Fully support the need for more housing in Woodstock, 600-800 houses over the course of the plan period seems appropriate, and would prevent the decline of the town and ensure infrastructure needs are met. Essential that CDC and WODC co-ordinate their planning response whilst consulting with the residents of Woodstock.
- Remote location in relation to Oxford City.
- Local road network overloaded.
- The site promoters and landowners have provided detailed comments and justification to support this site.

PR29: Land at Shipton on Cherwell, Shipton on Cherwell.

- Shipton on Cherwell and Thrupp PC state that the site is entirely inappropriate to meet Oxford’s needs due to remote location in relation to City. Existing local road network inadequate in its current form.
- Natural England state that the site is adjacent to Shipton on Cherwell and Whitehill Quarries SSSI, which is designated for its geological interest. Negative impacts on the SSSI would need to be avoided.
- BBOWT advises that site adjoins the Shipton on Cherwell Quarry SSSI. It appears to be a disused railway line that acts as a good connector in this agricultural countryside. Concerned about potential impacts on the SSSI and the adverse impact on the wider ecological network if the site was developed. Development on this site should be resisted.
- The site promoters state that this brownfield site provides an excellent opportunity for a mixed use ‘garden village’ development set within a unique landscape structure.
- Environment Agency advises that part of the site is in flood zone. SSSI adjoins northern boundary of site.

Other comments include:

- Improvements on the road to A4260 needed.
- Development would result in urban sprawl and fail to preserve the countryside.

PR30: Oil Storage Depot, Bletchingdon Road, Islip

- The Battlefields Trust advises that this site is likely to lie on the 1645 Islip Bridge battlefield. Site has local and national significance. There is likely to be surviving battlefield archaeology on the site which should be investigated. Need to establish whether the development of the site outweighs the public benefit of preserving this battlefield heritage.
- Noke PM states that 50 dwellings would be inappropriate for the size of the village.
- Islip PC is in favour of developing this site for limited development of 50 houses with a 50 bed care home/sheltered housing scheme.

Other comments include:

- Some development on this site is supported by the village. But Section 106 money should be directly invested in local area.
- Limited development would support Islip’s sustainability as a village.
- Brownfield site.
- Islip railway station needs parking.
- The site promoters have provided a detailed Land Quality Assessment together with a detailed Landscape and Visual Appraisal in support of this site. Would also commit to providing traffic calming measures and a new footbridge over the River Ray.
- A natural extension to Islip.
- Some 50 houses would have the support of the local community.
- Would ruin visual amenity and biodiversity.
- Development would result in loss of green belt, loss of open countryside, impact on wildlife and local road network.

PR55: Land off Bletchingdon Road, Islip

- The Battlefields Trust advises that this site is likely to lie on the 1645 Islip Bridge battlefield. Site has local and national significance. There is likely to be surviving battlefield archaeology on the site which should be investigated. Need to establish whether the development of the site outweighs the public benefit of preserving this battlefield heritage.
- Islip PC states that this site comprises agricultural land within the green belt. Developing this site would lead to a scale of development that would be excessive.
- Noke PM state that this proposal would be inappropriate for a small village like Noke. It would put unnecessary burden on the infrastructure services and facilities in the village.

Other comments include:

- Road and rail improvements needed.
- Unsuitable and would put more traffic on to Islip’s already inadequate road network.
- Objection as this is a green field site when brownfield are available.
- Development would result in loss of green belt, loss of open countryside, impact on wildlife and local road network.
- Inappropriate to the village and would significantly extend its current boundaries.
- Adverse impacts for properties along Kidlington Road and Bletchingdon Road with loss of privacy and open aspect.
- Impact on traffic and road safety.

PR157: Upper Noke, Noke

- Historic England considers that, this site is within the setting of the Romano-Celtic temple North of Woodeaton scheduled monument to the south-west. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting.
- Noke PM considers that large development for a small village like Noke would be inappropriate. CDC's vision includes the need "to ensure that people have convenient, affordable and sustainable travel opportunities to the city". This site would be contrary to this vision with increased traffic and congestion, no public transport, lack of infrastructure and services. It is adjacent to a nationally renowned bird sanctuary. It is the last remaining unspoilt hills in the area with important views and well used by walkers and cyclists. The Parish feels that the exceptional circumstances to release this site from the Green Belt would be difficult for the reasons mentioned above.
Other comments include:

- Hilltop views would be ruined
- The site is not linked to the village and stands exposed and elevated on the busy B4027.
- What reassurance is there that these houses will not be for London or Birmingham commuters?
- Islip primary school is at capacity.
- The owner of part of the site has advised that she has not given her consent for this land to be promoted. She has requested that the land is removed. A plan showing the land in question has been provided.
- Noke is totally unsuitable as it's a small village and any significant number of additional houses would detrimentally alter the nature of this remote and historic village. Its infrastructure, services and amenities could not sustain any growth. It has no public transport.
- 100 homes would be highly detrimental to Noke.
- Noke Hill is one of the last remaining unspoilt hills in the area, enjoyed by many and a bird migration route. Otmoor RSPB reserve is 1km away.
- Green Belt will be lost.
- Will exacerbate traffic problems.
- Landowner states that there is a strong case for some additional housing in Noke so that the community remains viable and attracts young families to the community.

### PR181: Land off Mill Street/Mill Lane, Islip

- The Battlefields Trust advises that this site is likely to lie on the 1645 Islip Bridge battlefield. Site has local and national significance. There is likely to be surviving battlefield archaeology on the site which should be investigated. Need to establish whether the development of the site outweighs the public benefit of preserving this battlefield heritage.
- Historic England advises that this the Islip Conservation Area abuts this site to the west, east and south. This end of Islip retains its historic settlement pattern as a row of houses which peters out and ends in a farm. To break this up with a new block of housing would be detrimental to the special interest, character and appearance of the Conservation Area. Consider that this site should not be taken forward.
- Islip PC states that this site is in the Green Belt and on the edge of the Islip Conservation Area. The access of Mill Lane is narrow and is not suitable for development as it would result in increase in traffic problems in the village and the bridge.
- Noke PM state that this proposal would be inappropriate for a small village like Noke. It would put unnecessary burden on the infrastructure services and facilities in the village.

Other comments include:

- Objection as this is a green field site when brownfield are available.
- Road and rail improvements needed.
- A natural extension to Islip
- Unsuitable and would put more traffic on to Islip’s already inadequate road network.
- Development would result in loss of green belt, loss of open countryside, impact on wildlife and local road network.

**Area of Search Option C**

**PR10: Land East of Wendlebury**

- Ambrosden PC have expressed significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there have been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains. The site also has significant visual impact, and hydrological issues, as it is on the River Ray basin, which is subject to flooding. There are significant issues related to elevated rail line. The site may be suitable for leisure or sporting use.
- Wendlebury PC considers the site proposal as inappropriate development, due to flooding, BAP habitat, Green Boundary zone, unsustainable location, viability and conflict with Local Plan Strategic Objectives SO6, SO11, SO12 and SO15. It is also contrary to Policies BSC 11, ESD 1, ESD 6, ESD 10, ESD 13, ESD 15, and ESD 18 of the local plan.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to developments around J9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements.
- BBOWT consider that this large site allocation is in close proximity to the Wendlebury Meads and Mansmoor Closes SSSI. It is separated from the site by the M40 but connectivity underneath the motorway might exist resulting in increased recreational pressures on the site. Indirect impacts caused by accessing the site might also exist and will need to be fully assessed.
- Historic England considers that this site abuts the Alcester Roman site scheduled monument to the north. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the monument.

Other comments include:

- Development would be a piecemeal way of getting the previously rejected Weston Otmoor Ecotown but without any of the ‘eco’ credentials.
- Near sensitive wildlife sites.
- Site located next to small existing communities with little or no infrastructure or public transport links.
- Would destroy the setting and character of Wendlebury village.
- Excessive noise and air pollution.
- Would exacerbate flooding problems.

