

Comments raised in consultation on PR9

Commenter	Comment	CDC officer response	Edit needed to Development Brief
S W Smith (local resident)	Flood risk - the Development Brief says nothing about the need to address the combined risk of groundwater and flash flooding to which both the site and the existing village has been susceptible for at least 30 yrs. How would the additional housing impact on this? Reduce it to a 1 in 5 return period perhaps?	Mentioned at section 6.1 (pg26), para 6.5.4 (pg53-54) and section 7.1 (pg59)	None
S W Smith (local resident)	Flood risk - the Development Brief says nothing about addressing the flood risk from foul sewage overflowing TW and private drains which some residents had to ensure for a period during flooding. How would the additional housing impact on this?	Comments acknowledged - the existence of this problem should be noted in the Development Brief as a constraint or matter that needs to be appropriately addressed in the development proposals	Reference to foul sewerage to be added specifically to 4.1 under site constraints
S W Smith (local resident)	Flood risk - you are now proposing to extend the village yet further north closing what's left of the flood corridor around the village for both surface water and ground water off Spring Hill. What measures will the LPA require of the developer to safeguard existing residents as well as the new ones?	Mentioned at section 6.1 (pg26), para 6.5.4 (pg53-54) and section 7.1 (pg59)	None
Jon Young (local resident)	Increased chance of surface water run off, increasing flood risk to Yarnnton properties - the developer should pay for an independent FRA chosen by the parish council - their recommendations in terms of improved piping and pumping should be paid for by dev under a s106 ag	Noted, but will be a matter for the planning application rather than the Dev Brief	None
Yarnnton Flood Defence Group (Yarnnton Parish Council makes the same point)	No acknowledgement or consideration of the combined flood risk from groundwater and flash flooding at the site or existing village both of which have been shown to be at real risk (not just hypothetical)	Mentioned at section 6.1 (pg26), para 6.5.4 (pg53-54) and section 7.1 (pg59)	None
Yarnnton Flood Defence Group	No acknowledgement or consideration to address existing flood risk from foul sewage, again, which has occurred recently and historically	Comments acknowledged - the existence of this problem should be	Reference to foul sewerage to be added specifically to

		noted in the Development Brief as a constraint or matter that needs to be appropriately addressed in the development proposals	4.1 under site constraints
Yarnton Flood Defence Group	Limited understanding of historic drainage channels and local topography with disconnected development leading to a heightened flood risk for the whole community	Noted. This is something with the applicant will need to address in a planning application submission.	None
Yarnton Flood Defence Group	Inadequate drainage assets both historical and part of development sites which have not considered the wider community context and been neglected for many years	Noted. This is something with the applicant will need to address in a planning application submission.	None
Sport England	Off-road cycling: • Consideration should be given to off-road cycle routes within the community woodland and local nature reserve. I would draw you attention to Sport Scotland' guide to project development for mountain bike trails and training facilities https://sportscotland.org.uk/facilities/design-guidance/outdoor-facilities/guide-to-project-development-for-mountain-bike-trails-and-training-facilities/	The proposals include various new cycle routes. Any cycle routes through the community woodland would need to consider impact on nature conservation and biodiversity.	None
Sport England	Connectivity: need to ensure good connectivity in areas to be used by the public and to have low level lighting for safety. This will encourage those feeling anxious about taking informal exercise be it walking or running to continue to go out in the twilight hours. Also the introduction of trim trail equipment should be considered and signage to indicate length of walk, again to encourage informal activity.	Too detailed for the scope of the Development Brief, and would need to be considered in light of ecological impacts	None
Sport England	Contributions: • P51 – para 6.5.3. Sport England supports the principle of off-site contributions rather than onsite towards new and improved sports facilities, but this needs to be backed up with a robust and up to date strategy. There should be contributions towards both indoor and outdoor facilities. Based on 540 dwellings I estimate the population to be between 1350-1890 persons (2.5 -3.5 occupiers per dwelling. Therefore the level of contributions toward built facilities based on Sport England's Sports Facility Calculator are:	This seems more relevant to the planning application rather than the Development Brief	None

