

Appendix 4 - Representations to the draft Submission Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan (Regulation 16 consultation)

All full original representations are available on-line at

<https://www.cherwell.gov.uk/info/221/neighbourhood-plans/400/mid-cherwell-neighbourhood-plan/4>

1.	Banbury Ornithological Society	<p>Supports the proposals for the Natural Environment, including the establishment of nature reserves.</p> <p>Would like the Plan to support investment in enhancing the four Conservation Target Areas as a priority for the natural environment. Create a dedicated section entitled Nature Conservation, to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation Target Areas • County Wildlife Sites • Reference to the importance of the area for birds and other wildlife. • Reference to the importance of restored minerals sites for nature. <p>Recommend mapping the County Wildlife sites and nature conservation target areas.</p> <p>The River Cherwell is an important habitat feature as well as a defining feature of the landscape. It has retained a relatively natural character, which should be protected and, wherever possible, enhanced.</p> <p>In terms of the potential impact of development on nature conservation, they would like the plan to ensure that development avoids impacts on all designated sites and county wildlife sites, and development achieves a measurable net gain in biodiversity.</p>
2.	Daniel Scharf	<p>Encloses information which refers to previous work on the site including planning applications and states that the approach being taken by the Council to this site of international historic/heritage significance is contrary to both law and policy.</p> <p>Raises concerns over the involvement of Dorchester group in the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan. Raises concerns about the reliance in the Plan of the masterplan referred at Appendix M.</p> <p>Objects to the lack of reference in the Plan to heritage.</p> <p>In terms of sustainable development refers to a policy by Oxford City Council and believes that development cannot</p>

		<p>be described as 'sustainable' if there is already a known need for it to be upgraded.</p> <p>Objects to policies relating to adaptable housing and suggests other ONS figures could have been considered. Believes the housing figures for the villages are too low.</p> <p>A shuttle bus could be mentioned in the Plan.</p>
3.	Ian Lough-Scott	<p>Wishes to record his gratitude for the work undertaken by the volunteers and professional staff to enable the concerns of local parishes to be collated and presented in a way that he believes reflects the feelings of the communities participating in the Neighbourhood Plan area.</p> <p>Wishes to stress the great importance of the provision of a zone of non-coalescence, defined on Policy Map Fig. 18, on the western boundary of Heyford Park in order to prevent coalescence Heyford Park with the village of Upper Heyford and to protect the Cherwell valley.</p> <p>Supports the recognition of light pollution in the Plan and the proposals for local green space designation and a cemetery and transport issues.</p>
4.	The Oxford Diocesan Board of Finance	<p>Object to the proposed designation of the allotments at Fir Lane, Steeple Aston as a Local Green Space (LGS). The site in question is site SA2 which is referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) as 'Allotments Fir Lane'.</p> <p>The site is considered to be unsuitable for designation as a LGS due to its current level of protection and ownership status. The designation is unjustified, not based on evidence and could prevent the use of the land for community use. The site should be removed as a proposed area of local green space and policy PD7 changed to have regard to national policy.</p>
5.	Judith Lane	Supports the designation of the Green Space at SA4 as it is regarded as a haven for wildlife and an asset for the village.
6.	Paula Harvey	Would like to express strong support for the Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan including the policies for preserving the rural character of the villages. The Plan Objectives form an excellent basis for the future of the Mid-Cherwell parishes.

7.	Antony Allen	<p>Supports the designation of site SA4 as an area of local green space due to it wildlife which he believes is demonstrated by a survey and it provides an area of recreation for local people. Believes it shouldn't be described as a garden and poor access would make the site unsuitable for housing.</p> <p>States that the people who wrote the Plan were acting with the best of intentions for preserving the life and character of the village for the residents.</p>
8.	Adrian White	<p>Supports the Infilling, conversion and minor development within the settlement area as a policy is wholly appropriate for a village such as Steeple Aston. Supports the definition of the settlement area as shown on Fig 11 of the Plan. Supports the approach to development and housing numbers in the Plan. There are access, transport and infrastructure constraints in the village which does not support more development.</p> <p>Supports the proposed designation of sites SA1 to SA4 and highlights the wildlife value and tranquillity. An ecological assessment of site SA4 is provided with the representation.</p> <p>Believes that sites should only be brought forward if it is really to meet a local need in Steeple Aston and not within the whole of the area covered by the Neighbourhood Plan. Agrees that a Community Land Trust might be the best way of ensuring that a truly local need is met. The area covered by the plan is large and if the housing is not meeting a truly local need, it defeats the object of enabling families to stay in the village.</p>
9.	Wild Oxfordshire	<p>Support the proposals for the natural environment, including the establishment of nature reserves.</p> <p>Currently there is no mention of the 4 Conservation Target Areas (CTAs) that fall either partially or entirely into the area of mid-Cherwell covered by this plan.</p> <p>Recommend including a map of all the Local Wildlife Sites in addition to SSSIs. Their protection and enhancement is vitally important.</p> <p>State that former mineral sites can be used for nature conservation. Would like the plan to ensure that development avoids impacts on all designated sites and county wildlife sites, and development achieves a measurable net gain in biodiversity.</p>