**PR11: Land North and South of A34/west of M40 Junction 9.**

- Ambrosden PC expresses significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there have been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains.
- Wendlebury PC objects as the site is located in the Green Belt, which prevents inappropriate development and stops urban sprawl. The site is not sustainable due to lack of infrastructure or connections to urban or developed areas, which would increase dependence on car; therefore contrary to objectives SO6, SO10, SO11, SO12, SO13 and SO15. Contrary to Policies ESD1, 6, 10, 13, and 14.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to developments around J9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements.
- Weston on the Green PC state that the site is unacceptable for reasons of the currently inadequate traffic infrastructure, and the impossible (and impassable) burden it would put on the A34. A major transport route would need to be put in place to accommodate more major development in the Cherwell corridor - even making the A34 into a motorway is not the solution (re the Botley bottleneck).
- BBOWT consider that this large site allocation includes or comes close to woodland blocks that are designated as Ancient Woodlands. In addition, there is a SSSI nearby that might come under pressure from development, e.g., recreational pressure.
- Historic England advises that the Weston-on-the-Green Conservation Area lies to the west of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

Other comments include:
- Development would be a piecemeal way of getting the previously rejected Weston Otmoor Ecotown but without any of the ‘eco’ credentials.
- Near sensitive wildlife sites.
- Maybe within the rainwater catchment of Weston Fen SSSI
- Site located next to small existing communities with little or no infrastructure or public transport links.
- Excessive noise and air pollution.
- Priority should be given to brown field sites and those outside the green belt.

PR12: Land at Little Chesterton

- Ambrosden PC expresses significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there have been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains.
- Wendlebury PC objects as this is unsustainable development for a small village. It would lead to merging Little Chesterton with Chesterton and to the urban sprawl of Bicester out towards the M40 and the eventual growth of the town over all the rural areas between it and the M40. Contrary to objectives SO6, SO10, SO11 and SO12. Contrary to Policies ESD10 and 13.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to developments around J9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements.

Other comments include:
- Site located next to small existing communities with little or no infrastructure or public transport links.
- Development would be a piecemeal way of getting the previously rejected Weston Otmoor Ecotown but without any of the ‘eco’ credentials.
- Unsustainable due to its remote location, no facilities and car access only.

PR97: Church Field, Wendlebury Road, Wendlebury

- Ambrosden PC expresses significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there have been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains.
- Wendlebury PC objects to this site as it represents a direct extension to the village (Category C), which only permits infilling. It would put undue strain on the existing infrastructure. The site is on higher ground, which would lead to flooding and drainage problems for the village. The site has historic agricultural ridge and furrow across the majority of it and dew ponds close to the church. The site lies outside the village built up area. The village has no services except a pub, which would lead to residents having to use private motor cars.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to developments around J9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements.
- Historic England advises that this site lies just to the south-west of the grade II listed Church of St Giles. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting.

Other comments include:

- Development would be a piecemeal way of getting the previously rejected Weston Otmoor Ecotown but without any of the ‘eco’ credentials.
- Site has ancient ridge and furrow and would swamp Wendlebury village.
- Site located next to small existing communities with little or no infrastructure or public transport links.
- Would exacerbate existing flooding problems
- Noise and pollution problems

PR139: Land at Lodge Farm, Chesterton

- Ambrosden PC expresses significant concerns about further development along the A34, A41 corridor, due to impact on Ambrosden. Note that there have been a large number of houses built in the last few years. Any development of this site would need to be justified by significant community planning gains.
- Wendlebury PC objects as would be inappropriate development within the Green Boundary Zone that protects merging the surrounding villages with Bicester. It represents an unsustainable form of development with no connection to major settlement for employment and other infrastructure. It will lead to increased congestion on roads around Bicester; therefore considered contrary to Objectives SO6, 11, 12 and 15 and LP Policies BSC11, ESD1, 6, 10, 13 and 15.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to developments around J9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements.
- Historic England advise that this site includes the grade II listed assets of Oxford Lodge and bridge c. 200m north-east of Lodge Farmhouse and abuts the Chesterton Conservation Area. A site visit is needed to fully understand the context and setting of the building but consider that an isolated rural location would be an important aspect of the significance of this building given that lodges are meant to signal the entrance to the estate of a country house, which essentially requires a countryside location. Consider that development of this site would be likely to result in a high level of harm to the significance of this building and that the site should therefore not be taken forward.

Other comments:
- Site has ridge and furrow pasture land and a brook which need to be protected.

PR196: Extension to Bicester Gateway, Bicester
- Historic England advises that this site is adjacent to the site of an Iron Age Romano-British settlement and Roman Road. Although neither is scheduled, any development of this site should have regard to the setting of these heritage assets.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to any extension to NW Bicester Eco Town.
- Wendlebury PC objects to the inclusion of this site within the already allocated Bicester Gateway employment scheme. Transport mitigation measures from the development affecting Wendlebury are not satisfactory. Any increase of traffic through the village is to be avoided. The village has no street lights or pavements. The village experiences high levels of traffic when there are accidents at Junction 9 of the M40.

Area of Search Option D

PR62: Land at Arncott Hill, off Patrick Haugh Road and Buchanan Road, Arncott
- BBOWT advises that this site adjoins or comes close to the Arncott Wood LWS, part of which is also designated as Ancient Woodland. Concerned about direct and indirect impacts on this site (eg recreational pressure) and consider it important that any potential development retains a minimum distance of 50m to the woodland edge.

PR149: Land at Murcott Road, Arncott
- BBOWT advises that this site adjoins or comes close to the Arncott Wood LWS, part of which is also designated as Ancient Woodland. Concerned about direct and indirect impacts on this site (eg recreational pressure) and consider it important that any potential development retains a minimum distance of 50m to the woodland edge.

Area of Search Option E

PR3: Land adjoining Graven Hill, Bicester/Ambrosden
- Ambrosden PC strongly object to this site as it will lead to the coalescence of Ambrosden with the urban extension of Bicester at Graven Hill
- Historic England advises that there is a grade II listed barn just to the north of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the barn.
- The promoters of this site have provided a very detailed report with a sustainability appraisal, transport appraisal and other evidence in support of the allocation of this site.

**PR7: Land at Wretchwick Farm, Ploughley Road, Ambrosden**

- Ambrosden PC objects to this site due to the effect on the setting of listed buildings. It will also lead to the coalescence of Ambrosden with the urban extension of Bicester. This land should be maintained as a green buffer zone between Graven Hill and Ambrosden.
- Historic England advises that a grade II listed barn lies just to the south of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the barn.

**PR33: South Lodge, Fringford Road, Caversfield**

- Caversfield PC state that a planning application on this site was dismissed at appeal in 2014. The reasons for refusal included character and appearance of the area, housing land supply, impact on adjacent heritage assets, landscape and poor access.
- Historic England advises that the RAF Bicester Conservation Area lies just to the east of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.
- Flood risk

**PR37: Land to the West of Himley Village. Middleton Stoney Road, Bicester**

- Middleton Stoney PC objects to any extension to NW Bicester Eco Town.

Other comments include:

- This relates to an area of land promoted by P3Eco. Any land identified for development adjacent or close to NW Bicester should be subject to the same Eco Town criteria that underpin the development.
- Remote, no facilities, car access only.

**PR77: Bicester Garden Centre, Bicester**

- No comments received in response to this question.