	<p>https://www.activeplacespower.com/reports/sports-facility-calculator between £563,559 and £788,982. I accept that CDC may use other occupancy rates but the principles sound and has been tested at Public Inquiries successfully over the years.</p>		
Sport England	<p>Playing fields: • P55 – there is a statement that no formal requirement for the playing fields at the school. This disappointing and I think it is in conflict the aim of creating healthy place shaping. There should be opportunities for the primary aged children to use their school playing fields to pursue formal sport which is age appropriate rather than travel to Kidlington or another town.</p>	<p>The requirements of the Development Brief have been developed in consultation with the Council's Recreation and Leisure team</p>	None
Begbroke Village Hall Management Committee	<p>PR9 stands in isolation... Begbroke is shown as peripheral to it...</p>	<p>Noted. This relates primarily to the principle of development. The role of the Development Brief is to guide developers as to the form, scale and layout of development with the aim of integrating the development as far as necessary with existing built form</p>	None
Begbroke Village Hall Management Committee	<p>There are facilities in Begbroke which could be to the benefit of the occupants of PR9</p>	<p>Noted</p>	None
Begbroke Village Hall Management Committee	<p>No public meeting place / community centre / hall for the new developments and, other than school grounds, no large expanse of ground available for sport and recreation</p>	<p>The requirements of the Development Brief have been developed in consultation with the Council's Recreation and Leisure team and having regard to the site's constraints and the requirements for the development as set out in Policy PR9. OCC has advised that the expansion of William Fletcher wouldn't be required if two schools are provided on PR8. The surplus land on either</p>	None

		could be proposed for this purpose. If this land does not become available, S106 contributions will be required towards off-site provision. Line 61 of Appendix 4 of the Partial Review Plan also applies.	
Begbroke Village Hall Management Committee	If PR8 and PR9 are to be examples of healthy place shaping, then it would seem sensible for CDC to consider the whole development and get commitment from developers to contribute toward improving facilities at Begbroke Playing Field	Would seem more relevant to the planning application stage than the Development Brief	None
Begbroke Village Hall Management Committee	Requests a signalised pedestrian crossing at Begbroke, to ensure safe passage across an increasingly busy A44	Would seem more relevant to the planning application stage than the Development Brief	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Needs to understand what measures will be in place to mitigate increased traffic and speeding	Matter for the planning application	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Increase in traffic on A44 is inevitable with the dev of PR8 and PR9. An updated traffic impact assessment must be a minimum requirement	Matter for the planning application	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Speeding problems, noise and air pollution, need for pedestrian crossing, comments re plans for 40mph speed limit	Matter for the planning application	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Measures to prevent parking outside William Fletcher School (by staff and during school drop off and pick up is already an issue) must be an explicit part of the brief	Would seem more relevant to the planning application stage than the Development Brief	None
Yarnton Parish Council	The proposed access point to PR9... introduces a potential hazard, further complicated by the proposed bus stop. Recommends the access point reverts to the A44 as in earlier plans as this is the most unsafe part of the road.	It is noted that the Local Plan policy requires two accesses onto the A44. The result of detailed discussions with OCC is the proposed variation as set out in the development brief	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Unless counter measures are established, access and egress at the proposed point in Rutten Lane will create increased traffic volume + associated increase in noise and air pollution. Traffic calming measures required	Would seem more relevant to the planning application stage than the Development Brief	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Against the closure of Sandy Lane	Not a relevant matter for the Development Briefs	None