10.	Canal and Rivers Trust	State that the canal network plays an important role in supporting growth and sustainable communities and bring huge wellbeing benefits to the area from aspects such as tourism, heritage, education, volunteering, biodiversity and walking /cycling. The trust recognises that the canal is discussed in the NP but states that the opportunity to incorporate further reference to these benefits within the Plan does not appear to have been addressed within the Submission Version. Comments are made on Policies PD4, PD5, PD6 and PD7.
11.	Mary White	Supports the designation of sites SA1 to 4 as proposed areas of local green space. Believes site SA4 hosts valuable wildlife and is valuable to the village and should be retained. Supports the approach in the Plan to housing and the settlement area for Steeple Aston
12.	Frank Damm	Supports the designation of the Green Space at SA4 and regards it as a haven for wildlife and an asset for the village.
13.	Paul Hoginmann	As a beekeeper explains he has become keenly aware of invertebrates and wildflowers in the environment. Supports the local green space designation at SA4 which he believes has an amazing diversity and richness. This is partly due to the unfertilised soil which is difficult for scientists to find. It should be retained and other agricultural land should be used for development.
14.	Bluestone on behalf of Lynda Sanders	These representations are submitted on behalf of the owner of the site proposed to be designated as a Local Green Space (LGS) in Steeple Aston, site SA3 which is also referred to in the Neighbourhood Plan (NP) as 'Field Adjacent to Paines Hill'. Objection is raised to the proposed designation of site SA3. There is a lack of evidence and appropriate reasoning in supporting the designation including why only part of the site is proposed for designation. The site is already protected by the Conservation area and designation would be inconsistent with the NPPF. It is raised as to the sites role and the owner's role in helping to prevent development in the past.

15.	Anne Allen	Agrees with the proposed policies of Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan, and in particular with the designation of the Green Space at the Old Quarry, Fenway (SA4) due to wildlife. Supports the settlement area plan which excludes the Old Quarry from the settlement area shown on Fig 11 of the Plan. As a resident of Steeple Aston with 25 years standing, felt the consultation process was excellent, and that the Neighbour Plan represents my views and that of many residents I know.
16.	Natural England	<p>Recommends strengthening the position on the environment and adding a series of environmental objectives under a subheading of "Environment".</p> <p>Following on from the objectives, recommend creating a new set of environmental policies on biodiversity, green infrastructure, connectivity and previously developed land priority habitats. Re-phrasing of policy PD1 to PD4 is required.</p> <p>Would like to emphasise that these suggested environmental objectives and policies should apply to both any new development proposals around the neighbourhood area, as well as at Heyford Park.</p>
17.	Patricia Vickers	Supports the proposed designation of site SA4 as an area of local green space due to the wildlife there in their view.
18.	Judith Allen	Supports the proposed designation of site SA4 as an area of local green space due to the wildlife there in their view. Refers to apparent use of the land by current owners as threatening this. Supports the Plan in its entirety and believes there is plenty of brown field land elsewhere which could be used for housing.
19.	Andrew Allen	Agrees with and support the designation of the 'Old Quarry' land (SA4) as a green space. States that it has been established by a local ecology expert that this is a very important site because it is a rare inland sand dune area.
20.	Tanya Cheetham	Supports the proposed designation of site SA4 as a Local Green Space.
21.	Alan Hedges	Is disturbed that the Aecom report drew on the SHMA report and by the undefined reference to 'Affordable Housing'. Given the inflated prices of housing in general, and particularly in areas like Mid-Cherwell, a wide slice of the population (and not just the poorest people) cannot aspire to paying anything near marked prices.