**PR105: Land north of Rau Court, Caversfield**

- Caversfield PC states that this is one of the only available green spaces in the village. Vehicular access is limited and the local roads are unable to support additional volume of traffic. The existing infrastructure and services cannot sustain additional pressure from new housing. The Parish Council believes that this site in particular should be retained in perpetuity as recreational land and given to the community for such use.
- BBOWT consider that, this site appears to be a central open space for the village and the aerial photograph suggests that it comprises a mosaic of habitats, which have the potential to support priority habitats and/or protected and notable species. We are concerned about the potential loss of this potentially wildlife rich site and that any loss of public open space will increase pressure on wildlife in the surrounding countryside.
- Historic England advises that the RAF Bicester Conservation Area lies just to the north of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

PR140: Skimmingdish Lane, Bicester

- BBOWT consider that this site appears overgrown and is likely to have developed ecological interest over time. Whilst generally support development to be located within the urban area rather than sprawling into the countryside concerned about the loss of this site for biodiversity and people. Consider that this site could form an important element of a GI network for the town providing a green link between town and countryside.
- Historic England advises that the RAF Bicester Conservation Area lies just to the north of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

PR141: Land East of Charbridge Lane, South of Railway, Bicester

- Launton PC state that this site is not sympathetic with the proposed Wretchwick Green development and by bringing Bicester housing so close to Launton, threatens coalescence with Launton.
- BBOWT consider that this site is entirely on the Gavray Drive LWS. It is wholly inappropriate not only as it is clearly against policy but also as this site forms part of an important existing, and proposed, open space connection between the town and the countryside. The site is an important element in the Bicester 12 application (currently under consideration), which proposes to connect this site via a Nature Conservation Area with the LWS to the east (‘Meadows NW of Blackthorn Hill’). This green connection is essential to make the development on Bicester 12 acceptable in ecological terms. As such development on this site will not only directly affect the designation and existing wildlife interest but would completely undermine any strategic work that is currently going on. In addition the site is located in the Upper Ray CTA and any development should not compromise the aims and objectives of the CTA. Strongly object to this allocation.

Other comments include:

- Nearness to Gavray Drive LWS meadows is a concern. There needs to be a wide green wildlife corridor preserved and protected.
- The promoters of this site consider that it should be an expansion to Bicester 12, not to increase the amount of developable land but to deliver environmental gains and as an enabling development.
- Site is part of Gavray Meadows LWS so should not be built on. A wildlife corridor is required to maintain free movement for animals living in Gavray Meadows.
- Strongly objects to development on this site. It is protected under policies ESD10 and ESD11 of CDC's adopted plan 2015 as it is land known to be of high nature conservation importance. It is part of Gavray Meadows Local Wildlife Site that provides a wildlife corridor and is part of the Ray Conservation Target Area.

PR142: Land North of Railway, East of Charbridge Lane, Bicester
- Launton PC states that this site will develop Bicester outside the ring road and would cause an unacceptable likelihood of coalescence with Launton.

Other comments include:

- Development would see the green space between Launton and Bicester disappear. It is important to maintain the village identity and keep Launton separate from Bicester.
- Nearness to Gavray Drive LWS meadows is a concern. There needs to be a wide green wildlife corridor preserved and protected.
- This site is being promoted along with site PR141. Promoters of sites propose that the allocation of this site for housing will secure PR141 as undeveloped land.

PR144: Bicester Sports Association Site, Oxford Road, Bicester

- BBOWT generally welcome the use of inner urban sites for development but are concerned about the resulting loss of open space to development. Bicester has little existing publicly available open space and concerned about the loss of this recreational site. In addition, the site forms part of one of few green links through the town (located along a stream) and should be considered as part of the GI network.
- Historic England advises that the Bicester Conservation Area lies just to the north-east of this site. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

Other comments include:

- Site is an important part of Bicester’s green infrastructure. It is a valuable community asset which should be protected.
- Pollution levels on the Oxford road are currently higher than recommended.

PR147: Land at Grange Farm, Launton

- Launton PC state that the site is unsuitable due to transport infrastructure deficiencies in Station Road, and the crossroads with the Bicester Road, Launton.

Other comments include:

- Site is unsuitable for development as it consists of greenfield land, beyond the built-up limits of Launton, within open countryside. It would deliver a disproportionate level of growth unsupported by local services and facilities contrary to longstanding policy parameters for the threshold for developments in Service Villages. Travel patterns that are reliant on cars would increase.
- Development will extend the built up limits of the village.

PR148: Land at Blackthorn Road, Launton

- Launton PC state that the site is mainly flood plain. The remainder of the site does not meet the site size threshold.
- The promoters of the site welcome its inclusion within the Options Paper. Details, including an indicative layout, have been provided.
Other comments include:

- Site has previously been rejected by CDC
- It does not meet the minimum requirements for a strategic site.
- Will include development in flood zone 3 and the Ray CTA.
- Congestion and road safety a concern.

PR150: The Plain, Land East of B4100, Bicester

- Caversfield PC states this site is labelled as Bicester, but is in Caversfield. It was requested as part of the Green Buffer to reduce the coalescence between Bicester/ Eco Town and Caversfield. The Green Buffer was rejected by the Inspector as there were other policies to protect it. Buildings on this land would be highly detrimental to the rural village of Caversfield and would be well outside the built up area of the village.
- Caversfield is a Category 3 settlement. It does not have the infrastructure to maintain this level of housing.

PR190: Dymock Farm, Caversfield

- Caversfield PC state that this has not been supported by the Parish Council since 2009. The infrastructure and services are not adequate to support 480 dwellings, with an additional 900 dwellings it would make it worse. This site is a long way from any form of public transport, pedestrian and vehicular access in to both Fringford Road and the Buckingham A4421 difficult. The narrow rural Fringford Road is not suitable for additional traffic and access onto the Buckingham Road would be dangerous.
- Caversfield is a Category 3 settlement. It does not have the infrastructure to maintain this level of housing.

PR197: North West Bicester, Bicester

- Noted that site was included in the original NW Bicester Masterplan but excluded from Policy Bicester 1.
- Any land identified for development adjacent to NW Bicester should be subject to the same Eco Town criteria.

Area of Search Option F Sites

PR16: Land west of Chilgrove Drive and North of Camp Road, Upper Heyford

- Historic England considers that, this site abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to the west and north. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to the promotion of this site and any extension to RAF Upper Heyford.

Other comments include:

- Increased pressure on roads.
- Site promoter’s state that the site should be allocated for housing as it is in a sustainable location.
- Flood risk.

**PR36: Letchmere Farm, Camp Road, Upper Heyford**

- Historic England considers that, this site abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to the north. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to the promotion of this site and any extension to RAF Upper Heyford.
- Kenley Holdings are promoting this site for residential development as a logical extension to an existing allocation.

**PR47: Land South of Upper Heyford Airfield, Upper Heyford**

- BBOWT are concerned about potential cumulative effects of developments in this area. The scale is completely out of context with the surrounding area and might result in Upper Heyford and Lower Heyford merging into one settlement. We consider the proposed allocation too large for this area and are concerned about the direct and indirect effects (including hydrological changes, recreation, and increased traffic) this might have on the natural resources in general and on designated sites such existing adjacent woodland blocks, the River Cherwell and Rousham Gardens.
- Historic England considers that this site would have an impact on the setting of Rousham Park. The site should therefore not be taken forward. In addition the western end of the site lies within the Rousham Conservation Area.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to the promotion of this site and any extension to RAF Upper Heyford.

**PR52: Land South East of Lower Heyford, Lower Heyford**

- BBOWT are concerned about potential cumulative effects of developments in this area. The scale is completely out of context with the surrounding area and might result in Upper Heyford and Lower Heyford merging into one settlement. We consider the proposed allocation too large for this area and are concerned about the direct and indirect effects (including hydrological changes, recreation, and increased traffic) this might have on the natural resources in general and on designated sites such existing adjacent woodland blocks, the River Cherwell and Rousham Gardens.
- Historic England considers that this site would have an impact on the setting of Rousham Park. Any major development would seriously harm the significance of the Park. In addition the site lies almost entirely within the Rousham Conservation Area.

Other comments include:

- Objection to strategic development sites that degrade the countryside, bridleways, footpaths, canals and rivers.
- Site completely disproportionate in size. Lower Heyford and Caulcott would be dwarfed.
- No capacity for growth at Lower Heyford Station.
- Important to preserve the views from historic Rousham House.
- Development of this site would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.