Yarnton Parish Council	Yarnton is a village, and PR9 is described as an extension to a village. Four storey buildings are therefore out of keeping; any building heights should not exceed that of the buildings in the Cresswell Close/Hayday Close development to the south of the village. Single storey dwellings are needed...must all residents wishing to live in single floor accommodation be restricted to live in a multi-storey flat?	The Development Brief sets out a requirement for four storeys at the northern end of the site adjacent to the A44. Elsewhere the maximum will be three storeys and, adjacent to existing built form, two storeys. These heights would be appropriate in principle in design terms and would help Cherwell meet its commitments in terms of the overall number of houses on the site. Reduced heights would likely result in this commitment not being met or in the need for further Green Belt land release, neither of which is appropriate.	None
Yarnton Parish Council	If 4 storey building is allowed each side of the A44 (PR8 and PR9) a high sided corridor with claustrophobic impression will be created	Ditto	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Definite limits should be imposed to minimise light and noise pollution, for residents and wildlife in the green spaces	Already covered in the DB as far as it can be; beyond that is for the planning application	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Developers must adhere to climate change policies and highest env standards including solar panels, triple glazing and insulation	Matter for the planning application	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Developers should be penalised for deviation from the brief	The Development Brief will be a material consideration in the assessment of the planning application. The proposals will need to accord with the Development Brief	None
Yarnton Parish Council	Impact on primary care healthcare facilities	Matter for the planning application	None

Begbroke Parish Council	The proposals offer very little to Begbroke	Noted	None
Begbroke Parish Council	Pedestrian crossing for Begbroke village not included in the plans - this is a major priority for the village and there has been much correspondence between BPC and OCC on this	Would seem more relevant to the planning application stage than the Development Brief	None
Begbroke Parish Council	Lack of a controlled crossing	Ditto	None
Begbroke Parish Council	Ideas about Dolton Lane are upsetting. The nature of this lovely ancient rural lane is that sometimes it is impassable, but this is what makes it so special. It would be a disaster if it were turned into an urban pathway as shown on Pages 28 and 36. The character of the lane would be lost forever	Agreed that the designs shown on pgs28 and 36 would not be appropriate. This may need amending or clarifying in the text, but pg44 is clear that the rural character of the Dolton Lane must be retained	The 2nd para in 6.4.5 to be amended to read "northwards" rather than "southwards". Also, the words "run alongside" to be removed.
Begbroke Parish Council	All of Binfield should be turned into woodland	Noted	None
Begbroke Parish Council	No transport links - no direct bus link	Noted	None
Begbroke Parish Council	Sewage - current system unable to cope	See above	See above
Begbroke Parish Council	If the proposed new Railway Station is built surely keeping Sandy Lane open both ways would make sense.	Not relevant to the Development Briefs	None
Begbroke Parish Council	No retail provision meaning that all residents must go to a larger settlement such as Kidlington for shopping. The nearest small facility to Begbroke is Budgens Yarnton.	These matters have been worked through in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council and others to ensure that the developments provide for the additional infrastructure required	None
Begbroke Parish Council	Shopping trips will require car journeys either via Langford Lane or Loop Farm if Sandy Lane is closed. People without transport will be stuck especially with one mini-bus trip/week. This must be addressed.	Matter for the planning application	None
Begbroke Parish Council	How can agricultural land be considered to provide significant ecological and biodiversity gains	It is not intended that the Development Brief says this. Ecological and	None

		biodiversity gain will require the necessary level of positive action rather than merely retention of agricultural land – this is set out in the Development Brief and the detail/capture will be a matter for the planning application	
Begbroke Parish Council	Inhabitants to the north of the site would find the facilities in Begbroke e.g., village hall bowling green and playing field closer than that of Yarnton.	This would seem to relate more to the planning assessment than to the scope of the Development Brief	None
Begbroke Parish Council	In item 5.1 there is reference to provision of sports facilities. 1. 'It is the Council's preference that in lieu of on-site formal sports provision an appropriate financial contribution be made towards new and improved facilities at southeast Kidlington' Given that there appears to be an option why not consider developing the playing field and village hall at Begbroke? There is already desire for an all-weather surface multi-sport facility - the current arrangements need improvement, and we have the space. This is likely to be cheaper and has the benefit of developing the social amenities within the village which can also be used by inhabitants of PR9 (and PR8) a pedestrian crossing is needed at Begbroke for safe access to these facilities.	The requirements of the Development Brief have been developed in consultation with the Council's Recreation and Leisure team and having regard to the site's constraints and the requirements for the development as set out in Policy PR9. OCC has advised that the expansion of William Fletcher wouldn't be required if two schools are provided on PR8. The surplus land on either could be proposed for this purpose. If this land does not become available, S106 contributions will be required towards off-site provision. In more general terms, line 64 of Appendix 4 of the Partial Review Plan applies: "Formal sports provision at Land West of Yarnton"	None