		<p>The already agreed development on Heyford Park represents a massive population increase in the parish and believes the scale of development should be capped at this level.</p> <p>Generally supports the Plan objectives and policies in the Plan. Feels very strongly that light pollution must be avoided and stringently controlled.</p>
22.	Jean Stone	<p>Agrees with the proposed policies of Mid Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan, and in particular with the designation of the Green Space at the Old Quarry, Fenway (SA4). Supports the settlement area plan which excludes the Old Quarry from the settlement area shown on Fig 11 of the Plan.</p>
23.	Hilary Magee	<p>Supports the proposed designation of site SA4 as an area of local green space due to the wildlife there.</p>
24.	The Woodland Trust	<p>The Woodland Trust is pleased to see that the vision for Mid-Cherwell identifies the importance of its quality landscape, and how it is enriched by its open aspect to the countryside, whilst also seeking to avoid harm to important landscape views and maintaining and enhancing biodiversity and geodiversity.</p> <p>Suggests some changes to the Plan are made to take account of the adopted Local Plan. The Plan should also seek to ensure development must conserve mature trees and hedgerows, so there is no loss or degradation of ancient woodland in your parish. Would like to see the importance of trees and woodland recognised for providing healthy living and recreation also being taken into account.</p>
25.	John Magee	<p>Supports the proposed designation of site SA4 as a local green space.</p>
26.	Helen Lauder	<p>Supports the proposed designation of site SA4 as an area of local green space due to the wildlife there and the community role the site plays. Is concerned about apparent current apparent treatment of the site.</p>
27.	Gladman	<p>Consider that the housing numbers proposed in policy PD1 should not be considered as a ceiling.</p> <p>Gladman are concerned with the lack of a Policy Map to support the identified key views and vistas.</p> <p>Whilst noting that an assessment of the proposed LGS designations has been undertaken at Appendix D, suggest that in the context of the settlements several of the proposed LGS designations are in fact extensive tracts of land and therefore do not meet all the criteria of paragraph 77 of the NPPF. These designations should therefore be deleted.</p>

		Other examiners reports are referred to.
28.	Brian & Alison Lewellyn	Strongly support the designation of the former sand works, Fenway (SA4) as a Local Green Space.
29.	Angela Marshall	Believes there is abundance of wildlife on the site and feels to have houses built on this space would be very detrimental to the village. There are not the roads or facilities to support even more houses.
30.	Savills on behalf of CALA Management Limited	<p>The Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum are to be congratulated for carrying out extensive consultation and drafting the Neighbourhood Plan. Considers that the basic conditions have been met.</p> <p>Savills represent their clients land at Fewcott Road, Fritwell. Both the main site and the land owned by OCC were considered to be suitable, available and achievable for housing in the 2018 HELAA with a joint indicative capacity of 42 dwellings (HELAA 131 and 133).</p> <p>Policy PD1: Development at Category A Villages - Supports the policy approach but contends that the figures proposed should be minimum figures recognising the opportunity development could have in supporting development in Category A villages.</p> <p>Policy PH1: Open Market Housing Schemes - Our client agrees with the principle of providing a mix of dwellings on-site, including provision of some smaller homes to meet local needs as appropriate. This policy is, however, too prescriptive in its requirements for a set number of dwelling sizes and assumes the same type of housing need(s) across the plan area. Whilst informed by the Oxfordshire SHMA, the wording of this policy should reflect a greater deal of flexibility to ensure delivery across the plan area meets specific locally identified market need at the time of delivery. This policy should more closely mirror the provisions of CDC Local Plan policy BSC4 which requires the mix of housing to be negotiated having regard to up to date evidence at the time.</p> <p>Policy PD5: Building and Site Design - Any new development should be designed to a high standard, responding to the distinctive character of the settlement.</p>
31.	Carol Neville	Supports site the proposed designation of site SA4. In this fast paced era of development and change they believe it is vital to retain these key elements of nature to maintain the equilibrium for current and future generations.
32.	Margaret Forey	Endorses the conclusions and recommendations in this plan and in particular draws attention to the need for small

		properties in the villages suitable for old people, so that they can downsize without having to leave the village. Believes these would have to be organised in such a way that they could remain available for such a purpose and not be instantly sold on for twice the price.
33.	Hunter Page Planning	State that the site at the former sand works site adjacent to Fenway (reference number SA4) is not appropriate for designation as a local green space considering the NPPF requirements for designation and suggest that it is suitable for housing development. An ecological assessment and other evidence is provided to support the representation.
34.	Thames Water	From a network perspective, development proposed within the Neighbourhood Plan are small in scale, as such Thames Water do not have concerns with regards to the level of development currently being proposed.
35.	Dorchester	<p>Highlight Dorchester's role in producing the Plan and the considerable effort undertaken in preparing the Plan by local people.</p> <p>Suggest the Masterplan at Appendix M is deleted.</p> <p>The Neighbourhood Plan should not constrain potential future development options at the Heyford Park.</p> <p>The NP should not refer to the RAF Upper Heyford Conservation Area Map as this has been superseded.</p> <p>Objects to the proposed policy on light pollution</p> <p>Highlights the Rousham Conservation Area changes.</p> <p>Objects to the proposed Local Green Space designation UH5 as it may prevent sports provision.</p>
36.	Mr and Mrs Mallison	Supports the designation of site SA4 as a Local Green Space due to the wildlife present and in terms of development affecting infrastructure as a whole.
37.	Alison Berry	Supports the MCNP policies and in particular the designation of a green space at the Old Quarry.
38.	Dean Cox	Supports the designation of site SA4 as a Local Green Space due to the wildlife present.
39.	Peter Stoddart	Supports the Plan but believes that there could have been a specified zone of non-coalescence between the southern boundary of Heyford Park and the hamlet of Caulcott.
40.	Kate Lauder	Supports the proposed designation of site SA4 as an area of local green space due to the wildlife there and the community role the site plays. Is concerned about apparent