**PR188: Heyford Leys Campsite, Camp Road, Upper Heyford**

- Historic England states that, this site abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to the northwest. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

**PR191: Land adjoining and west of Chilgrove Drive and adjoining and north of Camp Road, Upper Heyford**

- Historic England considers that, this site abuts the Upper Heyford Conservation Area to northwest. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

**Area of Search Option G Sites**

**PR26: Land at southern edge of village, Ardley**

- Middleton Stoney PC objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements.
- Ardley with Fewcott PC objects to the site on the grounds that the site is in Category C village where only infill and extensions are allowed. It lacks immediate relationship to Oxford. There is a potential for 200 dwellings which would drastically change the size of Ardley/Fewcott. The increase in traffic is unsustainable.
- Fritwell PC objects as it would increase car use on unsuitable roads, including the B430 which is already heavily congested. Every effort should be made to preserve and enhance the rights of way and connectivity across the rural areas and preserve the landscape and views.
- Anglian Water advise that development will impact on their infrastructure requirements.

**PR56: Land at Junction 10, M40, Ardley**

- Anglian Water advises that development will impact on their infrastructure requirements.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements.
- Fritwell PC are concerned that commercial development would give rise to warehousing and storage use wanting easy access to M40 and servicing needs across long distances. Do not consider that this will give rise to local employment to support economic development in Oxfordshire. Are concerned that development on this site would be very close to Fritwell and Ardley and contribute to destroying the rural aspects and valued space between the villages. It will be very visible from the rural footpaths on this side of Fritwell parish and produce light and visual pollution in this essential rural area. The Parish feel that every effort should be made to preserve and enhance the rights of way and connectivity across our rural areas and preserve the landscape and views.
PR67: Land adjoining playing field, Ardley

- Anglian Water advises that development will impact on their infrastructure requirements.
- Middleton Stoney PC objects to developments around Junction 9 and 10 of M40 given that these locations are already at capacity in spite of recent improvements.
- Ardley with Fewcott PC objects to the site on the grounds that the site is in Category C village where only infill and extensions are allowed. It lacks immediate relationship to Oxford. There is a potential for 200 dwellings which would drastically change the size of Ardley/Fewcott. The increase in traffic is unsustainable.
- Fritwell PC objects to this site as there is no sustainable transport (bus service) and residential development would result in an increase in car traffic on unsuitable roads through the rural villages. It addition, access is likely to be needed onto the narrow Ardley/Fritwell Road on a steep bend giving rise to safety concerns. Every effort should be made to preserve and enhance the rights of way and connectivity across our rural areas and preserve the landscape and views.

Other comments:

- Flood risk, close to M40 (noise and pollution)

Area of Search Option H Sites

PR15: Land at Crouch Farm, Banbury

- Bloxham PC is concerned about the impact on the A361.

Other comments:

- Objection to development on sites that degrade the countryside.
- Adverse impact on Conservation Target Area.

PR17: Site of the M40, Overthorpe, Banbury

- Banbury Town Council state that residential use on this site would lead to the isolating communities on this site and would result in increased car journeys and congestion on the roads. Industrial/employment uses should be explored.

PR28: Land West of Southam Road, Banbury

- Banbury Town Council advises that they have planning permission to change the use of this land to a cemetery to expand the Hardwick Cemetery.

Other comments include:

- Objection to strategic development sites that degrade the countryside and rivers.
- Flood risk
- Adding to congestion on Southam Road.
- Banbury and North Oxford Ramblers object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected. This site is an area of tranquillity.
PR43: Land to the North of Broughton Road, Banbury

- Objection to strategic development sites that degrade the countryside, bridleways and footpaths.
- Banbury and North Oxford Ramblers object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.
- Increased traffic congestion.
- Direct and indirect impact on Crouch Hill. Area should be considered a Landscape Protection Area.
- Negative impact on infrastructure.

PR45: Land adjoining Dover Avenue and Thornbury Drive, Banbury

- Historic England consider that, this site is within the setting of the grade II listed Withycombe Farmhouse and attached stable, immediately to the west. This is one of a number of proposed sites containing or near to isolated listed farmsteads, which would be surrounded by development if these sites were allocated, which in turn is likely to have a major impact on their significance. Their historical interest is often bound up in the relationship with the land from them and their aesthetic value is often enhanced by an isolated rural setting. Suggest that an analysis of the impact of development on the significance of the farmstead is undertaken and feeds into the consideration of any sites taken forward. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of these listed buildings.

Other comments:

- Objection to strategic development sites that degrade the countryside, bridleways and footpaths.
- Banbury and North Oxford Ramblers object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.
- Bloor Homes support this site as a potential extension to Site Banbury 3: Land west of Bretch Hill.

PR54: Land off Warwick Road, Banbury

- Objection to strategic development sites that degrade the countryside, bridleways and footpaths.
- Merges Hanwell in to Banbury
- Banbury and North Oxford Ramblers object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.

PR58: Bretch Farm, Broughton Road, Banbury

- Increased traffic congestion.
- Direct and indirect impact on Crouch Hill. Area should be considered a Landscape Protection Area.
- Negative impact on infrastructure.
PR130: Land south of Broughton Road, Banbury
- No comments received in response to this question.

PR146: Milestone Farm, Broughton Road, Banbury
- Objection to strategic development sites that degrade the countryside, bridleways and footpaths.
- Banbury and North Oxford Ramblers object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.
- Increased traffic congestion.
- Direct and indirect impact on Crouch Hill. Area should be considered a Landscape Protection Area.
- Negative impact on infrastructure.

PR186: Land south of Wards Crescent, Bodicote
- Objection due to traffic congestion, overstretched infrastructure, air pollution. Services already under threat e.g. Horton Hospital.
- Adverse impact on the village of Bodicote.
- Access roads are inadequate.
- Bodicote has already taken more than its fair share of housing.
- Flooding problems.
- Bodicote PC objects to this site due to its impact on Bodicote. There is a risk of flooding and development would increase traffic in the often congested village.

PR187: Dukes Meadow Drive, Banbury
- No comments received in response to this question.

PR198: Land at Southam Road, Banbury
- Flood risk
- Bounded by M40 and railway line.

PR199: Land at Wykham Park Farm, North of Wykham Lane, Banbury
- Bloxham PC is concerned about the impact on A361
- Historic England states that the site is within the setting of the grade II listed Wykham Farmhouse. This is one of a number of proposed sites containing or near to isolated listed farmsteads, which would be surrounded by development if these sites were allocated, which in turn is likely to have a major impact on their significance. Their historical interest is often bound up in the relationship with the land from them and their aesthetic value is often enhanced by an isolated rural setting. Suggest that an analysis of the impact of development on the significance of the farmstead is undertaken and feeds into the consideration of any sites taken forward. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting.
- Bodicote PC objects to the promotion of this site for housing due to its impact on Bodicote. Have already lost a large portion of the Parish to the Longford Park development and currently there are 2 developments approved on the south part of the Parish at Blossom.
Fields. This site is considered as a major problem. Vehicles will use Wykham Lane, which is narrow, winding, country lane, already in a poor condition and subject to near misses. It is not appropriate to build here and use Wykham Lane to enter and exit the site.

Other comments include:

- Site is pleasant rural agricultural land. Need to preserve rural character of Wykham Lane.
- Risk of merging Bodicote with Bloxham.
- Objection to strategic development sites that degrade the countryside, bridleways and footpaths.
- Banbury and North Oxford Ramblers object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected.
- Strong objection as sites already congested with traffic.
- Infrastructure cannot cope, air pollution and reduced quality of life. Services already under threat.
- Increased traffic along Wykham Lane.

Area of Search Option I Sites

PR1: Land off Station Road, Cropredy

- Cropredy PC state that a previous application was refused as it was considered to harm the character of the rural setting, and setting of a listed building. It would result in additional traffic movements. Cropredy is not supported by public transport.

Other comments include:

- Unsuitable due to flooding and next to main railway line.
- Promoters of site state that the allocation will assist the District’s housing need, assist in the vitality and viability of small businesses and services in Cropredy, deliver public open space and other infrastructure and biodiversity improvements.

PR8: Land North East of Ambrosden

- Ambrosden PC states that they may support the development of 30% of this site, subject to the provision of significant areas of open space, community and sports facilities. These benefits are unlikely to be achieved in any other way.