Begbroke Parish Council	The design brief shows no public meeting place/community centre/or hall planned for the new developments. Money should be allocated to improve existing Begbroke facilities at village hall.	The requirements of the Development Brief have been developed in consultation with the Council's Recreation and Leisure team and having regard to the site's constraints and the requirements for the development as set out in Policy PR9. In more general terms, line 57 of Appendix 4 of the Partial Review Plan applies: "Expansion of community facility in the vicinity"	None
Begbroke Parish Council	Allowing traffic on to the A44 at the science park junction will further increase queuing and probably reduce the gaps in traffic through Begbroke making it even more difficult to cross - the current traffic light sensors are also defective.	These matters have been worked through in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council Highways and, as far as it is applicable, reflected in the Development Brief. Beyond that, this would relate more to the planning application, and/or matters needing to be addressed independently by the local highway authority, than to the scope of the Development Brief	None
Peter Hewis (local resident)	No mention of affordable housing	Mentioned at Exec Summary (pg1), 2.1.6 (pg14), 6.3.1 (pg29), 7.1 (pg59)	None
Michelle Mason (Local resident) NB. The points made by Michelle Mason are also made verbatim by	Comments regarding the need for housing, the impact on Yarnton and the outcome of the court case	Relates to the principle of development which has already been set in the Local Plan, and not to the Development Brief	None

Richard Quinnell			
Michelle Mason (Local resident)	Impact of development on transport infrastructure	Ditto	None
Michelle Mason (Local resident)	Please provide a path from the rear of properties on western edge of Rutten Lane to provide easy, direct access to the green corridor so that we can continue to enjoy the countryside without having to make a significant walk to an alternative access point	This seems a reasonable point and it may be appropriate for the Development Brief text to be amended, although there would be a concern regarding the security of these properties. Footpath access provision will be made just north of Yarnton Medical Practice	Section 6.3.3 to be amended accordingly
Michelle Mason (Local resident)	Seems unfair and unacceptable not to make the same allowance re mitigation for neighbours to the dev on Rutten Lane as is proposed for new houses on the development (green spaces such as allotments and green corridor). Please provide these residents with a similar green space separating the rear of the existing properties/gardens from the school playing fields to mitigate any sound pollution, not an unsightly acoustic fence/similar. At the very least hedging, but not a large fence.	Some of the Rutten Lane dwellings would be bounded by the allotments and some bounded partially by open land that would include drainage attenuation features; for others there would be residential development to the other side of the boundary - in these cases it would be reasonable to require hedgerow planting along the site boundary	Section 6.3.1 and Fig 13 to be amended accordingly
Michelle Mason (Local resident)	Request for financial compensation for the impact on property value	This falls outside of the remit of the planning system	None
Michelle Mason (Local resident)	Construction traffic to be via the A44 and not the Cassington Road or Yarnton Lane	This would seem to relate more to the planning assessment than to the scope of the Development Brief	None
Michelle Mason (Local resident)	Flood risks need to be understood before the plans are progressed further	This is a requirement of the planning application submission	None

<p>Sue Blackshaw (local resident)</p>	<p>Shortage of indoor sports facility - would like to see an easy to run indoor provision allowing for two netball courts with 6ft run off</p>	<p>The requirements of the Development Brief have been developed in consultation with the Council's Recreation and Leisure team and having regard to the site's constraints and the requirements for the development as set out in Policy PR9. OCC has advised that the expansion of William Fletcher wouldn't be required if two schools are provided on PR8. The surplus land on either could be proposed for this purpose. If this land does not become available, S106 contributions will be required towards off-site provision. In more general terms, line 64 of Appendix 4 of the Partial Review Plan applies: "Formal sports provision at Land West of Yarnton"</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Jon Young (local resident)</p>	<p>The proposed access to the site off Rutten Lane is not needed as there is access off the A44 - it has the potential to create a rat run through Yarnton</p>	<p>It is noted that the Local Plan policy requires two accesses onto the A44. The result of detailed discussions with OCC is the proposed variation as set out in the Development Brief</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Jon Young (local resident)</p>	<p>Impact of traffic on Rutten Lane due to the development's proximity to the school - the developer should pay for speed decrease solutions under a S106 agreement, e.g. cameras, speed bumps</p>	<p>This would seem to relate more to the planning assessment than to the scope of the Development Brief</p>	<p>None</p>