		current treatment of the site by the current owner.
41.	Oxfordshire County Council	<p>Oxfordshire County Council (OCC) support in principle the ambition of the Mid-Cherwell Neighbourhood Plan Forum to adopt a Neighbourhood Plan.</p> <p>Policy T1 should be amended to ensure that the Neighbourhood Forum works with Highways England in addition to Oxfordshire County Council and Thames Valley Police.</p> <p>The NP should include reference to the Walking and Cycling Guidance which is published on Oxfordshire County Council's website:</p> <p>The proposals are broadly in line with Local Transport Plan 4 objectives.</p> <p>Objectives should be focussed on supporting good local use of services.</p> <p>Policy PD1, PD2, PH2: Development outside of the Local Plan Category A villages is unlikely to be regarded as sustainable development in transport terms.</p> <p>Comments are made on the Plans proposals for highway measures and that these would need to involve the County Council.</p> <p>County Council bus service subsidies have been withdrawn and any improvements will need to be through mitigation of further development at Heyford Park and ultimately self-sustaining and market led.</p> <p>Policy PT1 and text from PD6 should be omitted.</p> <p>Cil requirements in the Plan are considered superfluous and policy PC1 revised.</p> <p>Generally supports the use of innovative measures for road safety.</p> <p>Notes that the submitted plan does not contain any reference to protecting the archaeological heritage of the Mid-Cherwell area.</p> <p>There should be no cap on the number of dwellings (stated to be 25) that will be delivered as this is contrary to positive planning for the delivery of housing.</p> <p>There is no clear additional benefit that would accrue from the designation of site AF2 as a LGS that does not already exist today. Also adds that other designations should be considered.</p>

		<p>It is very disappointing that none of OCC's previous comments regarding landscape and biodiversity have been taken on board; these comments remain as previously and are attached within Appendix 1.</p>
42.	Cherwell District Council	<p>The Forum is commended for its hard work and dedication in preparing the Plan and for its collaborative and collective vision, objectives and policies for 11 parishes and in view of the fact that the Plan area contains the Local Plan strategic development site of Former RAF Upper Heyford (known as Heyford Park).</p> <p>The Council provides comments in terms of the draft Plans compliance with the basic conditions, biodiversity, landscape, previously developed land, heritage, the status of the Plan and procedures, the HELAA, data sources, consistency with the Local Plan, the SHMA, housing provision and type, design, local green space designation, parking, transport, developer contributions, cemetery's, Heyford Park and the Action Plan</p>

43.	Oxfordshire Clinical Commissioning Group	<p>OCCG supports investigating options of combining any primary medical care delivery with other community providers where feasible.</p> <p>OCCG does not consider that the additional development expected 2018-2031 is sufficient to commission a new stand-alone primary medical care service. Deddington Health Centre has some spare infrastructure capacity as a result of recent building improvements, but not sufficient to cater for all anticipated growth to 2031. Additional population growth anticipated in the area to 2031 is around 6,000 which is not sufficient to commission a sustainable new GP practice.</p> <p>Local GP practices do not have responsibility for schools health. OCCG does agree that the provision of a pharmacy or GP dispensing service would be very valuable to the area and should be considered carefully in all proposals.</p> <p>OCCG strongly advises that the plan considers that the anticipated residents of extra care housing are likely to have a very high need for health and social care. Policy PH4 mitigation of this should include the following two factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. The high demand for primary medical care services associated with extra care housing should be considered in developer contributions to GP local practices. ii. Oxfordshire has significant shortages of social care staff, including domiciliary workers, partly due to the high cost of housing in relation to wages. This has a major impact on the whole health and social care system locally, contributing to excess stays in hospital. The affordable housing element of associated developments needs to be made available in such a way as to enhance the social care workforce available locally. (Ref Policy PH2)
44.	Roderick Nicholson	<p>Overall finds the NP to be excellent, well-researched, well thought-through and well presented. Raises concern about any development at the old quarry site due to impact on biodiversity and access.</p> <p>Is of the view that access to Heyford Park should be from the east (M40 junction).</p> <p>Supports the designation of the sites at SA1 and SA4 as local green spaces. The countryside needs more designated Green Spaces.</p>

45.	Mr and Mrs Fowler	Concerned about the loss of wildlife if the site at the rear of the old quarry house was developed.
46.	Angela Allen	Supports the proposed designation of the site at the old quarry house at Steeple Aston (Site SA4) as an area of local green space.
47.	Glen Marshall	Concerned about the loss of wildlife if the site at the rear of the old quarry house was developed. Considers that due to the development at the former air base further development is not needed.