PR9: Land to rear of the Old Quarry House, Fenway, Steeple Aston

- A petition with 80 signatories has been received which strongly objects to the development of this site.
- BBOWT advise that the site is a disused quarry, not disturbed for a number of years. It is highly likely that the site supports priority habitats and protected and notable species, including adders. The ecological value of the site needs to be assessed before being considered further for development.
- Historic England advise that any development should have regard to the setting of the Steeple Aston Conservation Area.
PR18: Land west of Banbury Road, Adderbury

- Adderbury PC states that this site does not meet the criteria set within the consultation. Also the site will not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up limits of a settlement and the landscape.

PR31: Durrants Gravel, Finmere

- Anglian Water advise that development will have an impact on the capacity of STWs in the area.

Other comments:

- Why not a large development on the old airfield at Finmere?

PR35: Land North and South of Milton Road, Bloxham

- No comments received in response to this question.

PR46: Land West of Hook Norton Road, Sibford Ferris

- Sibford Ferris PC believes that the village infrastructure is not robust enough to sustain the scale of development proposed. It also considers that housing in the village would not provide people convenient, affordable, sustainable travel opportunities to Oxford.

Other comments include:

- Objection on grounds of access limitations, inaccuracies on the submission, need to protect the rural nature of the area, rural jobs and horse riders.
- Sibford is a particularly rural, unspoilt part of Cherwell District. It has a relatively poor local road network and limited infrastructure. A development of 100 houses would completely ruin the area.
- The site is close to the AONB.

PR53: Land at Oxfordshire Inn, Heathfield

- No comments received in response to this question.

PR57: Land at Station Road, Hook Norton

- No comments received in response to this question.

PR63: Land at Kiln Farm, Blackthorn

- Historic England considers that development of this site would be out of character with the existing settlement pattern, a linear form of development, and so this site should not be taken forward.

PR66: Land at Folly Farm, Sibford Ferris

- Historic England states that this site abuts the Sibford Ferris Conservation Area. The open rural approach to the conservation area is a very important part of its character. The
proposed development would entail a high level of harm therefore the site should not be taken forward.
- Sibford Ferris PC believes that the village infrastructure is not robust enough to sustain the scale of development proposed. It also considers that housing in the village would not provide people convenient, affordable, sustainable travel opportunities to Oxford.

Other comments include:
- Sibford is a particularly rural, unspoilt part of Cherwell District. It has a relatively poor local road network and limited infrastructure. A development of 100 houses would completely ruin the area.
- The site is close to the AONB
- Objection on grounds of access limitations, inaccuracies on the submission, need to protect the rural nature of the area, rural jobs and horse riders.

PR73: Land near Northampton Road, Weston on the Green
- Historic England advises that any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the Weston-on-the Green conservation area and its character appraisal.

PR80: Land adjacent to Paradise Lane, Milcombe
- Historic England states that this site is within the setting of the Grade II listed Farnell Fields to the north east. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting.

PR82: Field known as Baby Ben, adjoining Northampton Road, Weston on the Green
- No comments received in response to this question.

PR83: Land adjoining Caerleon, Northampton Road, Weston on the Green
- No comments received in response to this question.

PR87: Land off Banbury Road, Twyford, Adderbury
- Adderbury PC states that this site does not meet the criteria set within the consultation. Also the site will not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up limits of a settlement and the landscape.

PR88: Land off Milton Road, Adderbury
- Adderbury PC states that this site does not meet the criteria set within the consultation. Also the site will not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up limits of a settlement and the landscape.
- The promoters of this site state that it is well served by public transport and Kings Sutton station is accessible by cyclists. The site is available, suitable, achievable, and viable and located close to existing facilities and services within Adderbury, which is a Category A settlement.

PR94: Land to the North of Clifton Road, Deddington
- Deddington Development Watch consider that this is a greenfield site outside built-up limits comprising very good quality (Grade 2) agricultural land, except site PR98 is Grade 3. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.

PR95: Land to the west of Banbury Road, Deddington

- Deddington Development Watch consider that this site is a greenfield site, which abuts the Conservation Area. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.
- Objection to strategic developments that degrades the countryside and are along bridleways and footpaths.

PR98: Oxford Road, Deddington

- Deddington Development Watch consider that this site is a greenfield site, which abuts the Conservation Area. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.

PR99: Quarry Farm, Rattlecombe Road, Shenington

- Shenington with Alkerton PC state Inaccessibility to Oxford. Shenington due to its location in the north-west of the county is 30 miles from Oxford. The site is unlikely to deliver 100 dwellings due to its size, topography, capacity, net developable area, etc. The parish has a population of 425; an increase of 32 dwellings would be wholly disproportionate. Part of the site is in the Northern Valleys Conservation Target Area. The Shenington with Alkerton Conservation Area Appraisal (Feb 2009) clause 4, Archaeology, identifies much of the site as Old Quarry. Building on the site would extend the village boundary. It would totally alter the approach to the Shenington with Alkerton Conservation Area from the west. The eastern end of the site abuts the Conservation Area boundary. The sewerage system in Shenington is not capable of serving a large number of extra homes and waste would have to be pumped uphill to connect to it. Shenington is a Class C village, which only allows conversions and in-filling. The site is exposed to noise from the adjacent airfield (karting circuit, and powered aircraft and winches launching gliders). The village school is consistently full year-on-year.
- Historic England state that any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area.

PR109: The Bourne, Hook Norton

- Historic England advise that development of this site should have regard to the setting of the adjacent Hook Norton Conservation Area.

PR110: Land east of South Newington Road, Bloxham
- No comments received in response to this question.

**PR111: Land east of A4260 Banbury Road, Near Fire Station, Deddington**

- No comments received in response to this question.

**PR112: Land North of Earls Lane (portion of ‘Gas House’), Deddington**

- Historic England considers that, this site is within the setting of the Deddington Conservation Area to the south and may be within the setting of the Deddington Castle Scheduled Monument to the south. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal, and the setting of the scheduled monument.

Other comments include:

- Objection to strategic developments that degrades the countryside and are along bridleways and footpaths.
- Deddington Development Watch consider that this site is a greenfield site, which is located at the ‘gateways’ to the Conservation Area. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.

**PR113: Western End of Pond Field, North of Earls Lane, Deddington**

- Historic England considers that, this site is within the setting of the Deddington Conservation Area to the south and may be within the setting of the Deddington Castle Scheduled Monument to the south. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal, and the setting of the scheduled monument.
- Deddington Development Watch consider that this site is a greenfield site, which is located at the ‘gateways’ to the Conservation Area. It suffers from poor transport sustainability; it would result in an increase in population by 13%, putting further pressure on the existing services and facilities. There are inadequate education facilities in Deddington.

**PR114: The Paddock, Berry Hill Road, Adderbury**

- Adderbury PC states that this site does not meet the criteria set within the consultation. Also the site will not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up limits of a settlement and the landscape.
- The promoters of the site state that it fulfils all the planning policy requirements in order to obtain an allocation for residential development.

**PR116: Land at South Adderbury, Adderbury**
- Adderbury PC states that this site does not meet the criteria set within the consultation. Also the site will not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up limits of a settlement and the landscape.

**PR117: Land at Berry Hill Road, Adderbury**
- Adderbury PC states that this site does not meet the criteria set within the consultation. Also the site will not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up limits of a settlement and the landscape.

**PR119: Land at Fern Hill Farm, Milcombe**
- No comments received in response to this question.

**PR128: Church Leys Field, Blackthorn Road, Ambrosden**
- Ambrosden PC advise that the development of this site is considered to have least impact on the settlement of Ambrosden as it is on the edge of the settlement and in the neighbouring Parish of Arncott. Note that Ambrosden has seen a large number of houses built in the last few years.

Other comments:
- Site is too close to Arncott Bridge Meadows SSSI and Upper Ray living landscape of BBOWT. The green corridor between Otmoor and the Upper Ray meadows west of Aylesbury needs to be strictly protected to allow wildlife to travel freely between the two.

**PR129: Land at Ell’s Lane, Bloxham**
- No comments received in response to this question.

**PR134: Land East of Banbury Business Park, Aynho Road, Adderbury**
- Adderbury PC states that this site does not meet the criteria set within the consultation. Also the site will not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up limits of a settlement and the landscape.