Jon Young (local resident)	The improvements to non-vehicle transport infrastructure to support the dev are unsatisfactory - there should be a wider foot/cycle path and possibly on both sides allowing a satisfactory non-vehicle commute to Oxford	Being delivered by OCC	None
Jon Young (local resident)	Any increase in public transport should be directed along the A44 and not through Yarnton/Rutten Lane	There are a number of existing bus stops on Rutten Lane. It wouldn't appear to be the Development Brief's intention to direct more public transport use along Rutten Lane, but instead for the development not to adversely affect the capacity and safety of Rutten Lane	None
Jon Young (local resident)	Impact on medical and schooling	This relates to the principle of development rather than the Development Brief itself	None
Jon Young (local resident)	Noise pollution assessment of London Oxford Airport to be required as the new dev is under current agreed flight paths and likely to be affected.	This would seem to relate more to the planning assessment than to the scope of the Development Brief	None
OCC	The Development Brief should clearly set out how enhancement and beneficial use of the Green Belt land within the allocation will be achieved or conditioned upon an application for dev on any or all of the 25ha expected to be used for residential development	We have had regard to the positive use of the Green Belt in putting these allocations/policies together, and have identified in each case provision for open space and biodiversity etc.	Section 6.3.4 amended to refer to Green Belt benefits
OCC	Para 4.2.5 - the reference to Campsfield Road should read Upper Campsfield Road	Agreed	Para 4.2.5 amended accordingly
OCC	We request a new bullet point: “Opportunity for new southbound bus stop on Rutten Lane near Aysgarth Road” (as shown in Figure 15).	This would go against local third party responses but would reflect what is shown in Figure 15.	New point to be added to 4.2.5
OCC	Para 6.4.9 Alter final paragraph to “There will be a requirement for contributions towards the off-site A44 southbound bus lane enhancement, and for	Agreed	Para 6.4.11 amended accordingly

	increased service provision. These are to be agreed with OCC.”		
OCC	No mention of adhering to the Oxfordshire Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy for the residential dwellings. It is important that the minimum provisions are met from and also that consideration is given towards scalability with future demand.	This strategy was published after the Development Brief was formulated, and is new policy beyond the scope of the Development Brief, but a few words could be added in the sustainability section of the Development Brief	Added to 6.1 – ‘Electric vehicle charging is to be provided in accordance with the most recently adopted policy’.
OCC	The designing of cycling routes should be accommodated with sufficient wayfinding to support the “less car-centric” movements and modal shift.	Noted	The words "appropriate signage or surfacing treatments to facilitate (encourage?) use in the support of modal shift" added; text amended in 6.4.7
OCC	Part of section 6.5.4 ‘Blue Infrastructure’ is too specific for a high level design brief. The locations of drainage attenuation features must be agreed with the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) following a detailed assessment of the existing hydrology and flood risk issues. As this is a major development, the location of any drainage features will need to be agreed with the LLFA as well as the CDC flood officer, regarding any changes in land drainage management. Please amend as indicated with the strikethrough and red: ‘It is expected that the site will drain towards the eastern part of the site, reflecting the topography and existing outfalls on the eastern boundary, with drainage attenuation features broadly in the locations indicated on Fig.18 and to be agreed in detail with the LLFA and CDC Flood Officer, as an integral part of the overall landscape strategy for the site.’	Noted	Text to be amended accordingly, but also the words "and CDC Flood Officer" to be removed (replaced with LLFA)
OCC	Para 6.4.5 Please amend as indicated by the changes in red: ‘A new pedestrian footpath from Rutten Lane to the Dolton Lane green corridor, immediately to the south of the school and nursing home is to be provided (subject to survey and agreement with the pre-school, nursing home and the school and	Agreed	Para 6.4.7 amended