Other comments:
- Site is remote from the village and insufficiently connected to it to be considered sustainable.

**PR136: Land at Heatherstone Lodge, Finmere**
- Anglian Water advise that development in this area will have a cumulative impact on its infrastructure.

**PR137: Land to the North of Stratford Road, Site 3, Wroxton**
- Historic England states that any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the adjacent Wroxton Conservation Area, with reference to the character appraisal.

PR138: Land to the North of Stratford Road, Site 4, Wroxton
- Historic England states that, the southern half of this site is within the Wroxton Conservation Area. The Council is currently consulting on an updated Character Appraisal that recommends the extension of the conservation area to include the whole of this site. It is not clear from the updated Appraisal why this extension is proposed or, indeed, what contribution this area of land makes to the special interest, character or appearance of the Conservation Area, but it would seem likely that the loss of its openness would be detrimental to that interest, character and appearance, and therefore we consider that this site should not be taken forward.

PR145: Land to the Rear of Kelberg Trailers, Weston on the Green
- No comments received in response to this question.

PR153: Land west of Hempton, Deddington
- Deddington Development Watch state that this is a greenfield site outside built-up limits comprising very good quality (Grade 2) agricultural land. Hempton is a Category B settlement under Policy Villages 1. Hempton is not served by any form of public transport. Apart from the B4031 the other road links serving Hempton are unclassified roads. There are around 120 houses in Hempton with a current population around 285. A development of 67 houses (at 30 d.p.h.) on this site (5½ acres) would increase the population of this small settlement by over 50%.

Other comments include:
- No facilities in Hempton
- Banbury and North Oxford Ramblers object to the development of this site because it would degrade the countryside and the bridleways and footpaths along this site would be affected. This site is along nature reserves, local wildlife sites, Conservation Target Areas and general intrusion into the countryside.

PR158: Oak View, Milcombe
- No comments received in response to this question.

PR159: Land North East of Tadmarton Road, Bloxham
- Bloxham PC expresses concern that development would add to the congestion on the Tadmarton Road, there would be major loss of green space surrounding the school and adverse impact on air quality.

PR160: Land off Bloxham Grove Road, Bloxham
- No comments received in response to this question.
PR161: Land adjoining Middle Aston Lane, Middle Aston

- Middle Aston PM strongly object to this site as it is an inappropriate location for residential development. The village is a Category B village with limited services and facilities. The proposal would be out of keeping with the character of the village, result in backland development, double the size of the village, be prominent in the landscape, harm the setting of listed buildings.

Other comments:

- This field captures the essence of the Cherwell Valley incorporating a ridge, footpath and fields. This is an important break in the landscape between settlements which also provides wildlife habitats.

PR162: Land off B4100, Adderbury

- Adderbury PC states that this site does not meet the criteria set within the consultation. Also the site will not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside the built up limits of a settlement and the landscape.

PR163: Land off Bloxham Road, Milcombe

- No comments received in response to this question.

PR164: Land East of Sands Lane, South Newington

- South Newington PC states that this site does not offer a suitable development in a sustainable location. It does not meet the criteria in Policy Villages 2. Areas of concern include loss of amenity, impact on heritage and wildlife assets, existing infrastructure unable to cope with increasing size of village by 50%.

Other comments:

- There are highway and access problems with this site.
- A 50% increase in the size of the village, much of which is a conservation area, would destroy its character.
- Existing infrastructure already over stretched.
- Incompatible with policies in the adopted Cherwell Local Plan.

PR166: Land north of Fenway, Steeple Aston

- 80 Steeple Aston residents strongly object to the development of this site and consider it thoroughly unsuitable.

PR171: Land south of Fenway, Steeple Aston

- 80 Steeple Aston residents strongly object to the development of this site and consider it thoroughly unsuitable.
- Historic England considers that, this site may be within the setting of the Steeple Aston Conservation Area to the south-east. Any development of this site should have regard to
the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

PR172: Gravel Farm, Finmere
- Anglian Water advise that this development would have an impact on its infrastructure.

PR176: Land east of Sibford Road, Hook Norton
- This site has been granted planning permission at appeal (ref: 14/00844/OUT)

PR183: Land off Lince Lane, Kirtlington
- Kirtlington PC considers that this site is inappropriate for most of the criteria set out in the consultation document. Two appeals for housing on this site have been dismissed by two different planning inspectors.
- This site should be considered for development

PR184: Land west of Banbury Road, Adderbury
- Historic England considers that this site is within the setting of the Adderbury Conservation Area and of the grade I listed Church of St Mary. We consider that this site should not be taken forward.
- Adderbury PC considers that this site does not meet the criteria set out within this consultation, particularly for density of homes of 50 dwellings per hectare. Also in the absence of a proven housing need that cannot be met elsewhere (such as Areas A and B), this site would not comply with the current local plan policies with regard to location outside of the built up settlement and landscape.

Other comments:
- Adderbury is recognised as being a sustainable settlement for new development. Site could deliver up to 50 dwellings with play space and parkland. It fills a gap between existing development at Adderbury Close and Summers Close/Green Hill.

PR189: Land off South View, Great Bourton
- No comments received in response to this question.

PR192: Hatch End Industrial Estate, Middle Aston
- No comments received in response to this question.

PR200: Land opposite Staplehurst Farm, Church Road, Weston on the Green
- Historic England considers that, this site may be within the setting of the Weston-on-the-Green Conservation Area to the east. Any development of this site should have regard to the setting of the conservation area, with reference to the conservation area character appraisal.

PR201: Land at junction of Bloxham Road and New Road, Milcombe
- Historic England considers that, this site is within the setting of the grade II listed Church of St Lawrence to the north-west. Any development of this site should have regard to this setting.

**Officer Response**

The site selection process and subsequent detailed site specific requirements have had regard to the comments raised by consultees and stakeholders.

The weight and views of the public expressed in their representations has been a factor in the site selection process.

The Plan preparation process has concluded that sites within Areas of Search C to I or a combination of any options including C to I would not sufficiently deliver the vision and objectives of the Partial Review.

Sites within Areas of Search C to I would have a greater detrimental impact on the development strategy for Cherwell set out in the existing adopted 2015 Local Plan.

It has been concluded, based on the extensive evidence base, that sites within Areas of Search A and B could deliver the vision and objectives of the Partial Review.

Options A and B will have a far less significant impact on the delivery of the development strategy for meeting Cherwell’s needs.

It is reasonable to consider sites in the Oxford Green Belt as the Plan has concluded that there are exceptional circumstances why there is a need to provide for development in the green belt to meet Oxford’s unmet housing needs.

In accordance with the ITP and NPPF, the Partial Review seeks to make the fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling, and focuses development in locations which are, or can be made, sustainable.

Locating development in sites not Areas of Search A and B would not help minimise the significant number of vehicular trips generated by jobs in Oxford nor provide the same opportunity to assist with the delivery of the Oxford Transport Strategy. Increased congestion would be likely as there would be fewer opportunities for higher levels of walking, cycling and public transport use from the new developments.

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

- The Proposed Submission Plan consider sites of two or more hectares within Areas of Search Options A and B as these areas are considered to be most suitable for Oxford’s needs.
- The 41 sites within Areas of Search Options A and B were considered and assessed through the consideration of range of evidence including landscape, transport, land availability, flood risk and green belt studies. Feedback from the consultation was also considered.

**Q12. Do any site promoters/ developers/ landowners wish to provide updated or supporting information about your sites?**
68 responses were received in response to this question. The majority were from landowners/promoters. Most confirmed their site’s availability and suitability for development. Supporting statements and assessments with Masterplans were also provided in some cases. The sites in question were:

- site at Arncott as a potential strategic site
- PR39, PR186, PR1, Sites in Islip PR55, PR181, PR21, PR23, PR24, PR94, PR95, PR25, PR22, PR51, PR46, PR128, PR41, PR199, PR109, PR187, PR178, PR35, PR184,
- Banbury 3: potential to deliver more housing
- Richborough Estates promote their Vision Document
- Church Leys site in Ambrosden
- Land off Arncott Road

**Officer Response**

The additional information provided has been considered in the detailed site assessments.