	agreement on how this will be managed in perpetuity).’		
OCC	Para 6.4.3 Please amend as indicated by the changes in red: ‘One access point to Rutten Lane: adjacent to the Medical Practice. To the south of the primary school and nursing home a pedestrian footpath should be provided (subject to survey and agreement with the pre-school, school and nursing home and agreement on how this will be managed in perpetuity). The accesses from Rutten Lane to the school will be part of the school site and secured as required for safeguarding purposes.’	The para referred is the penultimate one on pg39. The first suggested change appears to relate to vehicular access rather than pedestrian access, which is covered instead in 6.4.2	The latter addition ("and agreement on how...") to be made; the earlier changes to be made but using slightly amended text to what is suggested
OCC	6.5.4 Please amend as indicated by the changes in red: ‘Attenuation ponds should not be placed within the area identified for school expansion. Runoff from the hillside to the west will need to be attenuated before it reaches both the new nursing home access road and the school boundary. The LLFA recommends the applicant places the attenuation for the school site outside the immediate school boundary. This should be in the form of an on the surface attenuation basin as opposed to underground storage. The LLFA feels this would provide bio-diversity benefits, cost savings and a reduced maintenance liability.’	Noted	Para 6.4.14 amended
OCC	6.6 Please amend as indicated by the changes in red: ‘To ensure that the school site is in the optimal location and layout for satisfactory education provision, it shall comply with the County Council’s design requirements, processes, interrogations and checklists as described within the following documents:’	The change requested here is for the County Council to be referred to as such rather than OCC. This makes sense as it would distinguish it from the City Council	Para 6.5 amended
OCC	‘The existing vehicular access from Rutten Lane to the school and nursing home is to be retained as a vehicular route, to access the school site only, that will be secure and that will not cross the children’s pedestrian routes within the school site. NB All subject to agreement with the nursing home, see below.’	Noted	Para 6.5 amended
OCC	The vehicular access and pedestrian routes into the school and nursing home sites are to be shallower than 1:21 from the drop off area into the school and nursing home access and along all routes to the school site.	Noted	Para 6.5 amended
OCC	‘To enable an integrated and secure primary school site, the existing vehicle and pedestrian access to Yarnton Residential Nursing Home from Rutten Lane is to be rerouted via the site. This route, where it runs alongside the playing fields is to be a private access for the nursing home and will be managed	Noted	Amended accordingly

OCC	6.3.2 Please add this text in red: 'Cycle parking is to be easily accessible, ideally at house frontages, to promote active travel.'	Noted	Amended accordingly
OCC	6.3.3 Please add this text in red: 'On plot parking in front of properties is to be avoided. Easily accessible cycle parking is to be provided.'	Noted	Amended accordingly
OCC	6.4.5 Reference should be made to the fact that cycling routes should support connectivity.	Noted	6.4.7 amended and reference to LCWIP added
OCC	6.4.7 Please amend so that this and all development briefs mention the need to provide for EV charging on site.	Noted	Added to sustainability section 6.1
OCC	6.7 Please amend as indicated by the changes in red: 'Planning applications for development on the site will need to include a desk based assessment, incorporating the results of an archaeological evaluation, to assess the significance of any archaeological deposits on the site.'	Noted	6.6 amended
OCC	'An archaeological mitigation strategy, including provision for the preservation in situ of any significant archaeological deposits, will need to be submitted along with any planning application for the site.'	Noted	6.6 amended
Cllr Middleton	Would like the Council to hold developers to a high standard of sustainable development	This would seem to relate more to the planning assessment than to the scope of the Development Brief	None
Cllr Middleton	The Council should make sure biodiversity enhancements are applied and maintained long term	This would seem to relate more to the planning assessment than to the scope of the Development Brief	None
Cllr Middleton	Seems to be a lack of health and educations provision provided for both development briefs	These matters have been worked through in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council and others to ensure that the developments provide for the additional infrastructure required	None
Cllr Middleton	Consideration into the effect on local roads the development and closure of Sandy Lane will have on traffic. Pedestrian crossing are vital pieces of infrastructure and should respond to the local need.	These matters have been worked through in consultation with Oxfordshire County Council Highways and, as far as it is	None