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

- The Proposed Submission Plan consider sites of two or more hectares within Areas of Search Options A and B as these areas are considered to be most suitable for Oxford’s needs.
- The 41 sites within Areas of Search Options A and B were considered and assessed through the consideration of range of evidence including landscape, transport, land availability, flood risk and green belt studies. Feedback from the consultation was also considered.

**Q13. Are there any potential sites we have not identified?**

The following additional sites were received in response to this question.

- Land adjacent to Bicester Road, Gosford, Kidlington
- Land at South East Bicester, Bicester/Ambrosden
- Land at Launton, Launton
- Dewars Farm Buildings, Middleton Stoney
- Land west of South Newington Road, Bloxham
- Lower Cherwell Street, Banbury
- St David’s Barracks, Graven Hill Bicester
- Land at Islip
- Land at Hampton Poyle
- 2 Oxford sites, Oxford
- Land at Weston on the Green
- Frieze Farm, Kidlington (amended site boundaries)
- Heath Close, Milcombe (amended)
- Land off Lince Lane, Kirtlington (amended)
- Arncott Motoparc, Murcott Road, Arncott
Some respondents considered that additional sites could come forward through criteria based policies, which would allow sustainable, sites to be delivered whilst preventing harm to heritage and ecological assets.

Officer Response

These sites have been added to, and included within, the detailed site assessments

How the identified issues have been taken into account

- The Proposed Submission Plan consider sites of two or more hectares within Areas of Search Options A and B as these areas are considered to be most suitable for Oxford’s needs.
- New sites received during the consultation that meets the site size threshold of two hectares and are within Areas of Search Options A and B were considered and included in the Sustainability Appraisal.

Q14. Do you have any comments on the representations and submissions we have received so far? Do you disagree with any we have received? Please provide the representation number where applicable.

There was widespread criticism of the consultation process, the timescales required for responses and the availability of documents.

Most responses again raised site specific objections. However, a number of responses have been made which criticise/endorse documents submitted in support of potential allocations. Sites commented on include those at

- Steeple Aston
- Begbroke Science Park (PR20)
- South Newington (PR164)
- Land to the North of the Moors, Kidlington (PR14)
- Land at North Oxford.
- Land at Yarnton

Officer Response

The comments made on the consultation process have been noted.

The consultation exercise has met all the requirements stipulated by the relevant planning regulations.

Hard copies of all the consultation documents were available at the ‘deposit’ locations. Documents were also available on the Council’s website.

Site specific comments have been taken in to account when assessing the suitability of sites for allocation within the Partial Review Plan.

How the identified issues have been taken into account
• The Proposed Submission Plan consider sites of two or more hectares within Areas of Search Options A and B as these areas are considered to be most suitable for Oxford’s needs.
• The 41 sites within Areas of Search Options A and B were considered and assessed through the consideration of range of evidence including landscape, transport, land availability, flood risk and green belt studies. Feedback from the consultation was also considered.

**Question 15: Interim Transport Assessment – Key Findings for Areas of Search.**

**Do you have any comments on the Assessments and findings?**

The Transport Assessment which accompanies the proposed Submission Partial Review summarises the representations made to the Initial Transport Assessment (November 2016) and provides responses to the representations.

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

• The Transport Assessment was considered when preparing the Proposed Submission Plan.

**Question 16 Areas of Search – Selection of Options**

**Do you agree with all of the Areas of Search being considered reasonable?**

The vast majority of responses received object to development in Areas A and B, particularly the loss of green belt.

Historic England notes the initial SA conclusions but questions whether any significant development would be truly sustainable. OCCG advises that remote or rural sites pose additional challenges due to distance from existing surgeries and lack of sustainable options for new surgeries. Oxfordshire County Council agrees that Areas of Search within green belt would be reasonable if they are related to transport corridors.

Kidlington PC does not consider that adequate assessment of other alternatives, than A and B, has been undertaken, or that due regard has been had to the importance of protecting the green belt.

Bodicote PC states that Area H should be deleted as there has already been a considerable amount of new build in this area and more is planned.

Middle Aston PM state that it is not reasonable to include rural dispersal sites and areas to the north of the District due to limitations of the transport infrastructure.

Other comments include:

- Category A villages within Area I can provide a proportion of the housing.
- Area I should not be included.
- It is essential to consider all options but not accept them all.
- Options in the green belt close to Oxford must be considered reasonable.
- Area E most appropriate.
- Option H should be omitted.
Opportunities outside the green belt should be assessed in the first instance before the release of green belt is considered.
- Area I is too general.
- Areas C and G imply travelling on M40.
- Areas A and B are most suitable for meeting Oxford’s housing needs.

Officer Response

Nine areas of search were considered as potential broad locations for accommodating housing growth.

The Plan preparation process concluded that Areas of Search C to I or a combination of any options including C to I would not sufficiently deliver the vision and objectives which underpin the Partial Review. Additionally, Areas of Search C to I would have a greater detrimental impact on the development strategy for Cherwell set out in the existing adopted 2015 Local Plan.

It has been concluded, based on the evidence, that Areas of Search A and B could deliver the vision and objectives of the Partial Review. Furthermore, it was considered that they would not significantly undermine the delivery of the development strategy for meeting Cherwell’s needs set out in the existing Local Plan (2015). In the absence of other suitable options, Areas A and B were taken forward.

The Partial Review responds to national planning policy, including that relating to the Green Belt.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

- Section 2 of the Proposed Submission Plan explains the Areas of Search Options and provides reasons why Options A and B were preferred.

Question 17: Initial Sustainability Appraisal – Key Findings for Areas of Search

The Sustainability Appraisal which accompanies the Proposed Submission Partial Review summarises the representations made to the Initial Sustainability Appraisal (November 2016) and provides responses to the representations.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

- The Sustainability Appraisal was considered when preparing the Proposed Submission Plan.

Question 18: Strategic Development Sites – Initial Selection of Options for Testing

Do you agree with the initial selection of site options for testing?

The majority of responses do not agree with the initial selection of site options for testing, of these most have objected to the consideration of sites within the green belt. A small number were objecting to, or supporting, particular sites with many essentially repeating comments made under Q11 and Q12.
Oxfordshire CC, Oxford City Council, Banbury TC and Bicester TC agree with the initial site selection.

Kidlington PC understands that many fundamental issues have yet to be considered. They are of the view that other options outside Areas A and B should not be discarded at this stage. Gosford and Water Eaton PC states that the decision to focus on these areas is derived from a flawed argument presented by the Oxford Growth Board.

Other comments include:

- Houses should be dispersed throughout the District.
- Agree that sites within Areas A and B are the most sustainable and support the initial selection of these site options for testing.
- Does not reflect the need to facilitate the delivery of a portfolio of sites to ensure a 5-year housing land supply.
- Serious concerns about an emerging strategy that would be reliant on a small number of strategic sites.
- Search should have strong connections with the City; however, this does not necessarily mean the areas geographically closest to Oxford should be chosen.
- Village locations are not suitable for large allocations.
- CDC has a duty to make sure that the proposals are the most appropriate given the ‘reasonable alternatives’ and to demonstrate how the tests of soundness have been met.
- Area will become a big dormitory for London.

Officer Response

In identifying sites to allocate in the Plan regard has been had to all the issues raised, including the weight of public opinion.

The findings of the Sustainability Appraisal have confirmed that sites within Areas A and B are the most sustainable locations for development to meet Oxford’s unmet needs.

In addition to their overall sustainability, sites were considered for their suitability in meeting the Plan’s vision and objectives. Sites within the Green Belt have been considered due to the absence of other suitable alternatives.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

- The Proposed Submission Plan consider sites of two or more hectares within Areas of Search Options A and B as these areas are considered to be most suitable for Oxford’s needs.
- The evidence base including the Sustainability Appraisal and the outcome of the consultation suggest that Options C to I were not considered to be suitable with the reasons listed in Section 2 of the Proposed Submission Plan.
- The 41 sites within Areas of Search Options A and B were considered and assessed through the consideration of range of evidence including landscape, transport, land availability, flood risk and green belt studies. Feedback from the consultation was also considered.

Question 19 Initial Transport Assessments – Key Findings for Strategic Development Sites
Do you have any comments on the Assessment and its findings?

The Transport Assessment which accompanies the proposed Submission Partial Review summarises the representations made to the Initial Transport Assessment (November 2016) and provides responses to the representations.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

• The Transport Assessment was considered when preparing the Proposed Submission Plan.

Q 20 Initial Sustainability Appraisal – Key Findings for Strategic Development Sites

The Sustainability Appraisal which accompanies the Proposed Submission Partial Review summarises the representations made to the Initial Sustainability Appraisal (November 2016) and provides responses to the representations.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

• The Sustainability Appraisal was considered when preparing the Proposed Submission Plan.

Q.21 Evidence Base

A number of comments were made in response to this question.

The largest number of comments relate to the SHMA, including that from Kidlington PC. The general view was that the SHMA should be updated to take into account, for example, recent changes in the economy and BREXIT.

Oxfordshire CC suggests that wider strategies in ‘Connecting Oxfordshire’ should be taken into account.

Historic England was of the view that there should be more historic environment evidence.

The Environment Agency noted that it was proposed to undertake a water cycle study, a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment, and a flood risk sequential test.

Other responses include:

- Identify and develop brownfield sites.
- Green Belt Review and justification for development in the green belt.
- Wishes of local people should be a priority.
- Cost of each development should be evaluated.
- Flooding issues.
- Health provision needs to be considered.
- Fails to consider all reasonable alternatives.
- Lack of evidence about environmental and social impacts.
- Need Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment, Transport Assessment, the HELAA, and the Strategic Development Sites – Place Shaping Principles and Capacity Assessment.

**Officer Response**

The SHMA remains the most up-to-date objective assessment of housing need for the housing market area.

The Plan has been informed by a significant evidence base which includes Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment; HRA Assessment, Transport Assessment, HELAA, Green Belt Studies, Sustainability Appraisal, SFRA Level 1 and Level 2, Water Cycle Study, Flooding Sequential Test, Ecological Impact Study, and Plan Viability Study.

Historic environment evidence has been taken in to account in the site selection process and has informed site specific policy requirements.

The requirements of the Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group have been taken in to account in the site selection process.

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

- The Proposed Submission Plan has been prepared taking into account a range of evidence base such as Landscape Sensitivity and Capacity Assessment, Transport Assessment, Green Belt Studies, Sustainability Appraisal, flooding, etc.
- The evidence base studies will be made available on the Council’s website at www.cherwell.gov.uk/planningpolicy.

**Q.22 Five Year Land Supply Start Date**

Approximately 100 comments were made in response to this question. The majority of responses thought that the 2021 start date was reasonable, including Oxfordshire CC, West Oxfordshire DC and Kidlington PC.

There were however a significant number of representations which did not agree with this approach. Comments made included:

- Houses should be built in response to actual not projected need.
- The market will best respond to the deliverability of sites.
- Timescale too short for the necessary infrastructure to be in place.
- The start date for delivery should be the date of adoption of the Partial Review Local Plan.
- Should start as soon as possible to ensure needs are met by 2031.
- A start date of 2021 is not justified and is inconsistent with Government policy.
- Should not preclude an earlier commencement should a development be in a position to offer it.
- Concern expressed that Oxford’s unmet need will result in putting Cherwell’s 5 year land supply at risk.
- 2021 is unduly optimistic.
- Ring fencing of a specific supply for Oxford is required to avoid harm to the Cherwell strategy.

**Officer Response**

The Oxfordshire Growth Board has agreed upon a common assumed start date of 2021. This recognised the complexity of the issues involved and allowed for reasonable ‘lead-in’ times.

2021 is a reasonable start date due to the fact that there is no pre-existing housing supply in the pipeline that has been planned to meet Oxford’s needs.

Infrastructure delivery is critical and there is a need to ensure that the necessary provision to support the additional development is made.

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

- The Proposed Submission Plan proposes the five year land supply start date of 2021 as agreed by the Oxfordshire Growth Board. This recognises the complexity of the issues involved and to allow for reasonable ‘lead-in’ times.

**Q.23 Maintaining a Five Year Land Supply.**

There were approximately 90 responses to this question. Most respondents agreed that phasing was necessary but many of the developers/site promoters/agents raised concerns. Oxfordshire CC recommended that, wherever possible, health and wellbeing facilitating infrastructure is included in the earliest phases of development.

Comments included:

- An alternative strategy would be to allocate a range of sites across existing settlements which will appeal to a range of different developers.
- Phasing can constrain housing delivery and cause further delays to site delivery.
- Delivery is slowed by the planning process and market demand.
- Phasing for sites of less than 200 units is not appropriate.
- Would welcome provision to allow earlier release of sites if planned strategic sites do not come forward as expected.
- Phasing is unlikely to promote developer competition and will not assist the maintenance of a 5 year housing supply.
- Phasing could positively assist delivery.
- Seeking to restrict the delivery of new homes against market demand would be counterproductive.
- There is no reference in Government policy or guidance that the phased release of strategic sites is a mechanism through which a 5 year housing land supply can be maintained.
- The ability of developers to land bank sites must be prevented.
- Land releases should be phased to ensure that there is no over development if requirements should change.

**Officer Response**

The Partial Review is a focused Plan to help meet the identified unmet needs of Oxford. It is therefore appropriate and necessary that the monitoring of housing supply for Oxford’s needs is undertaken separately from that for Cherwell and only housing supply that meets the vision and objectives for Oxford is approved.

The Partial Review is a time limited plan. It has been prepared for a specific purpose and to ensure delivery by 2031.

Detailed phasing and infrastructure requirements are included within the site specific policies in the Plan.

The Council cannot control the rate at which houses are delivered by the market.

**How the identified issues have been taken into account**

- A housing trajectory is included in Appendix 3 of the Proposed Submission Plan which sets out the anticipated delivery rates of the proposed strategic development sites. This also includes a five year housing land supply calculation.

**Q.24 Monitoring Delivery**

Oxford City Council states that there needs to be a distinction in monitoring between the housing for Cherwell and that for the City.

Shipton on Cherwell and Thrupp PC suggest that a specialist design and development team should be created tasked with the overall integration, design and delivery of the sites.

CPRE Oxfordshire believes that an Oxfordshire Structure Plan is now urgently required.

Other responses to this question include:

- How will the housing be allocated with regards to local residents and those for Oxford?
- It should conform to NPPF.
- Traffic generation remains a central issue.
- Council should take more notice of local opinion, present proposals better and allow more time for consideration.
- The creation of a London corridor should be avoided.
- Specific measures should be introduced to monitor delivery and to allow for adaption of the Plan if sites are not delivered in the anticipated timescale.
- The monitoring approach should be set out in the Plan.
- A missing component is the regeneration of Kidlington.
- Development should be capable of providing mixed and balanced sustainable communities.
- Affordable housing target should be 50%.
- An annual performance review should be published.
- Restrict buy-to-lets.
- Necessary infrastructure needs to be in place.
- Government should put a national housing policy in place.
- There are credible and effective alternatives to housing development in the green belt.

Officer Response

The Partial Review is a focused Plan to help meet the identified unmet needs of Oxford. It is therefore appropriate and necessary that the monitoring of housing supply for Oxford’s needs is undertaken separately from that for Cherwell and only housing supply that meets the vision and objectives for Oxford is approved.

A number of indicators will be used to measure the effectiveness of the policies in the Plan. These will be reported in the Council’s Annual Monitoring Report.

The progress in delivering support infrastructure will also be reported annually.

The Oxfordshire Growth Board has agreed, in principle, to prepare a spatial plan for Oxfordshire on a joint basis.

How the identified issues have been taken into account

- Monitoring and securing delivery is explained in Section 6 of the Proposed Submission Plan.
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