		applicable, reflected in the Development Brief. Beyond that, this would relate more to the planning application than to the scope of the Development Brief	
Cllr Middleton	Recommendation to set up a local forum consisting of councillors and residents to give back feedback to the LPA and developers.	Noted	None
Cllr Middleton	Yarnton seeing more flooding events regularly often related with run off from Spring Hill. Endorses response from Yarnton Flood Defence Group	Noted. Picked up in response to comments made by the YFDG	As per above
David Lock Associates for OUD	Given the interrelationships between the Partial Review sites, subject to the series of Development Briefs currently being prepared, it is imperative that the planning submissions, and planning permissions, are prepared, structured and consented in a way that ensures compatible and complementary development in terms of both design and delivery.	Noted	None
David Lock Associates for OUD	Section 7.2 should also reference the need to secure the co-ordination of design or delivery elements that are common across the PR sites	CDC officers agree and these changes to be made, with some amendments to the wording in the 2 nd bullet point	<p>Addition of two new bullets after the first bullet of 7.2, to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where land, services or infrastructure within the site is designed to serve wider CLPPR developments, planning applications will demonstrate how this can be co-ordinated and delivered effectively through site master-planning and S106 agreements. • Any infrastructure links or open space networks that are

			<p>common to more than one CLPPR development site will either be constructed to the site boundary or in such a way as to facilitate connection, where required, between development sites and with access to residents/public provided so as to avoid a 'ransom' position being established which prejudices the effective delivery of this common infrastructure and/or its long term community benefit.</p> <p>Two additional bullets added after bullet three of section 7.2, and that the current bullet four is amended to read:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Obligations are to be secured via a planning agreement, entered into under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.
--	--	--	---

		<p>Consistent with national planning policy and practice guidance and the Cherwell Developer Contributions SPD (February 2018), the allocation of S106 costs required to serve the development is to be agreed with the applicant to secure appropriate financial contributions and/or in-kind works under a direct delivery obligation. Subject to statutory tests, these shall provide for “on site” and/or “offsite” facilities and infrastructure as required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• In preparing a draft Head of Terms, it is recommended that proposals applicants should have regard to matters including the LPPR Infrastructure schedule. Where facilities and infrastructure are required to
--	--	--

			be provided on land outside the site, these are to be secured by way of proportionate planning obligations and/or through the pooling of contributions as appropriate, in accordance with the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010, as amended.
Gerald Eve (for the land promoter)	While the quantum of new community woodland is agreed (7.8ha), notes the brief proposes a single area of woodland, north of the residential area; proposes two woodland areas rather than one, performing slightly different functions, the first acting as a buffer between the site as a Begbroke but the land being more open, the second being within the woodland habitat buffer, adjacent to and contiguous with the southern and eastern boundary of Begbroke Wood, substantially increasing the size of the woodland block and enhancing woodland edge habitat	These matters have been worked through in consultation with relevant advisers to the Council. Variations to this will be considered as part of any future planning application	None
Gerald Eve (for the land promoter)	The area of retained green belt immediately west of the development area is proposed to be repurposed as a working meadow with grazing animals as opposed to its proposed use under the brief as a new green space / park	These matters have been worked through in consultation with relevant advisers to the Council to ensure that the developments provide for the additional infrastructure required	None
Gerald Eve (for the land promoter)	The applicant will be proposing one additional use, namely up to 9,000 sq m of elderly/extra care floor space to be located close to the vehicular entrance on the eastern boundary, accessed via the Rutten Lane / A44 roundabout	The requirements for land uses on the site have been worked through in detail with the land promoter and other stakeholders. This addition is a matter more appropriately picked up at planning application stage. The	None

		planning policy for the site remains the starting point for consideration and it would need to be ensured that the required elements are included in an outline application	
Highways England	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None
Historic England	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None
Thames Water	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None
Berks, Bucks and Oxfordshire Wildlife Trust	[No substantive comments re the content of the Development Brief]	N/A	None